

military services of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 6175. A bill to amend section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the first day of each new year as Good Neighbor Day, for the purposes of setting an example in neighborliness on the first day of the year, to serve as an inspiration and a standard for all the days to follow, leading to better relations at home, in all the Americas, and throughout the world; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. Res. 376. Resolution requesting the President and the Secretary of State to negotiate for the purchase of a part of the Dominion of Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 377. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate the activities of the Farm Security Administration; 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. IZAC:

H. R. 6176. A bill for the relief of Shirley Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 6177. A bill for the relief of Owen Young; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 6178. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nancy Jane Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H. R. 6179. A bill for the relief of Thomas H. VanNoy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 6180. A bill for the relief of George J. Cataldo; 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:

2117. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the office of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, Tuesday, November 25, 1941, wherein they record their opposition to legislation to exempt from State and local taxes the sale, purchase, storage, use, or consumption of tangible personal property for use in performing defense contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2118. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Resolution adopted by Common Council of the City of Detroit, Mich., opposing tax exemption of property or transactions connected with national defense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2119. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the National Coordinating Committee for Women's Auxiliaries, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Bill of Rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2120. By Mr. MACIEJEWSKI: Memorial of the City Council of the City of Chicago, memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to increase the minimum rate of pay of those enrolled in the Army during this emergency to \$42 per month and also to extend to them the privilege of free mail service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2121. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Silverlake Young Democrats of Los Angeles, Calif., requesting that Senate bill 1987 be not passed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2122. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Camp 79, O. O. of A. Barrington, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Heavenly Father, Thou who art our peace, grant that we may find rest unto our souls. In a day with fightings within and fears without and of conflicts which no mortal can escape, come with spiritual power; at times Thou dost seem far away, deaf to our cryings and dumb to our needs. With ampler powers and for larger service do Thou fit us in a better world. We pray that we may be saved by our sufferings and sacrifices for those joys which our enfranchised spirits shall share. All that we crowd into our day's ambition, wealth, and purpose may they all be Thine for we are God's; they are but broken lights of Thee and Thou, O Lord, art more than they.

O Master, come with Thy blessed quietness and as we pray with our trembling faith, may we find the shifting sands beneath our feet as firm and as enduring as the Rock of Ages. With bated breath and whispering humbleness we ask for help and strength; grant that righteous conviction may ever struggle toward utterance as we attempt to realize in common everyday living the brotherhood of man; where cross the crowded ways of life. Praise be Thine, O Lord, our Redeemer. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1060. An act to extend the 6 months' death gratuity benefits, now paid only to dependents of officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, to dependents of all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army of the United States who die in line of duty while in active military service of the United States.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation from the following committees: Education, Flood Control, Mines and Mining, and Pensions.

Sincerely yours,

WM. J. FITZGERALD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.
There was no objection.

ADMITTING ANANTA KHITTASANGKA TO THE ACADEMY AT WEST POINT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 251, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Joint Resolution 251, authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy, at West Point, Ananta Khittasangka, a citizen of Thailand

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to permit Ananta Khittasangka to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy, at West Point: *Provided*, That no expense shall be caused to the United States thereby, and that Ananta Khittasangka shall agree to comply with all regulations for the police and discipline of the academy, to be studious, and to give his utmost efforts to accomplish the courses in the various departments of instruction, and that said Ananta Khittasangka shall not be admitted to the academy until he shall have passed the mental and physical examinations prescribed for candidates from the United States and that he shall be immediately withdrawn if deficient in studies or in conduct and so recommended by the academic board: *Provided further*, That in the case of said Ananta Khittasangka, the provisions of sections 1320 and 1321 of the Revised Statutes shall be suspended, and the provisions of law relating to age limitations upon the admission of candidates to the academy shall not apply.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. What are we doing with Thailand? What does this bill do? Will the gentleman please explain this?

Mr. MAY. We are not doing anything with Thailand in this resolution, but the resolution proposes to authorize the Secretary of War to admit Ananta Khittasangka into the West Point Military Academy. This young man is the son of the Prime Minister of Thailand. This is to be done without expense to the United States. He is already in this country and is a student at the Purdue University, at Lafayette, Ind. He is to be subject to all of the rules and regulations of the academy and to pass the necessary physical and mental examinations and all other requirements. If at any time he is disobedient to any rule or regulation, he shall be dismissed from the academy.

Mr. MICHENER. Will this proposed legislation establish a precedent?

Mr. MAY. No; it will not. The Secretary of War has approved this.

Mr. MICHENER. Does this create a new precedent or is this the custom? Is this appointment presumed to be a compliment, is it a good neighborly act, or merely an act of friendship? What is the motive prompting the proposal?

Mr. MAY. I had started to explain to the gentleman when he asked if it was a precedent, by saying that the Secretary of State points out here four or five different similar instances, and refers to the act and the date and the terms of it when others have been admitted. It is stated in a letter or report from the Thailand consul here in Washington, and by the Secretary of State, that it will help to bring about better relations with this country and the present situation in Thailand. It is more complimentary than anything else.

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

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can the gentleman assure us, if this young man goes there, that he will not learn some of these vital military secrets that are a necessary part of the national defense and then go back and tell somebody over there?

Mr. MAY. Oh, the gentleman knows that the academy board at West Point is made up of Army officers, and they will not permit military secrets to be given to military students.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman certain that the entrance of this young man into the academy will not cost us anything. That cannot be possible.

Mr. MAY. It is so provided in the resolution.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Notwithstanding the resolution, does the gentleman really think that we are going to get out of it without paying for it?

Mr. MAY. I think the resolution is the law in the case, and that the Secretary of War will not violate the law.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, is not this the first instance that we have ever done anything for a foreigner without it costing us anything?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. What amount will be paid to this Government for this education at West Point?

Mr. MAY. I do not know whether anything will be paid to the Government or not, but it is expressly provided in this resolution in the proviso on the first page that no expense will be caused to the United States thereby.

Mr. RICH. The point I want to make is, Will this come under the terms of the lease-lend bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair requests the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] to temporarily withdraw his request, because the Chair understood this was a unanimous report from the committee and there would be no contest about the matter.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I temporarily withdraw the request, but I wish to say it is a unanimous report of the House Military Affairs Committee.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of all business on the Speaker's table I may be permitted to address the House for 35 minutes this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an address made by me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NO SEPARATE AIR CORPS

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement made by our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], who has just returned from England. I think the House

would be interested in a statement he has made on "No separate Air Corps."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

As a result of my visit to the British Isles and my conversation with high commanders of the British Army and with our own military observers, who have seen first-hand the warfare in England, on the Continent, and in Russia, I am convinced that the idea of an Air Corps separate from our Army and our Navy is a mistake which should never be adopted by our country. It has been the lack of adequate air support for the ground army that has been primarily responsible for the tactical failures of the British to date. It is largely because of the very close support and cooperation between the air arm and the ground arms that the Russians have taken such a toll of German tanks and have been able to make such a valiant fight.

While it is realized that the fighter command of the independent Royal Air Force have done a superb job in preventing the Germans from gaining air superiority over the British Isles, we must remember that the problem of the British Isles, which, after all, is small in area, is not the same problem as in the United States or in Russia; and, furthermore, the Royal Air Force, in the defense of the British Isles had the support of the antiaircraft artillery, which is a part of the ground forces. Even so, I am informed that had England not started the war with a separate air force it would never have one now; and they cannot understand why anyone in our country is advocating such a basic change in our present Army organization when we are in the midst of a national emergency.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an article by a young lady from Green Bay, Wis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial and also I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a news item.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the requests of the gentleman from New York are granted.

There was no objection.

LABOR LEGISLATION

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, without any animosity at all, but in sorrow and with some regret, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that the editorial writers in the great newspapers which have been clamoring for the last 5 or 6 weeks for labor legislation now in their editorials characterize the bill which was passed last week as being drastic antilabor legislation.

It would be a fine thing if some of those editorial writers who have been pounding us on the back for labor legislation would now display a little sincerity and knowledge of what we did and tell us wherein the Smith bill is drastic antilabor legis-

lation. Let them point out to us what provision is un-American. Let them tell us now whether or not they favor violence in strikes, whether they favor jurisdictional and sympathetic strikes, whether they favor the collection of a fee for the sale of work permits to the men before they are permitted to work—evils which they have been writing about for the last 2 or 3 years. Let them be honest with the House and point out wherein they claim we have erred.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Just to recapitulate on next week's work: On Monday there will be the extension of the Soil Conservation Act. I was hoping that it would be brought up today, but it will be brought up Monday.

I understand there are two noncontroversial bills from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

On Tuesday will be the Private Calendar; not the omnibus bills, but the call of the Private Calendar.

If a rule is reported out of the Rules Committee, on Wednesday we will take up the national-defense housing bill. I have nothing further to announce to the House for next week.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. FULMER. If we have time this afternoon, it would be satisfactory to bring up the extension of the Soil Conservation Act today.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman knows the statement I have just made was as a result of a conference I had with the gentleman yesterday. I wanted to bring it up today. It is agreeable to me, if the appropriation bill is finished in time, to take it up this afternoon; but if not, it will come up on Monday.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman contemplate any conference report before Monday of next week from the Senate?

Mr. McCORMACK. I doubt if anything would be here before probably the latter part of next week. That is the best answer I can give the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Permit the Chair to state that, after talking to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] yesterday, the Chair told several Members the soil-conservation bill would not come up today.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want the position understood, that I was anxious to have it brought up today. I had made arrangements to ask that the House meet at 11 o'clock. I had conferred with the minority leader, and as a result of the talk I had with the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on

Agriculture, I deferred making that unanimous-consent request and asked that we would go over until Monday. Certainly, if the Speaker has told Members definitely that the bill would not come up until Monday, there is only one thing to do. If I had told one Member it would not come up until Monday, I would feel obligated to keep that promise, and under the circumstances I think, in view of what the Speaker has said, the bill should not come up today.

The SPEAKER. Well, the bill will not come up today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by Hon. William C. Bullitt, former Ambassador to France.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein two business letters I have received from Detroit.

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a statement I made before the House Committee on Agriculture relative to aiding farmers whose crops have failed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the Mountain States Association in their convention in Albuquerque.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6159) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6159, the supplemental appropriation bill for the

national defense, with Mr. RAMSPECK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRAVEL OF THE ARMY

For travel of the Army, \$10,000,000.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Page 3, line 10, strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$25,000,000."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes in order to describe the meaning of this amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, in the appropriations called for in this bill we are taking some very drastic steps, steps the House will remember for many years to come. I have consulted with various officials of the War Department and have asked their opinion on different items in this bill and have examined various items under which I could include furlough travel pay for the 600,000 young men who are to be able to go home on furlough this Christmas. The committee will recall when I presented the Hall bill, H. R. 5922. Not enough time has elapsed since then to enable the bill to be brought before the House on a discharge petition and, as I have had no report from the Military Affairs Committee or the War Department, I take this opportunity to present my amendment to this bill.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will yield a little later. I have 10 minutes. I will greatly appreciate it if I may proceed.

Mr. ANDREWS. I merely wanted to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that his amendment would not be in order, the Committee on Military Affairs not having authorized the expenditure.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If I may proceed, this amendment seeks to increase by \$15,000,000 the item for Army travel of \$10,000,000 on page 3, line 10. The purpose of the amendment is to provide transportation home during furlough for all those who will be granted furlough by the War Department this Christmas. According to the figures which have been procured, it will run about 600,000 men. I have talked with various officials trying to get an estimate of the cost of such transportation and find the consensus is that the amount charged the United States Government in case this amendment is passed, will not be in excess of the 1½ cents a mile the boys are now charged. For this reason I am presenting this amendment at this time and asking the House, as the last opportunity it will have to give these boys their transportation home, to consider it on a sane and wholesome basis.

The members of the committee well know that I have attempted to present the proposition on various occasions. It

will be recalled that during the consideration of the draft extension bill I offered an amendment providing for transportation during furlough, but, as the amendment had not had wide discussion, it was not accepted at that time and I did not press for a record vote in the House. Since that time, however, I submit to the committee that there has been sufficient and wide discussion throughout the entire country on this proposal of paying the boys' transportation home on furlough. I dare say that at this time there is not a Member of this House who has not heard from some of the folks back home urging each and every Member to consider the feasibility of paying these boys' transportation home.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Let me say to the gentleman that if I am properly informed, when he delivered his radio address he called on the country to write all of their Congressmen about it; and in view of the fact that he has never asked the House Committee on Military Affairs for a hearing, it has not come up. He has now filed a discharge petition on the desk.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is mistaken, because I have no discharge petition on the desk. I have purposely refrained from filing one because I felt that at this time it would be appropriate to ask the House for this action. Mr. Chairman, I may say that the bill now under consideration calls upon the House to appropriate great sums of money for the national defense and for the defense of other nations which the President deems necessary to designate. According to one of the minority leaders I talked with last night, this bill provides at least a billion dollars for the President to dispose of as he sees fit. That is, for the defense of other nations he deems necessary for our defense. I propose at this time to give a small amount of that \$8,000,000,000 bill which we are now considering to the boys so that they may return to their homes and their families and see their loved ones during this Christmas holiday period. During recent days in the press we have seen a great many items describing the President's plan for a widespread, deliberate program of defense of a vigilant nature which will spread over the entire world, including an expeditionary force of some 10,000,000 men, to go to the continents of Asia, Africa, and every other place throughout the world that is deemed necessary to take care of the situation. As a mother wrote me not long ago, this may be the last chance that a great many of the boys have to come home. This may be the last opportunity the House may have to go on record as being willing to pay for the transportation of these boys to their places of residence.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say that I am for the idea the gentleman expresses, but when this was brought up before the Military Affairs Committee we were of

the opinion that there should be some testimony taken as to the transportation facilities, and we looked for the gentleman so that we could get this information.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If I may proceed, I will answer the gentleman in this way: I have not had the opportunity, I have not had the chance, nor has the Military Affairs Committee had the opportunity to study this proposal because of the time element; but there is no question about the fact that the mandate has been given by the people throughout the United States, and they are more than anxious to see some action taken at this time so that the boys may have their way paid home during furlough for Christmas. I submit that this is the only opportunity that we will have between now and December 25 to carry out such proposal.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS. I would like to point out two or three things to the gentleman, and I am sympathetic with his idea in connection with this amendment. I must say, however, I believe it unfair in the last analysis to the veterans and to the soldiers and to their families to associate the idea of a Christmas vacation with this. It is misleading because it is not assured that 600,000 men will be returned home. Christmas leaves must be given at the convenience of the War Department and the Army. The Military Committee has asked for a report on this bill. The Budget has not yet reported on the matter. As soon as this is reported the Military Affairs Committee will act upon it. It is a gross mistake to associate the idea with a Christmas holiday, however.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further. In the meantime, however, there is little time left for consideration between now and Christmas outside of the pending amendment. I submit to the House this may be the last opportunity we will have to send these boys home for a furlough. I submit that according to the War Department about 600,000 men will be allowed to go home during this furlough period, and I am simply speaking from information which I have received. It has been estimated that it would cost \$30 a head. It may, but I am inclined to disagree with that statement. It may not cost more than \$25 per head to send these boys home. I submit that in the event it is not more expensive than that the \$15,000,000 increase which I have provided for by this amendment will be sufficient to take care of the half-million boys who will go home.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the committee to give every consideration to my amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this close in 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have a little time.

LXXXVII—597

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 50 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, as appealing as this motion is and as emotional as the general approach is, I seriously question the advisability of our proceeding to enact such proposal into law. If I was in a military camp today and one of my buddies had a furlough to go home and I could not go, if he had all of his expenses paid, and I had to remain on duty and at some future time happened to get a furlough and did go home and then had to pay all my expenses, I would have a first-class ground for complaint. If we are to establish a policy of paying transportation home for the boys who are given a furlough, let us make it a blanket proposition applying to all and not proceed with a lot of discriminatory tactics in the manner here presented.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. No one is more anxious than I am to inaugurate such a policy, but unfortunately there is a limit to the time and for that reason this is probably the last chance we will have.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I see no limit to the time whatsoever. This could be granted 15 years after the man dies in service, as we often make grants to dependents of soldiers, if he lost his life in the service. If he is given a furlough and he goes home, at some future date when the Congress sees fit and a bill is enacted into law, he may be reimbursed at so much per mile for that trip.

I have traveled many miles on expense accounts, and I have had those expense accounts paid anywhere from 3 days to 3 months after I incurred the expense, so I see no time limitation whatever on this proposition.

If the boys want to go home for Christmas and can get a furlough, let them go home. If they travel by hitchhiking and incur no expenses of consequence, and later we pass a bill which gives them 2 cents a mile or 3 cents per mile coach fare, that can be made payable to them at some future date after Congress acts, and to cover the mileage traveled.

My principal objection to this amendment is the discriminatory approach it takes. As much as I like my friend from New York—I have been in his district, I know some of his people, I know he is doing a grand job in representing them well, and they deserve all of that—to me this is a national proposition, and every man now in the service or who may be called into the service at some future date is involved and is entitled to the

same consideration. If I supported the proposition, I would by no means limit it to \$15,000,000. I would make it apply to every man in the naval and military service who received a furlough and who traveled home and could show evidence that he had been home to see his folks. I would let it apply on that basis. That would be my general approach.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In reference to the gentleman's remark about it applying to all the men in the service, I submit that since 600,000 have already been granted their furloughs they would be eligible anyway, and this would embrace all of them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. All right; but does this limit it to that group?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There is where I disagree with the proposition. I would gladly support the amendment if you will make it apply to all the boys.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this amendment, and I informed the gentleman from New York over a week ago that I would support his amendment.

What amuses me, Mr. Chairman, is that during the debate on the extension of the Selective Service Act many Members drew a comparison between the boys in the camps getting \$21 a month and the men in industry making big wages. In the debate on the antilabor bill that passed the House this week, some of the proponents of the bill drew the comparison between the boys in the camps getting only \$21 a month and the men outside getting large wages. They cried with horror at the thought of our boys in camps being away from home and family, with very little chance to get back home—they viewed with alarm and were shaken to their foundations at the threat to democracy.

I say to those who made those remarks and those comparisons that if you meant what you said, then support this Hall amendment, because this is the least you can do to help those kids get home for Christmas. This is your chance to prove your talk was not hypocrisy—that you are truthfully interested in democracy and that you had the welfare of these boys at heart.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I wonder if the gentleman knows what has been done as far as the railroads are concerned. Are they willing to make greater concessions in railroad fares? That might help remove the objections of some of the Members.

Mr. FOGARTY. I would be for anything that would help the boys get home, those that can get home. I would not care what legislation was advanced if it would help them get home for Christmas.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman believe the railroads would give them a lower rate?

Mr. FOGARTY. They give them a lower rate to some extent at the present time—half a cent a mile or 1 cent a mile, I think it is.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Frankly I do not believe the boys that could not go home would begrudge the boys that could go home the chance to go. During the last war men who were selected for especially dangerous duties did not complain because their comrades did not have that duty to perform. The men are not as selfish as some would make them out to be.

Mr. FOGARTY. No; I do not think so, either.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should like to have them all go home.

Mr. FOGARTY. The main reason I rose here today is to say that I should like to see those kids get home for Christmas; they deserve at least that consideration.

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

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

Mr. CANFIELD. Is not this the first all-American proposal that has been before this House in many weeks?

Mr. FOGARTY. It is; and we should pass it with more speed than some of the previous measures got.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman knows that today a man in uniform, if he has a certificate from his commanding officer, can go to any ticket office on any railroad in the United States and buy a ticket at the rate of 1 cent a mile.

Mr. FOGARTY. Either 1 cent a mile or half a cent a mile.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. One cent a mile.

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman favor limiting this only to the boys who are going home on Christmas furlough? Does not the amendment automatically limit it to that?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes; it does; that is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think there is a defect there in the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. I am going to support the gentleman's amendment as he has put it before the House. If he should change it in the near future, I would go along with him on any changes he makes. A lot of my colleagues have been in favor of throwing money around all over the world to bring freedom and democracy to the peoples of other nations; all right, but let us not be unwilling to pay the fare of these boys who have homes and families. We have a greater obligation to freedom and democracy here. Help to preserve the finest thing there is in the world—the love of a boy for his home.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In answer to the gentleman may I say that there is an addition of \$15,000,000 to the \$10,000,000 already in the bill. It was mentioned in my argument, and I specifically advised that it is my desire to see this money spent for Christmas furloughs. If it is the sense of the House to do this, and my amendment is adopted, I believe the War Department will proceed accordingly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the amendment offered to this bill by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], which provides for an increase of \$15,000,000 for travel allowances to pay the transportation of soldier boys from their respective camps to their homes on furlough. We must bear in mind that tens of thousands of these soldier boys receive only \$21 per month. An overwhelming majority of them are young men in very moderate circumstances, and they come from families who are in very moderate circumstances. A great majority of them cannot pay their way home on their furloughs and neither can their families provide the money for that purpose. They must take care of their insurance premiums, laundry, shaving equipment, soap, stamps, shows occasionally, and many other items of expense so that at the end of each month the average soldier does not have anything left. In fact, he must deny himself of the luxury of an occasional hamburger or hot dog. In thousands of instances where these young men are granted furloughs to go home on a visit they must thumb their way. I have picked up scores of them along the public highways. Many of them are taken long distances from their homes. Before they could thumb their way to their homes and return, their time of furlough would have expired.

Our young men are being transferred from time to time to places overseas, and every one of them should have an opportunity to visit his home, his family, and friends. The furlough will mean nothing to the average soldier unless his transportation is paid by the Government. The Government can secure transportation for the soldiers and sailors at 1 cent a mile.

I have received scores of appealing letters from fathers and mothers urging me to vote for the Hall bill so that it might be possible for their sons to visit them. I am happy to have an opportunity to respond to their appeal.

The bill before us calls for approximately \$8,300,000,000. Two billion fifty-six million four hundred and ninety-six thousand two hundred and forty-six dollars may be given away by the President to Russia, Turkey, China, Great Britain, or any other country. Congress, but not with my vote, on the demand of the President, has heretofore voted approximately thirteen billions to give away to any country or countries on the face of the earth that the President desires to give the money or equipment. The first lend-

lease bill for seven billions was approved on March 11, 1941. If this bill becomes a law, then Congress will have voted to give away \$15,041,496,246 in less than 9 months. In other words, Congress has voted to give away a sum equal to \$110 for every man, woman, and child in America in 9 months, and we are told that there will be another big bill brought before Congress early in 1942 providing other billions of lend-lease-give-away. Everybody knows that none of this money will ever be paid back that we are giving to Russia, Turkey, China, Great Britain, and other countries. It is estimated that it will cost the Government on an average not more than \$25 to pay the transportation of our soldier boys from their camps to their homes and return.

The administration and the administration's leaders were very active, and are now active, in taking fifteen billion or more from the taxpayers of this country and giving this vast sum to foreign countries, but the administration and the administration's leaders are here actively opposing this amendment of our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], and they may be able to defeat it. How many of the Members who oppose paying the transportation of our defenders to visit their homes will accept mileage for themselves in going to their homes after this session and in returning on January 3, 1942, to the new session of Congress?

I shall vote to recommit this bill and strike from it the \$2,056,496,246 of the lend-lease-give-away. There are many other objectionable features in the bill but it is claimed that they are necessary for our own national defense. I shall vote for the six billion or more provided in this bill and then I shall have voted for more than fifty-six billion, every dollar that the President has asked from the Congress for the defense of this country and the Western Hemisphere.

Investigations now being conducted by a Senate and House committee are disclosing some sordid conditions of graft and waste. I am afraid it will develop into a national scandal. When this bill passes, Congress, at the behest of the President, will have voted approximately \$69,000,000,000 for the defense of our own country and to give away to other countries. What an enormous sum of money this is. We now have 132,000,000 people in our country. This means that Congress has voted in the name of national defense since July 1, 1940, in less than 18 months, more than \$530 for every man, woman, and child in this country, or more than \$1,600 for the average American family, and this is only the beginning. This is more than twice the cost of the other World War and many billions more than double the assessed value of all the farm lands in the United States with the improvements thereon. Yet the administration is fighting over a few million dollars in the Hall amendment to provide transportation for our soldiers to visit their homes and their families, and is requiring the American soldiers to serve for \$21 to \$30 per month. The administration had repealed the law limiting profits to be

made on Government contracts in the manufacture of munitions of war and we are now told that some of these concerns are making as much as 250 percent profit. Lobbyists, fly-by-night brokers, and others are dipping deep into these billions. I have never thought it was just and fair for one part of our population to do all of the sacrificing and the other part take all of the profits.

INCREASE THE PAY OF OUR SERVICE MEN

We take the flower of the young manhood of the Nation and put them into the Army at \$21 per month—70 cents a day. At the end of 4 months we increase it to \$30 per month—\$1 a day. This includes some of our very best young farmers, young businessmen, lawyers, teachers, carpenters, machinists, painters, mechanics, and other skilled workers, while others remain at home and, with less intelligence, skill, or ability, receive \$7, \$10, and perhaps more, per day, with time and one-half for overtime and double time for Sundays and holidays. On the other hand, the soldier and sailor must be subject to call 24 hours a day and 7 days to the week. He receives no extra pay for overtime or for Sundays or holidays.

War has resolved itself into a great game of machines, skill, and intensive training. The soldier must be able to handle powerful and complicated machines and vehicles. Our armies must be mechanized through and through, and the instrumentalities of war must be handled by physically fit, well-trained, and skilled men.

We should be willing to pay these physically fit, skilled, and trained men such salaries as would induce them to adopt some branch of our defense service as a career. They should not be required to render this unusual service, leave their homes, their families, and friends for 70 cents a day or \$1 a day and about one-fifth as much as many common laborers receive remaining at their homes with their families and required to work not more than 8 hours per day.

There are a number of measures before Congress now that provide for substantial increase in the pay of our soldiers, sailors, and marines. I hope that we will be given an opportunity to vote for some of these bills and give substantial increase in pay to our defenders.

THE SECRET IS OUT

We have been told by the President and his leaders from time to time that the repeal of the neutrality law, the extension of the draft, passage of the lend-lease bills, and other similar measures were in defense of the United States and the Western Hemisphere and to keep us from being involved as active belligerents in the European-Asiatic-African wars. But the secret is now out. Consternation was created in the Nation's Capital on yesterday, December 4, 1941, when the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., published a letter of the President dated July 1941 to the Secretary of War in which he called upon the Secretary of War and others to make an investigation and report the number of men and the amount of equipment necessary to defeat the German Army in Europe.

In September 1941 the high-ranking officers of the Army and Navy made their report in writing. This report was likewise printed on yesterday. Some few have attempted to deny it for the President, but the President has not denied it, and no one in authority has denied it.

The papers report that the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy have set on foot an investigation to find out who let the secret out. The President did not ask his Army and Navy leaders as to whether or not we ought to go to war; he wanted to know what number of men and how much equipment it would require to win the war. Make no mistake about it, the President, long ago, determined in his own mind, in my opinion, to take this country into the European-Asiatic-African wars if it was possible for him to do so.

This Board made up of the high ranking admirals and generals of the Army, aided by Hon. Harry L. Hopkins, stated in substance in their report, I am informed, that it would require 10,000,000 soldiers and sailors and the plan is for our soldiers and sailors to carry on the war in Europe, Asia, and Africa, and the islands of the seas. In other words, if the President can have his way, our ships and our men will be fighting in every part of the globe, and the main purpose is to save the British Empire. It will cost anywhere from \$125,000,000,000 to \$150,000,000,000. It is planned to start the great push on or about July 1, 1943.

We can begin now to see why the War Department has bought enough clothing, shoes, hats, caps, and other equipment for an Army of 10,000,000 men. Many of us have charged that the purpose of the appropriation of these billions and the passage of these various measures had but one object in mind, and that was for this Nation to engage in this world-wide conflict on such a gigantic scale as was never dreamed of by man in all history. Congress and the people alone can prevent our involvement in this long, bloody war. Let us assert as we have many times that no one has threatened to invade the United States or any of our possessions. In fact, no country has laid the weight of a finger upon any American or the rights of any American, but the President has had our ships and our men to go thousands of miles to the war and butt into it. Americans have no direct interest in the Burma Road in southern Asia, and neither our citizens nor their rights are involved in Thailand in southern Asia.

Why are we butting into those remote countries nearly 8,000 miles from our own country? They lie adjacent to the British possessions on the Malay Peninsula in southern Asia, and at the end of the Malay Peninsula is the great British naval base of Singapore. We are simply trying to help save Singapore and the British Empire, and I shudder to think what this far-flung war policy of the administration will do to our country. Before it is over this country will furnish its full quota of blood, tears, and suffering. Its national debt and national obligations now are far above \$70,000,000,000 and before it is over it may be one hundred and fifty billion. The industrial, economic, social, and financial structure of our

country has been greatly upset. It is just the beginning. The end can mean nothing less than bankruptcy and ruin and the loss of our own liberties and freedom.

Millions of loyal Americans are appealing to this administration and to Congress to preserve democracy on this side of the Atlantic and Pacific and preserve this fine heritage of our wonderful country for our own children and not dissipate it in fruitless quarrels and wars throughout the world.

If Mr. HALL's amendment is defeated, tens of thousands of American soldiers will be denied the privilege of visiting their parents and their homes unless the Senate, when the bill comes to them, amends it and puts this provision in the bill.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I merely rose and objected to the limiting of debate on the amendment, not because I expected to speak on the amendment myself, but because I was very much interested in hearing the amendment debated. It seems that every time a proposal comes before this House for something that is pro-American, something for our own boys, the cry goes up to limit the time for debate—anything to defeat the measure. That has been the case with many proposals that have been brought before this House since I have been here. Someone suggested that we have not had time to get a report on the Hall bill. Let me tell you what my experience has been in getting reports. The Federal Government literally stole so much property from the taxpayers in my district. They admitted the property was stolen—not in so many words—but they refused to do anything about it. I introduced a bill to take care of the situation; and what kind of a report does the committee get back on the bill? This is what they said: "It is not in keeping with the President's policy." Since when, I ask you, did legislation always have to be in keeping with the President's policy? If that is not dictatorship, I do not know what it is.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; I yield to my good friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman think for a moment that the American taxpayers would refuse to pay this amount of money for the boys to be sent home?

Mr. WILSON. Certainly not; they would be glad to do it. When I think of the thousands of dollars that were spent just the other day to launch the battleship *Indiana* at Newport News—yes; dollars spent to buy champagne for high-salaried officials to imbibe freely, and also to indulge in feasting—then I wonder how in the world anyone could object to a few dollars for these boys who are sacrificing—yes; preparing to die—for this country. Who is going to do the fighting? Mr. Chairman, if we adjourn, we will get 20 cents per mile to go home for Christmas. How can we refuse these boys 1 cent per mile?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is well to remember at this point that this \$15,000,000 is just 1 percent of the \$1,500,000,000 included in this bill for lend-lease to other nations. Surely we are not going to be picayunish and refuse to allocate these \$15,000,000 to our own boys.

Mr. WILSON. Yes; and only one-fifth of 1 percent of the entire appropriation. Mr. Chairman, when I think of giving all this money to Russia and England and think of the Members in this House who have, under false pretenses, voted to send these boys to war, and who just Wednesday voted against all-out production of arms to defend their lives, I wonder how they can go home and face their people. I did not vote to put these boys into war; but, thank God, I voted to produce everything possible for our money with which they may defend their lives and this country.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I feel that when we spend \$34,000,000 for a War Department building just across the river we ought to be able to spend half an amount representing only a small percentage of that amount to let the boys come home, where they have left their mothers, their fathers, their wives, brothers, sisters, and their sweethearts. Let us send them back home for Christmas. I have been here only 8 months. However, I have voted for all necessary defense appropriations. This Congress is spending \$60,000,000,000. I feel that is a necessary part of defense to allow these young men at least an opportunity to go home for a short interval. This will pay their mileage, and I know we can get a rate of 1 cent per mile.

We have had two Thanksgivings at home ourselves. Why can we not give the boys at least one Christmas at home? I want to tell you Members, whether Democrats or Republicans, you should vote for this amendment. I am not getting up here as a demagogue. Most of my soldier-boy friends are close enough to home to be able to come home, but some of them are not. This amendment will provide for transportation of the soldiers to their respective homes on their Christmas furlough. Let us vote for this amendment.

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

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield.

Mr. HAINES. Does the gentleman think this would contribute to the morale of the boys in the camps?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I think it will not only contribute to the morale of the boys in the camps but to the entire Nation as well.

Mr. HAINES. And the folks back home?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. HAINES. I presume the gentleman has received some letters from the folks at home asking him to support this legislation?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes. I have received a considerable number of letters

and cards from my constituents. In fact, I have more letters from people favoring this legislation than I have about any other legislative matter.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment providing funds for soldiers' furloughs is important to my district, because we live so far removed from the centers where many of these boys are in training. It is 3,000 miles from where I am now speaking to where I live in Portland, Oreg. In passing from Washington to my home, usually by automobile, I find many, many of these men in uniform trudging along the road with their thumbs up wanting a free ride. I always accede to their requests and speak to them about conditions in the camps. If there is one thing more than any other that is in their hearts today it is an opportunity to go home for a little visit, whether it is for the Christmas holidays or any other time.

I had a letter today from a young man from my district in the service calling attention to the fact that in all likelihood they would be called overseas, probably beyond the Americas, although it is true that the law as enacted by us provides that they shall not go beyond the Western Hemisphere. If we can afford to spend, as we are, some \$60,000,000,000 for carrying out this all-out defense program, is it not within the rule of reason that we can spend a small stipend of \$15,000,000 to permit these boys on their regular furloughs to go to their homes to keep up their morale and their families' at home? Certainly they cannot do it on \$21 a month. What surprises me more than anything else is that anyone here would raise his voice against it; that the chairman of the committee having this bill in charge would, in effect, block the way to allowing \$15,000,000 for an additional appropriation for these boys to go home.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to say to the gentleman I am heartily in accord with everything he has said. I think it is a mighty good amendment, and I am going to vote for it.

Mr. ANGELL. I hope that not only will this amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] pass by a large majority but that we will almost unanimously, if not unanimously, approve the measure allowing \$15,000,000 out of probably the \$100,000,000,000 we will expend before we are relieved from duty in the Seventy-seventh Congress to permit these boys to go home on a little furlough. As they have said, possibly it will be the last furlough many of them will have for a long, long time. I personally want to commend the gentleman from New York, my colleague [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], in his insistence, in time and out of time, that we make this modest provision for our men in uniform. As I said a moment ago, the surprising thing to me is that these gentle-

men who are willing to give a billion dollars to Russia without the scratch of a pen, without saying anything about it to us in the Congress, or \$2,000,000,000 as provided in this bill for lend-lease, or a total of over \$60,000,000,000 over all for war purposes, would then draw the line and say, "We will not allow a measly \$15,000,000 to let these boys in uniform have a little respite from their training service and go home over the holiday for a short furlough." In this connection, we should remember that when we called these boys to training service we told them it would be for only 1 year. After getting them into the service we scratched the agreement and extended their term a year and a half. It looks now that before the service is over they will be sent overseas or to bases on the fringe of or beyond the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, this is not a sentimental matter. In my humble opinion, I think it is one of the most important items we shall have under consideration today. We have not provided in the wage or salary we pay to a drafted man a sufficient sum for him to save enough to pay his way home when he gets a furlough. Having served for 2 years in an army, I know something of the value to morale of these furloughs home. You cannot train a man when he is not in the proper frame of mind to receive training.

Last week I was discussing this same subject with three or four officers in one of the big training camps in Georgia. One of them said, "CAMP, somebody up there suggested that we pay the boys' railroad fare home if they can get furloughs Christmas." He said, "That thing has been discussed in the camps more than anything else, and I hope you do it. It will do a lot for their morale."

Let me call your attention to the fact that the armies of Europe give their boys furloughs at stated intervals, sometimes as frequently as every 3 months. They pay the boys' transportation home and let them stay 7 days, then pay their way back. We are lending to those armies under the lease-lend program, and they are doing this thing suggested by the pending amendment. I think it is as little as we can do to provide railroad fare for the boys to go home Christmas, and I am going to support it.

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

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman support a proposition to adopt a policy that we allow all men who are given furloughs, whenever that time may be, to have travel expense home?

Mr. CAMP. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that is the weakness of this proposition.

Mr. CANFIELD. I do, too; but we cannot let all the boys go at once. Those who do not go Christmas should be allowed to have furloughs soon afterward. I think the War Department should adopt such a policy without legislation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, for many years it was my privilege to serve as an enlisted man in the armed forces of our country and I spent the Christmas holiday period sometimes five or six thousand miles from home; therefore, I understand how it feels to be away from home and the family fireside during the holiday period. In the interest of the young men who make up the armed forces, and their families, I heartily support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

As you travel over the country almost every weekend you find a soldier or sailor or marine on the highway asking for a ride. Naturally you pick him up. Generally you find that he is on his way to visit his mother, dad, or sweetheart. You ask him whether he has any money. Some are too modest to tell the truth, but the majority of them are without money.

The soldier, sailor, and marine of today is in a similar position to those of us who served during the first World War. During 1917-18 we had war-risk insurance, just like the young men today have national life insurance. We were told to take a \$10,000 policy and we took it. There was deducted from our pay on the first of every month \$6.60. Then in addition we were urged to buy a Liberty bond, just like the young men are today being implored to buy defense bonds. There was deducted from our pay on the first of the month \$10 as our monthly payment on the Liberty bond. Then we were told further, if we had any dependents at home, just like the young men are today, that we should send an allotment back home. So the average fellow sent an allotment back home that amounted to about \$15 a month. As a rule on the first of the month many soldiers, sailors, and marines during the period of the World War actually found themselves in debt to Uncle Sam to the extent of \$1.60. When a furlough was offered them they had no money to travel on. They stayed in their camps or aboard ship. Many of the young men today find it impossible to get home to visit loved ones because of the deductions and other obligations that they have as a soldier, sailor, or marine in our armed forces. So by adopting this amendment you simply provide we will say on an average about \$25 to send these soldiers, sailors, and marines home to see their mothers, dads, or sweethearts.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Many of these boys, perhaps more than half of them, come from homes that are absolutely unable to get up the money to send for the boys?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. They have not the money and these boys ought to have the chance to come home?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes. The membership of this House will recall that during the discussion relative to the retention

of selectees it was stated that the War Department proposed establishing a new policy of transferring the soldiers or regiments from one camp to another to give them a little sightseeing so that the morale of the men would be improved. If you want to boost the morale of the armed forces today, give them \$25 and let them go home for Christmas, and they will return to their posts with renewed vigor and confidence.

Mr. HAINES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAINES. Is it not true that many of our Pennsylvania boys are quite a distance from home? I have some communications from our boys down in Texas and they do not see how they can get home for the holidays.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct. The Pennsylvania boys are at Camp Shelby, Miss., Fort Benning, Ga., Fort Bragg, N. C., and in various other States, while many are in the far islands of the Pacific, and they all want to come home for the Christmas season. This may be the last Christmas many of these boys will spend in the United States, and I can think of no finer contribution to the morale of our armed forces than to give them a trip home.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN].

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment to provide \$15,000,000 to pay transportation for our soldiers who receive leave for Christmas. I certainly hope it will pass. I cannot see how anyone could afford to vote against it. Many of our boys cannot get home if they have to pay their own transportation.

I really had intended to talk about something else, but it is right in line with this matter. I believe I can show how we could save more than what is involved here by doing something about the lobbyists that are infesting this city and the amount of money that it cost the Government. That is what I intended to talk about.

Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I called the attention of the House to Resolution No. 347, which I introduced calling for the appointment of a select committee to investigate the activities of lobbyists and to recommend to this body legislation to outlaw the "defense broker" and commission agent of defense contracts. If we cannot exterminate him from the scene, at least require registration and some kind of regulations under which they must declare themselves and under which their operations must be governed.

I said then that their existence here implied that all was not well with our system. That was the easy inference to draw. These men are being paid salaries and fees amounting to a king's ransom for supposedly using their influence and contacts to get contracts for a favored few. Suits are cropping up and are now pending to collect these fees for ostensibly delivering millions of dollars' worth of defense orders.

There is only one other conclusion, and that is the one I chose to adopt. If these

men are not getting the contracts through their efforts—if these orders would come regardless of whether or not they were on the scene—then they are impostors of the worst sort. They are extorting money under false pretenses. I here and now want to call a spade a spade—that is what they actually are doing.

We must have faith in the men in our Government. I am not asking for a blind and unreasoning trust. I know that most of these men in key positions have proved themselves well and continue to acquit themselves in an honest and patriotic manner. That is why I resent the presence of the contract lobbyist and salesman, the "profit patriot," who slyly implies a corruptness on the part of officialdom. The facts are otherwise.

I have a testimonial in my possession which I want to bring to the attention of this House—yes, more publicly to the whole Nation. Sensational charges may make better reading and may be more avidly followed in the press, but here is a tribute to the men of the Maritime Commission which should warm the hearts of all Americans with any amount of idealism and faith in their Government. All too often officials hear only from the critical and never kindness from the appreciative.

I want to quote these remarks of Mr. Clarence Skamser, secretary of the Globe Shipbuilding Co., of Superior, Wis. This company is comparatively new and is beginning on a contract negotiated with the Maritime Commission. I have always had a great amount of respect for Admiral Land and his men, so I am most happy to make public this letter of commendation:

We learned many things during our long stay in your city, but the one that makes us feel best is the first-hand knowledge we have gained in respect to the workings in the Commission.

It's an agreeable surprise to learn that all we heard is not true and to find that the men making up the Commission are as straight thinking and as aboveboard as any group we know. Even though we had not received our award, we could not help but have the highest regard for them.

We appreciate, too, why you advised against political intervention. After all, it was up to us to prove to them that we could do the job, and as long as we got an even break with the other yards, we could have no complaint. And that is exactly as it should be.

Mr. Chairman, this man was here for several weeks while negotiating with the Commission. He was heckled and pestered by men who represented that they could secure results for a stipulated fee—that they had connections through which they could work. Their proffered help was spurned; the Globe Co. went directly to the Commission. They found the men there preeminently fair and honest; they dealt with them in an open and straightforward manner and were awarded a contract.

Personally, I want to add that I know the Army and Navy are employing the same fair tactics in dealing with industry. I am sure that the procurement officers of all departments will welcome legislation removing the order solicitors for profit.

I want to again remind this body that this resolution has no bearing on the legitimate officials of corporations doing defense work, nor to the legislative representatives appearing on behalf of pending bills.

This shows that the defense workers who are peddling pap about being the fair-haired fixers are sailing under false colors. The companies that hire them must add their exorbitant fees to the contract price, and the American taxpayer has to pay the bill. Why should the people of the Nation skimp and save to buy bonds while we allow part of the money to be paid to the bogus defense broker? We here in Congress have a duty to perform. This cancerous condition must be excised from our national economic picture. They are mere confidence men working under the guise of trained business agents. They are getting money under false pretenses. They are selling America short.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this is not a pleasant subject to discuss or oppose. I was selected by the minority side to watch public expenditures. I, too, want to save the morale of our boys. I voted not to keep them in over a year because of morale, as I found it, and I feel that I was more closely associated with them than most of you. I live within a few miles of a large camp.

I will tell you what the boys really want, and if the gentleman will suggest what the boys really desire, I will vote for it. I have asked those boys over and over again what they most desire and it is always "transportation out of camp." That is their great desire when any period of leave is theirs. They now have to walk, usually many miles, to any village or facilities of the United Service Organizations. I take some of them in my car very often. Whenever I leave home for the larger part of my district I drive through a camp and I am nearly always accompanied by soldiers. I feel that I know what they want. Amend this so as to give them transportation out of camp and we will be doing something. Why the Army cannot furnish transportation for short trips in and out of camp I cannot understand. Of course, this suggestion is most appealing, but we all know that it is only a gesture. There is yet no authority to use the money and it is very impracticable.

Nearly everybody travels at Christmas time. Railroad facilities are not available. I do not want those boys taken home in cattle trains. Perhaps they would be willing to do it. However, the last time I went home there were four boys on the train, and they were complaining because, they said, "We are soldiers and we cannot get decent accommodations because we are soldiers."

You would send some boys home and you could not send all. Of course, many must remain in the camps. We have no report from the Army officials as to what they could do if authorized. Do they not love their soldiers as much as we do? Do they not want to please them as much

as we do? Do they not want to preserve the morale as much as we do? I think so. They have not approved of this.

You desire to raise this travel expense item from \$10,000,000 to \$25,000,000 for this purpose, and it more than doubles this appropriation. You complain about witnesses being ejected by other speakers. I will not try to be frivolous about this matter. I am very serious.

However, no matter how you vote, I want you to remember this little quotation. It came to my attention last evening:

Here's to you, as good as you are;
And here's to me, as bad as I am;
But as good as you are, and as bad as I am,
I'm as good as you are, as bad as I am.

Surely I need not feel that I am less appreciative of our soldiers than you. This is ineffective legislation and we should not deceive ourselves or them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 13, noes 91.

So the motion was rejected.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I have been reading about it in the newspapers and I have been talking to the railroad people about handling this Christmas crowd. I understand the railroads now have all the cars that are available lined up to take the boys home who have already been provided for and given furloughs, and it would be absolutely impossible to transport any more, except in freight cars.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have no doubt but that that is the correct situation.

Mr. Chairman, there are many reasons why this amendment should not be adopted. For the benefit of those members of the Committee who are not in the Hall, I may say that the amendment is an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York to the item "Travel" under the Army appropriation, increasing the amount from \$10,000,000 to \$25,000,000, the avowed purpose being to provide funds with which members of the Army might have their railroad fare home Christmas if they got a furlough.

In the first place, let me say that the amendment would not accomplish its purpose even if we adopted it. Merely to put the money in the bill would not accomplish the purpose, for two reasons: One is that the Army does not have the legislative authority to spend any funds which they have for the purpose of paying transportation home for enlisted men in the Army on furlough. So unless accompanying the appropriation of this money you would pass legislation, this would be purely an idle gesture, and you would be holding out a golden apple to

the boys that they could never reach at Christmas time. That is reason No. 1.

Reason No. 2 is that this will not become a law, perhaps, and be signed by the President before the 18th or 20th of December, entirely too late for the administrative machinery to be put into effect to give anybody the benefit of such provisions.

Let me say in all seriousness, without any effort to be flippant or to ridicule this suggestion, that this is a thing about which we might work up a good deal of mushy sentiment. We might even arouse ourselves to the point of having a little Christmas tree down on the table here, and maybe singing a few Christmas carols as we pass this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are engaged in a serious and grim business. I have been to some of these camps and I find these men in the camps to be not little boys who want rattles handed to them at Christmas time but grim, hardened American citizens who are being trained for the grim and serious business of answering the call to service if that call comes.

I am willing to vote every dollar out of the United States Treasury and more besides if it is necessary to give these young men equipment, training, preparation, and protection; but do not let us start pinning any bouquets on them; do not let us apply any softening process. Aside from that, and speaking of morale, what could you do today that could be a more serious blow at the morale of the armed forces of America than to adopt this amendment? It applies only to the Army. Think that over, if you please. The bill the gentleman has introduced and this amendment apply only to the Army.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; not now.

Mr. WILSON. The Army boys are the only ones that have been drafted; the others volunteered.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not yield to the gentleman.

Who are the American boys today that are already under fire? They are in the Navy and in the Marine Corps and in the Coast Guard. They cannot even get furloughs home. The boys on the ships that are engaged in the Atlantic patrol, who are already in the thick of this thing, and whose families do not know what morning they may pick up the paper and read the sad news about them, not only cannot get furloughs home but when their ships get into the ports they cannot get furloughs off the ships to go home because we are in a serious, grim business.

Now, pick out the boys who have been drafted and who have been selected for training, a training that is benefiting them every day they serve there.

Every man in this House regretted the necessity for having to pass a conscription bill. No one wanted to do that. It had to be done, but those boys are getting better treatment, better protection, better care than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] and his colleagues received who served in the World War, because we are trying to do everything that we can to provide for

their comfort and their safety. How can we justify selecting one small group and conferring this upon them? Only a small portion of the men who are conscripted will get a furlough home. What are you going to do with the rest of them? Can you justify giving one boy \$25 or \$30 to go home, with a furlough, and saying to another boy, "You not only cannot have your furlough but you cannot have the \$30?" What does that do for morale? Where are you going to stop it? What are you going to do for the boys in the veterans' hospitals? They would like to go home for Christmas. Ought we not give them a ticket home? Oh, I plead with you gentlemen, let us scrape the bottom of the United States Treasury for anything that calls for equipment, or paraphernalia, protection, or for their physical being or mental equipment or their health or anything else, but do not let us make this a mushy, soft, sentimental proposition that we are going into.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I suggest to the gentleman that the situation is so serious in England that they are now drafting women.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I have an amendment that I would like to offer at the proper time to take care of the men in the Navy and in the Marine Corps. And one more comment, and that is that as far as those who are confined in the veterans' hospitals are concerned, the veterans of the World War, and the American Legion, and others will take care of them and the veterans will get a ticket to their homes at Christmas.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is what they should do, and we should do everything that we can for those boys in the camps. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has a bill pending before the Committee on Military Affairs. There will be a hearing on, and the report will be had from the Department, and they will undoubtedly work out if they can something that will not show partialities and put us in the position of having passed half-baked ill-considered discriminatory legislation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman know that the history of the Congress shows that the Congress repeatedly has voted appropriations for this small group or that small group.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is not a good way to legislate, and we ought not to start it today. Of course, the question of farms ought not to be mentioned—about forty or fifty million dollars, nobody knows how much; but if you pass this amendment the War Department could not spend it, and if they could spend it and they had the legislation to warrant it, they could not put the administrative machinery to work in time.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. RICH. If we make some provision for the welfare of our own soldiers, would it not be a whole lot better than to appropriate a billion and a half dollars in this bill that the President can do as he pleases with, to give to Turkey, like some of the north countries?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Every dollar that we spend of this lend-lease money which can be spent by Great Britain, Russia, Turkey, or any other nation is just that much nearer preventing us from the necessity of having to have these boys fight with the guns that we are putting in their hands.

Mr. RICH. Has the Committee on Appropriations ever had anybody come from these foreign countries to tell the Committee on Appropriations that they needed this money to spend, in order to help them?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, no; and if we had the gentleman from Pennsylvania would be the first one to get on the floor of the House and say the Committee on Appropriations is having foreigners coming over here to run our business.

Mr. RICH. Yes; because I am for America first, I want to help America and I do not want to do all I can to help these European fellows.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL), there were—ayes 62, noes 88.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL and Mr. CANNON of Missouri to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 80, noes 127.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHORRERA AND RIO HATO ROAD, REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

To enable the United States to cooperate with the Republic of Panama in connection with the construction of a highway between Chorrera and Rio Hato in the Republic of Panama, fiscal year 1942, \$873,000, to remain available until expended and to be additional to the appropriation for this purpose in the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1939.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the paragraph which has just been read by the Clerk appropriates \$873,000 in connection with the construction of a highway between Chorrera and Rio Hato in the Republic of Panama. I want to call the attention of the Members of the Committee to the fact that we are providing most of the cost for the construction of this road, which is intended eventually to provide a link in a highway that will serve motorists going from this country down through Central America. When I was in Panama last April I found that a great many American people who had gone from the States down to the Canal Zone found themselves bothered by the fact that

Panamanians insist upon following the continental system of driving to the left of the road. It results in a great deal of confusion, a great many accidents, and it causes a great deal of expense in the changing over of automobiles. It has seemed to me that Panama ought to conform to the rest of the countries in North and South America and use the right-hand drive the same as her neighbors do.

Some suggestion was made while I was there that if the United States was going to contribute most of the cost for constructing this highway it would be the appropriate and courteous thing for the Panamanians to adjust their custom to that of most of the other countries of the two continents. While it might be that we might tie a condition upon this particular appropriation to require that that be done before the appropriation would be available, that probably would interfere with the construction of the highway, so I am not offering an amendment to that effect. But I do take this occasion to call attention to the situation and to express the hope that the Panamanians, in appreciation of the gold mine we are providing them in all the construction activities in the building of this highway and other improvements now going on, that they will conform to the custom of most of the Americas.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, during the World War our service men rode free because of the fact the Government took over the railroads. I believe it would be a worthy gesture of this Government, which is so benevolent to foreign countries and foreign service men, to at least give free transportation to our own boys in service so they may enjoy the company of their fathers, mothers, wives, and friends at Christmas. I was in hopes the amendment would pass, and voted accordingly.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, this is an appropriation of \$173,000 for the Panamanian highway, which might be deemed very advisable. It might be a good-neighbor policy, but we have discussed with Canada the advisability of constructing a highway between the United States and Alaska. We do not have any developments as to the advisability of getting this highway, and it seems to me that now is a good time, by the tokens we are offering to Canada and to Great Britain, to have legislation forthcoming in Canada to grant the United States the right to assist jointly with Canada in the construction of this highway to Alaska. If we are to use Alaska for the purpose of a defense area, and to join it up with the United States by highway, certainly the means of transportation by boat from Seattle or the west coast is not an appropriate manner of getting to Alaska as compared by highway.

I hope that consideration will be given by the House of Representatives to securing permission from the Canadian Government at once to assist us in the construction of a highway between the United States and Alaska. It is in the

interest of national defense, and Canada should cooperate and cooperate now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. Chairman, we are considering an appropriation bill of over \$8,000,000,000. This legislation involves a huge potential expenditure of funds. We are all familiar with the demands made by the general public throughout this country for a reduction in expenditure of money on nondefense items. There has been a perfect barrage of propaganda going out over this country which has for its pur-

pose spreading the belief that Members of Congress are making unlawful and unwarranted use of their franking privilege, thereby burdening the Post Office Department with the tremendous burden of carrying franked mail and thus contributing to the deficit in the Post Office Department.

On yesterday the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] submitted to the Congress in his extension of remarks a series of tables and figures bearing upon that question. Because I was furnished this morning by the Comptroller of the Post Office Department, the most recent

available figures upon this subject, numerous Members of Congress have asked me to present them to the Congress as an answer to the propaganda charging Members of Congress with abusing the franking privilege of Members of Congress to burden the Post Office Department and build up the Post Office Department deficit.

I call your attention to the fact that these statistics, which I will ask the privilege of inserting in the RECORD at the proper time, indicate that the greatest burden on the Post Office Department arises from the use of governmental agencies in sending our penalty mail.

Services performed for other branches and agencies of Government, and to aid of certain general welfare and national-policy projects, sometimes referred to as "nonpostal credits"

Service	Fiscal year 1937		Fiscal year 1938		Fiscal year 1939		Fiscal year 1940		Fiscal year 1941	
	Number of pieces	Estimated revenue at regular postage rates	Number of pieces	Estimated revenue at regular postage rates	Number of pieces	Estimated revenue at regular postage rates	Number of pieces	Estimated revenue at regular postage rates	Number of pieces	Estimated revenue at regular postage rates
As listed in act of June 9, 1930:										
Penalty mail (other than Post Office Department).....		\$32,625,126	882,352,048	\$34,166,571	967,583,181	\$36,408,851	995,571,096	\$39,905,033	1,118,461,730	\$49,020,191
Free registry (other than Post Office Department).....	12,019,409	1,456,801	10,985,053	1,524,236	11,535,024	1,522,274	12,029,101	1,628,477	12,089,675	2,537,306
Franked mail.....	42,785,753	1,137,655	24,217,512	779,369	35,570,127	1,003,659	44,975,397	1,217,561	30,779,974	926,843
Second-class publications free in county.....	462,209,428	647,383	400,204,742	637,150	380,844,629	609,024	371,905,741	606,260	371,324,086	616,353
Free mail for blind.....	1,205,693	171,627	1,176,468	188,091	1,263,446	257,287	1,507,228	254,001	2,042,120	265,656
Publications receiving reduced rates (religious, scientific, educational). Aircraft service (estimated excess during the year of cost of aircraft service over the postage revenues derived from air mail).....	858,204,676	59,848	645,686,163	771,474	635,293,542	591,583	888,313,462	316,952	893,585,521	314,868
Other: Custodial and maintenance service in quarters used by other Government agencies.....		6,151,978		5,232,796		8,147,595		9,402,888		5,156,254
		5,760,464		6,310,539		6,834,617		7,503,223		8,254,654
Total.....		57,347,800		49,110,226		55,374,890		60,834,395		67,092,124

In addition to the foregoing, a study made of such services performed during 1941 indicates that other somewhat similar services were performed by the Postal Establishment such as selling and accounting for internal-revenue stamps valued at \$4,828,545.95; selling and accounting for 1,257,313 migratory-bird hunting stamps valued at \$1,257,313; selling and accounting for 3,967,581 United States defense savings bonds valued at \$981,768,250; accepting and accounting for veterans' adjusted-service bonds presented for payment; registering and finger-printing 5,000,000 aliens (act of June 28, 1940); transporting diplomatic mail for State Department; conducting examinations by Post Office personnel for Civil Service Commission; collecting and accounting for customs charges amounting to \$10,300,000 on dutiable merchandise.

The figures on the costs of such services are not yet available.

Penalty mail is the type of mail you get from the Department of Agriculture with that little sign up in the corner, "Government business. Penalty \$300."

Now, just see what has occurred. In 1937 the amount of penalty mail reflected in postage that would have been paid at the regular postage rate was \$32,625,126. In 1941 that had risen to \$49,020,190, an increase from \$32,000,000 to \$49,000,000 in penalty mail from 1937 to 1941.

Now, let us look at the franked mail and see what the situation is.

Franked mail: The postage revenues that would have been paid at regular postage rates would, in 1937, have amounted to \$1,137,655. In 1941, despite all the editorial comment and all the propaganda that has gone out charging Members of Congress with abusing the franking privilege, the facts indicate that the amount of postage, had it been paid on franked mail, would have been \$926,843, a decline, if you please, of the postage that would have been paid if postage had been put on franked mail from \$1,137,655 in 1937 to \$926,000 in 1941. It does seem to me, therefore, that in view of the facts indicated in this report from the Comptroller of the Post Office Department, that the charges that Members of the Congress are abusing their franking privilege in an unwar-

ranted manner, are not justified by the facts.

If you will take all the other items of free mail and reduced-postage mail which appear in this table you will see that the principal increase in the burden on the Post Office Department arises from the terrible increase in the amount of penalty mail.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. The figures indicate that the amount of postal revenues lost through publications receiving reduced rates has increased from \$259,000 to \$314,000. The free mail has increased from a 1937 figure of \$171,000 to a 1941 figure of \$265,000. The second-class publications free in the county was \$647,000 in 1937 and \$616,000 in 1941. So when you get the totals you will see that the principal burden upon the Post Office deficit does not come from the increase in the use of the franking privilege by Members of Congress, it does not come from the increased use of the other facilities of the Post Office Department at reduced postal rates, but it does come

from the tremendous use of the Postal Service of this country by the administrative agencies of Government which are sending out these tons and tons of penalty mail, a large part of which finds lodgment and resting place in the wastebaskets of Members of Congress and others who receive it.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. I may suggest to the gentleman that he distinguished in his remarks just what type of mail the Congressmen usually use. Is it not true that all Members of Congress have a great amount of mail directly in answer to requests and relating to official business?

Mr. KEEFE. Why, of course; and they are supposed to use the franking privilege only for that purpose. The mail I am referring to that Members of Congress use is that mail which is referred to in this table as franked mail. The penalty mail is the mail sent out by the departments of the Government that you receive every day in your offices and that is sent out by the ton all over the United States.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. As a matter of fact, the reports of the Post Office Department have shown that the amount of franked mail sent out by Members of Congress approximates 2½ percent of the total of franked and penalty mail.

Mr. KEEFE. I think that is approximately correct.

Mr. BUCK. The newspapers in our own districts, which are criticizing us for sending out franked mail, forget the privileges they enjoy, which in the case of newspapers sent free might amount to \$90,000,000 a year.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not know that they are forgetting, but I think the average person is confused between franked mail and penalty mail. They are inclined to consider all this penalty mail as franked mail. The Members of Congress do not use penalty mail; they use franked mail. The departments of the Government use penalty mail, and that is where practically the entire increase in this postal deficit is as shown by this report.

Mr. BUCK. I am in accord with the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Much has been said about Members of Congress franking copies of their remarks made on the floor of the Congress to the folks back home. Is it not true that under penalty mail thousands of copies of speeches by Cabinet members are scattered throughout the Nation?

Mr. KEEFE. I assume that is true; at least, I have had occasion to throw a good many of them in the wastebasket, the same as the gentleman has.

I am going to take the time, some of these days, to tell you something about what it is costing the people of the United States to send out all over the country this penalty mail, which does not serve the purpose for which perhaps it is intended.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It has also been known that certain members of the official family have sent out Christmas greetings under penalty mail.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not know as to that, but I do know that one agency of the Government, or its employees, did send Christmas greetings to me at least in a penalty envelope. I do know that.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I want to take this occasion to compliment the brilliant gentleman from Wisconsin for having the temerity to defend the House of Representatives against these attacks so promiscuously made by the press of the Nation. I compliment him.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, short years ago, when the novelist Ibañez was popular reading, the story of the Four Horsemen was on every tongue. But the story does not end there. They followed the opening of the four seals of revelations. Then came the opening of the fifth seal to disclose the slain under the

altar of the earth. Finally came the opening of the sixth seal.

Its opening was followed by an earthquake; the sun became black; the moon turned to blood; the stars fell; the rich men, the great men, the captains, the mighty men, the bondsmen, and the freemen hid in the dens and rocks of the mountains. The day of wrath had come.

THE DAY OF WRATH

How little we hear of the aftermath of the present world struggle; yet our day of wrath is approaching. The very preparation we make to meet the forces from without helps breed destructive forces from within. The time is at hand for careful internal defense.

THE DOMESTIC SCENE

Consider the domestic scene. Small business is begging for life. Priorities are strangling the material supply. Government's own figures on cantonment construction and acquisition of defense supplies testify to inefficiency and waste. Actual expenditures for defense in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, are estimated at eighteen thousand million dollars. This is \$135 per capita, or \$515 for every family. One dollar of every five earned this year goes to Federal expenditures. Next year it is estimated at one dollar of every three. The debt now stands at \$415 for every man, woman, and child.

When World War No. 1 began it was but \$12.36. A debt of ninety billion means about \$700 for every person in the land. Every child now born will be endowed with opportunity and the privilege of sharing in a huge public debt. The national pay roll stands at an all-time high and includes 1,477,000 persons. Federal subsidies, first spurned and then reluctantly accepted, are now demanded by large groups of our people. By the end of the fiscal year the cost of borrowing money will be one and one-half billions annually, and that amount increases as the debt grows. Bank deposits and excess reserves are at record levels. Two and one-half billion ounces of useless silver clutter our vaults to accelerate the inflationary spiral. Twenty-two billions in gold are causing grave concern. There is a growing allergy toward work. Employment in defense industries increases at the expense of employment in nondefense industries. More than 3,000 plants have been or are being expanded for defense at a cost of more than four billion to the Government and one billion to private enterprise. Notwithstanding huge defense outlays, unemployment in October was estimated at 3,900,000 persons. Ten strikes affecting defense and involving 6,900 workers were reported at the week ending November 22. Living costs are soaring. The handmaiden of spending is taxes, and already people are recoiling from additional tax suggestions. A former Member of this House has filed suit against the Empire Ordnance Co. for a commission of \$687,000, representing 1 percent on seventy million of defense business. What must the folks back home think as they read that fact in their daily newspaper?

We are unanimous for a boom but not for the effervescence and headache which

attends a boom. As population levels off, the debt burden becomes even more ominous because debt is but a speculation on time. There is airy talk of repudiation without realizing that we must repudiate ourselves. Daily we venture into new land without a road map. The stimulation of defense will end. The Horsemen will cease to ride. The fifth seal will be opened to disclose the slain crying for vengeance on the living who dwell in the earth. The sixth seal will be broken. The economic earthquake will come and the day of wrath will be at hand. Then what?

TIME TO PREPARE OUR DOMESTIC HOUSE

Somber-hued as this picture appears, there is time for preparation of our domestic house against the fury and shock of peace. The pattern is clear and distinct. Not once in 2,000 years has it varied. The transition will be marked by a continuing exhilaration. Then follows deflation, an impoverished world, a demand for disarmament, disrupted world currencies, rehabilitation loans, unemployment, despair, the application of the lease-lend formula to domestic problems, distrust, and then denouement. There will be no royal road to readjustment. We must prepare now for the impact of peace. The economic road map for the return journey must be ready.

PARTNERS—SACRIFICE

Today, as we appropriate funds for defense against forces from without, should we not immediately design a program for defense against the mounting forces from within. There is a remedy. Its essence is quite simple. Every element of the Nation must become partners in sacrifice. It is a stern but necessary choice. As Shakespeare expressed it, "What king, Bezonian? Speak or die." The choice is between sacrifice and destruction. Perhaps a realistic program will assist the choice and here it is:

First. Government can be reasonable and stop hoarding. Business is entitled to live.

Second. Nondefense spending can be curtailed and emergency activities which have lost their emergency character can be eliminated. Government must become a partner in sacrifice.

Third. In the defense program, the best brains are cheap at any price. Efficient spending requires efficient spenders.

Fourth. Let there be a vigorous use of the broom on defense brokers and favoritism. The growing belief that influence is required to obtain defense contracts is an expeditious way of destroying faith in the integrity of that Government which millions of boys receiving \$21 per month are expected to defend.

Fifth. Aid to Russia is one thing; accepting Russian doctrine is another. Purge government of communism. It is better to crack down now than to crack up later.

Sixth. Priorities have brought distress. The law on competitive bidding should be modified to permit direct negotiation of defense contracts with distressed industries and distressed areas.

Seventh. We planned our way into our present domestic plight. We must plan our way out. Now is the time to prepare the blueprint of transition.

Eighth. American production is the last best hope of an embattled starving world. Why not more emphasis on production and a little less emphasis on allocation?

Ninth. There are still 48 States in the Union. Let defense work be equitably distributed so that all taxpayers might share.

Tenth. The 18 major private defense industries now employ 2,700,000 persons. What of the other 130,000 industries who must live, pay taxes, and provide jobs? Let time limits be shortened on prime defense contracts to compel farming-out and diffusion.

Eleventh. A sound labor policy is imperative. Congress has authorized and appropriated sixty-seven billions for defense. It might as well be 67 cents unless dollars can be translated into defense materials.

Twelfth. Business as usual, strikes as usual, bureaucracy as usual will end in an unusual result. Take the priority off of belt buckles and pull up a couple of notches in the interest of national welfare.

Thirteenth. New taxes if any should be designed to conserve and not destroy capital. We shall need healthy industries to get through the period of wrath which lies ahead. Taxes should conserve the incentive to save because saving is a testimony in our faith in the future.

As partners in sacrifice, let us also be partners in devotion to the cause of our economic salvation when the emergency is over.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, we are considering a very important measure. It provides for the expenditure of the further sum of \$8,000,000,000 for national defense. This makes a total of \$68,000,000,000 in the last 18 months. It means a charge of about \$2,700 for every family in the United States. And yet we are advised our defenses are still inadequate. On the question of adequate defense there is little argument. Our people want it as promptly and as effectively as it can be done.

Mr. Chairman, since we are giving consideration to the most important of our problems, I want to express my view that those who are responsible for carrying out this tremendous program could do well to put their house in better order. I ask that attention be given to at least three important matters.

Stop the graft, the waste, and the extravagance now going on in our defense effort. I refer particularly to the unwarranted and scandalous fees that are paid to certain individuals, some of whom have held high positions in Government, for claiming to assist in securing defense contracts. They are sometimes referred to as defense brokers. Most of you know, or have heard of, Charles West, a former Member of this body. He has also held some high positions in the present administration. He was a sort of go-between the White House and Capitol Hill at one time. He is now in private practice. He claims a balance of fees of \$687,000 for acting on behalf of the Empire Ordnance Co., of New York, in securing defense contracts of \$70,000,000. He says he was entitled to \$700,000 and that only \$13,000 has been paid. It also

appears the company, controlled by Mr. Edward Cohen, of New York, is really some kind of a holding company. I understand Mr. Thomas Corcoran, former associate of the administration is also engaged in representing concerns interested in defense contracts.

The House Military Affairs Committee is investigating Mr. Leon K. Schanack, of New York, an alleged "profit-patriot," whose commissions on defense contracts are estimated at approximately \$200,000. This money is said to come by way of the Greenwich Machine Tool Co. of New York. Another so-called broker had less than \$5 in his pocket a year ago, and now has a bank account running into six figures. There are a number of other instances that have come to the attention; for example, the case of an agent who got \$5,000 for doing little other than delivering a check from one concern to another.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that with the expenditure of billions of dollars there is bound to be some extravagance, but I say to you that the stopping of the payment of unnecessary commissions, fees, and exorbitant profits will come none too soon. After all, the whole business is charged to the people of this country.

Mr. Chairman, just the other day a distinguished Member of the majority side of the House said his committee were of the opinion now that we had overpaid for cantonment lands alone approximately \$100,000,000. As I have said, there is bound to be some waste, but we have had too much of it.

Mr. Chairman, there has recently been some discussion about the political phase of the matter. This is no time to play politics. Men should be appointed to positions of responsibility in policy making because of their ability to do the job and not because they belong to a political faith. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, we still have our pressure groups.

Mr. Chairman, one thing more: I believe it is high time that the administration should be more frank with Congress and with the people. Yesterday a newspaper announced certain plans were in the making for increasing our armed forces up to five or ten million men. The leadership of the House have told us they are sure the statement is incorrect. Why cannot those in charge of the program explain the situation? If it is a matter that cannot be properly discussed, then say so. Woodrow Wilson said, "Honesty and competency require no shield of secrecy." So I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the administration proceed to get rid of these "lobby brokers" and all of their kind, and do it right now; that huge profits be stopped; that no favors be granted; that we have no partisan politics in the defense effort; that those in responsibility of the defense program be more frank and clear in dealing with the American people.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, a member of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact

that the releases of the purchases of the War Department bear out the figures given in that statement yesterday.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I thoroughly agree with the genial gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] who preceded me in the fact that there are exorbitant profits and that those exorbitant profits should be wiped off the books. In the first 17 months of our defense program there was in excess of \$2,090,000,000 over what the program should have cost; but I am getting just a little bit tired of the innuendos that Democrats are responsible for it. Let us look at the record. I know that Mr. Knox, the Secretary of the Navy, is not a Democrat; and I do not think that Mr. Stimson, the Secretary of War, is a Democrat; nor do I think that Mr. Knudsen, in charge of O. P. M., or that Mr. Stettinius are Democrats; and I can safely say that 9 out of 10 of those who are in charge of defense spending are not of the Democratic Party. It is about time that we of the Democratic Party request and vigorously insist that the administration, if you please, take out those who are responsible for this extravagance. If such a request was granted, I guarantee that 9 out of 10 of them will not be of the Democratic stripe. Those who are receiving these unwarranted prices for the contracts they got are 99 percent Republican.

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

Mr. HOOK. Yes.

Mr. RICH. And who does the voting for all of these expenses? Where do you get the votes for these expenses? And where are you going to get this money? It is right over on your side that you get the votes, and the people are going to have to pay.

Mr. HOOK. Yes; and we have to have a defense program, and we must have the money to save this country from the onslaught of Hitlerism, and I shall carry on and help vote the money; but I say it is about time that we got rid of the Republicans who are squandering the money that we appropriate. It is this abuse of squandering the defense money we provide to save our Nation from destruction that is the cause of the breaking down of national defense, and not the laboring man, as the propagandists would lead the unsuspecting public to believe.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, there was a sound of revelry by night. I notice in the United Press item that the Soviet Embassy had a reception. Incidentally, I was not invited. There was champagne and Scotch and caviar dished out very freely for the benefit of some 3,000 guests, and it was estimated by the United Press correspondent that it cost about \$10,000 to hold

this celebration, but he noted that one \$10,000 bill will not be missed out of the 100,000 \$10,000 bills that we gave them without any hope of return.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Does not the gentleman believe that perhaps the Soviet Embassy put on that party in the spirit of casting bread upon the waters?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Undoubtedly, and it came back a hundredfold. Seriously, Mr. Chairman, let me call attention, as a contrast, to what is taking place right here among our own people.

Small business men are greatly disturbed and are becoming increasingly alarmed over their precarious future. Many of them are being forced to quit business; many more will follow. It is estimated that by the end of 1942 anywhere from 50,000 to 100,000 small businessmen will have been forced to quit.

This will mean that many more thousands will be thrown out of employment, and will be looking for jobs. Where can they find them? Only in defense industries. But that will not absorb the many thousands who are too old. No one will want them. Their only chance for a job will be W. P. A.

Let us examine the chances on W. P. A. The appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, was \$1,350,000,000. The appropriation for the present fiscal year is \$875,000,000, or a decrease of \$500,000,000. However, during the first quarter of the present fiscal year, about 39 percent of all W. P. A. expenditures went into national-defense projects. The passing of many small business men and the unemployment of those now working for these small business men will mean a marked increase of demands on W. P. A. The average age of workers in industry is 37 years according to the last census, while the average age in W. P. A. is 43 years. Where can the man of 60 years, or even 50 years go, unless the Government gives him a chance. If W. P. A. takes care of those under 60, then old-age pensions can take care of those 60 and over.

How about old-age pensions? We passed the Federal Old-Age Pension Act in 1935. Its provisions are utterly inadequate. Some States are paying the old folks as low as \$7 per month on which to live. How is that possible? All of us know that seven times seven would be needed to supply the minimum of decency. Yet in spite of bills, petitions, meetings, conferences, and caucuses, our prayers are disregarded and our entreaties go unheard. We are told that there is no money.

No money? As already stated, only recently we gave Russia \$1,000,000,000, and of the party at the Soviet Embassy, referred to, Sam Love, United Press correspondent, wrote:

The Russians, who found a billion-dollar baby in a local lend-lease store, responded handsomely tonight by throwing the gosh-darndest party Washington has seen since the historic "recognition" blow-out of 1934.

It set the Soviet Embassy back about \$10,000. But, between friends, what is one

out of one hundred thousand \$10,000 bills? The modest setting up of a beer and a pretzel.

At least 3,000 guests, from admirals and generals to Office of Production Management clerks from the grass roots, dipped into the caviar, sampled Scotch and champagne, and admired a super-sturgeon baked and literally bedecked with red flags.

In addition, we have given Britain \$23,000,000,000 to date in one way and another, and we are assured that more is to follow. Besides the foregoing, we have given other nations many millions. No money? Oh, yes; millions for foreigners, but not a dime for our old folks. Champagne and caviar to celebrate a billion-dollar gift, while, cold and hungry, our own people must suffer in silence. Ten thousand dollars for a blow-out by the Communists, while our old people in some States are told to feed and clothe themselves on 23 cents a day. If someone will give them their clothes, then they can eat 7-cent meals. And even these tragic pitiabilities would not furnish a roof over their heads or fuel to warm their half-starved bodies.

Let us have less champagne and caviar for foreigners and more ham and eggs for Americans.

Mr. SHAFFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KEEFE) have rendered a great service in furnishing revealing figures in connection with the many abuses of the penalty mail privileges now being enjoyed by the many bureaus and departments of the administration. While these abuses continue to increase, the Government, at the same time, is calling for conservation of paper and ink supplies. The hundreds of mimeographs of the various bureaus grind night and day flooding the newspapers of the country with propaganda which one Washington newspaper recently characterized as "highly uninformative information."

This Washington newspaper, the Daily News, recently showed the utter disregard of the bureaucrats for the pleas for economy in nondefense spending and for conservation of paper. This newspaper conducted a survey of the situation in its own office with the result that it printed an article to the effect that each day's mail brings more than 3 pounds of propaganda hand-outs across the editor's desk. What little news these hand-outs contain usually has been covered by the newspaper's own reporters or press associations, with the result that most of the propaganda finds its way into the wastebasket.

It was pointed out that a typical day's mail of Government propaganda contained 77 releases, ranging from a single Marine Corps flimsy to a 24-page magazine published by the Office of Production Management. At first-class rates the cost of mailing would be 86 cents. Actually, since the pieces arrived in 50 different envelopes, the loss in postal revenue represents nearly three times the bulk 86-cent rate. Each of the Washington newspapers receives an equal volume of this publicity and varying amounts of the same material are mailed to 3,500 daily newspapers throughout the country and to the larger number of weekly newspapers and magazines. I have had many

complaints from editors as to the amount of propaganda they are receiving. One letter, which is typical, demanded legislation to abolish every last publicity bureau. Let me read what this editor wrote:

There is one law that I wish you would get enacted. It would be one to abolish every last Government publicity bureau. All they do is to make us poor editors work an extra hour or two each day throwing away their tripe. We are now threatened with a paper shortage. If Government publicity bureaus would quit sending out their blurbs, at least a quarter of the pulp shortage would be taken care of right there.

This editor is right, but instead of a decrease in the amount of Government propaganda I fear he will see an increasing amount during the weeks and months to come.

The United States Government, according to estimates, will spend at least \$10,000,000 in the fiscal year 1942 for publicity activities merely for national defense and to popularize the war. This will provide employment for no less than 1,436 newspaper representatives, clerks, stenographers, psychologists, cartoonists, song writers, and such who will spread the good word in one form or another. Those workers are spread through at least eight different departments: The War Department, Navy Department, Treasury, State Department, Office of Emergency Management, Selective Service System, Office of the Coordinator of Information, Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Relations, and Office of Facts and Figures.

The Navy Department alone has a staff of more than 211 persons engaged in publicity work. Thirty-nine of these are officers, 14 are enlisted men, and 54 are civilians, all located in Washington. In the field it has a staff of 104 officers, together with the necessary clerical assistants. There is no budget for this organization but it is estimated that it must cost not less than \$1,000,000 a year. Likewise the War Department has a publicity staff of no less than 259 persons. Many of those are Regular Army officers detailed to this task; and here again there is no direct appropriation by Congress for such a function.

The State Department, in the Division of Current Information, is carrying on a comparable type of work, but the Budget for this item is only \$110,113 a year. This organization in the State Department has for one of its principal tasks the determination of the general plan and tone of American foreign broadcasts.

The Treasury Department is spending about \$3,300,000 a year on publicity, primarily for national-defense purposes. Its regular propaganda organization employs from 10 to 59 persons and it has a temporary staff of 43 persons in Washington dealing with the problem. Throughout the country it has a field staff of probably 130 persons. This organization is engaged in building up general public morale for the war and devising various appeals for patriotism.

In the Office for Emergency Management there is a publicity organization of close to 240 on a budget of approximately \$885,000 a year. This organization is engaged in doing nothing but publicizing

national defense and the war and justifying appropriations.

The Office of the Coordinator of Information, which is headed by Col. William J. Donovan, has a staff of at least 175 persons in Washington and 40 in New York. This is supposedly for the purpose of coordinating all defense information that comes to Washington and the preparation of a basic background for American foreign news broadcasts. It is doubtful whether this organization can function on a budget of much under a million dollars a year.

In the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Relations there is another very large propaganda division for the dissemination of the good word about defense. This organization has a publicity staff of no less than 75 persons and a budget for their salaries of at least \$250,000. In addition it has \$3,000,000 for special project work in propaganda; \$600,000 will be used for production of motion pictures to be displayed in Latin America; at least a million will be used to supply Latin American newspapers with American news services; and \$700,000 will be used to subsidize American broadcasts to Latin America. A subsidy of at least \$200,000 has already been given to the World Wide Broadcasting Foundation of Boston to subsidize broadcasts over station WRUL. Slightly larger subsidies are to be given to the Columbia Broadcasting System and the National Broadcasting Co.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, listening to the discussion this afternoon, I am prompted to seek this time to rise and speak in the light of the voice of experience, and tell my colleagues in the House of Representatives a personal experience that I had while in the capacity of a post-office inspector. A man appeared at the post office in Chicago, Ill., and pretended to have influence whereby he could place people on the pay roll to do work at Christmas time. He met these men and encouraged them, telling them that they could not expect to go to work unless they bought a uniform. They paid him in money a part of the sum to get the uniform, and he took the money from these prospective applicants, as much as he could collect, and then disappeared. I went before United States Commissioner, Judge Beiter, in Chicago and swore out a warrant for his arrest for violation of section 32 of the United States Criminal Code, which very clearly provides that any person pretending to have such influence or be in a position to wield such influence shall be subject to the penalty of that Criminal Code. He was bound over and indicted by the grand jury and sentenced by the court to serve a term in a county jail in northern Illinois.

Knowing that statute to be applicable to the ramifications that have been resorted to by the people we have heard discussed this afternoon, I consulted with the Speaker several days ago and introduced a bill, H. R. 6151. It is very brief. It only extends and delineates a little further on the subject, outlining some of the titles and terms that these people use. Also it increases the penalties.

I feel that I should take occasion, in the light of this discussion, to bring that matter to the attention of the House.

In my official capacity I went through the World War period. Much that has been discussed this afternoon was in line with the investigations with which I was charged in the matter of investigating cases of disloyalty, sedition, espionage, and anything else that any of the coordinate branches of the Government might be called upon to investigate with a view to effecting prosecutions.

The machinery of law is available, and if evidence is being disclosed before a subcommittee of our Committee on Military Affairs, to which the newspapers have given publicity, I sincerely trust that the chairman of that committee or someone sufficiently interested in getting possession of that evidence will place it before the Department of Justice and urge thereupon the prosecution of these malefactors.

When the first teller bell rang this afternoon, I was in conversation with the Attorney General's office on that very subject. I do not feel that I violate any trust or confidence, but I do feel that we can have the cooperation of the Department of Justice in the criminal prosecution of these malefactors whom we have heard discussed here, if the evidence we have heard is available is presented in proper form.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. Chairman, I am sure most of you were here when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] said that these gentlemen who are wrecking the defense program, profiteering and finagling here in Washington are all Republicans.

I recall that we had a college professor from Ohio who became a Member of Congress and later was drafted by the administration to run for the United States Senate from my own State. He was not a Republican. He was drafted to run against Vic Donahey, a substantial citizen of Ohio, former Democratic Governor. He ran as the administration's candidate for Senator. You know him—Charley West. Was he a Republican?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Has the gentleman overlooked the fact the President thought so highly of the capabilities of this gentleman that for a long time he was the contact man between the White House and this House of Representatives?

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman. He was contact man for the White House. Certainly the President did not select a Republican. He selected a Democrat for that purpose.

Mr. TABER. That is the polite word for "lobbyist," is it not?

Mr. BENDER. That is right.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Who is responsible for placing this man that the gentleman spoke about in the Cabinet?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield just there?

Mr. RICH. I would like to have an answer to that. Who is responsible for placing him in the Cabinet?

Mr. BENDER. It was not one of the Republican Roosevelts.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Who is responsible for keeping them there?

Mr. BENDER. That answers itself. He is a Democrat.

Then we have this man they call Chip Robert and "Little Evy" Robert. Not Republicans. I recall in connection with the Dupont Circle Apartment affair no Republicans were involved there. And "Tommy the Cork," who does not occupy an office here, was one of the President's right-hand men. Is he a Republican? My friends, I knew that at some time or other they would get around to charging the Republicans with all the shortcomings of the present administration. Pretty soon we will be charged with the New Deal.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Who is responsible for voting all this money for the various non-defense departments of Government? Are they members of the Republican Party?

Mr. BENDER. You know who runs this House. In fact, you know who runs Washington. They even referred to the majority as "rubber stamps." Certainly those of us who are here understand that it is not the Republican Party. For some time when I first came here I heard them talk about Teapot Dome. Those fellows, reprehensible as they were, were mere pikers compared with the boys who are now operating on the defense program. As a matter of fact, I wish the gentleman from Michigan would study his politics a little more.

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

Mr. BENDER. I will yield.

Mr. HOOK. I notice the gentleman said that Charles West was liaison officer between the White House and the Congress. He probably now is liaison officer between that Republican bunch I spoke of and the contractors who are getting the gravy.

Mr. BENDER. Well, he certainly knows on which side of his bread the gravy is.

Then, as I recall, the members of the firm of Roosevelt & Sargent were not the Republican Roosevelts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CREAL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky rise?

Mr. CREAL. I only want the RECORD to show that on the teller vote on the amendment to give the boys transportation on their Christmas furloughs I voted "aye."

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

Mr. Chairman, for just a few minutes I want to get back to this bill and to matters that are germane to it, and I am going to anticipate the Clerk somewhat in the reading of the bill. On page 24 of the bill appears an item of \$30,000,000 for the Bonneville Administration for transmission lines. The Committee on

Appropriations and the subcommittee that handled this, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], assisted by the chief clerk of the committee, Marcelus Shield, have made a report on Bonneville and Grand Coulee, which appears on pages 28 and 29 of the committee report. There was accord not alone among the entire membership of the subcommittee but in the whole committee when they reported the bill on this \$30,000,000 item, and I do not anticipate any difficulty here in the Committee of the Whole House.

This report, however, is so exceptional and so completely clarifies what has heretofore been misunderstood in this House during the 5 years these mighty projects have been moving forward that I want to take the time now to read it into the RECORD and give the membership and the public at large a full understanding, in language clear-cut and concise, just what these projects are, what progress they have made to date, and what needs to be done in the immediate future, and the great part they play in national defense. After a reading of this report, I know that no person need ever say they do not understand these great projects.

I read from the report:

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

The amount recommended for the Bonneville Power Administration is \$30,000,000. The Administration is the marketing agency for the salable power from the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams and is charged with the responsibility of the construction and operation of the necessary transmission facilities for that purpose. The funds provided in the bill are for materials and equipment necessary in the construction of additional transmission lines and substations.

The expedition of furnishing the facilities for generation and transmission of power from these two dams arises from the necessities of the national-defense program. The estimates of power needs of the United States within the next few years for national-defense purposes indicate a requirement of 20,000,000 additional kilowatts of which 3,000,000 kilowatts are expected to be provided in the Pacific Northwest and the Bonneville-Grand Coulee area.

Funds have been provided for the procurement of the full complement of 10 generators at Bonneville Dam and the last of these is expected to be installed by December 1943. Funds likewise have been provided for nine generators at Grand Coulee which will complete installations in the west powerhouse and the last of these is expected to be installed by May 1944. Further installations at Grand Coulee must await completion of additional powerhouse accommodations. On the basis of the present schedules for the installation of these generators the present generating capacity of 356,400 kilowatts will rise to 1,166,400 by December 1943 and to 1,490,400 kilowatts by May 1944.

The natural deposits of defense raw materials in this area and the accessibility to them of the power facilities of these two large dams make the area ideal for the development of national-defense industries and advantage is being taken of these circumstances to a very extensive degree. Power demands for defense industries are now in excess of the supply. The defense load commitment has risen from 65,000 kilowatts in July 1940, to 525,000 kilowatts at present and the prospective needs are rapidly accumulating. All power now being generated 24 hours a day is being used and contracts in effect or substantially agreed upon are in excess of the supply.

In order to get the power from the dams to the industries to be served in the area an extensive transmission system is necessary. This consists primarily of a 230,000 volt double-circuit steel transmission grid encircling the entire territory from Grand Coulee Dam to the Puget Sound area, from the Puget Sound area to the Portland, Oreg., area, and then back to Grand Coulee, with the necessary substations, feeder lines, and interconnections.

The provision of the transmission lines is geared in point of time to the installation of the generators and the readiness of those lines to carry the power when it is ready for delivery. The entire cost of the transmission system and substations is \$156,000,000, of which \$60,000,000 has heretofore been appropriated, \$30,000,000 is included in this bill, and leaving \$66,000,000 for future appropriation. The amount included in the accompanying bill is expected to be devoted to the procurement of necessary materials for extension of these lines. The construction of lines requires from 18 to 24 months from the time the money is made available. The \$30,000,000 for materials at this time will enable the administration to take advantage of purchases and priorities in a market which is rising and which will cost more if purchased later and will enable the administration to have the lines ready when the power is available at the dams.

Revenues from power from the two dams were \$1,874,444 in the fiscal year 1941. They are estimated at \$6,500,000 for the fiscal year 1942 and at \$10,500,000 for the fiscal year 1943 and are expected to rise to \$22,500,000 in the fiscal year 1947 on the basis of the utilization of the full generating capacity of 1,490,400 kilowatts.

The power investment is estimated at \$322,000,000, consisting of \$156,000,000 for transmission lines, \$51,000,000 power allocation of the cost of Bonneville, and \$115,000,000 power allocation of the cost of Grand Coulee. The Administration estimates that the rate structure is sufficient to provide expenses of operation and amortize this cost over a period of 40 years.

Provision for these transmission lines is recommended by the Office of Production Management to enable the Administration to meet the defense demands at the earliest possible date.

The Government has made provision for a tremendous production program, and plants are projected and being projected to manufacture the defense articles needed. Power is the key to production. All of the power-generating facilities have been provided for 1,490,400 kilowatts. Failure to make provision for the necessary transmission lines will hinder the defense effort and deprive the Government of the revenue which will start as soon as the power is ready to be taken away from the dams.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that no finer, more thorough, more complete, unbiased, and impartial statement of these two mighty projects could have been made, than can be found right here in the report of the committee, and I commend the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], his clerks, and the whole committee. I also desire to compliment Dr. Paul Raver and his assistants for the excellent presentation made in justification of this appropriation, when they appeared before the committee.

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

Mr. LEAVY. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I wonder if the gentleman will inform the House whether or not, of this full \$30,000,000, the cost of expanding these facil-

ities including the transmission lines, only 32 percent will be charged off to the power users as related to the original construction cost, or whether or not the power user is going to pay the cost of the installation?

Mr. LEAVY. If I understand the gentleman's question correctly, I will say every dollar of this money will be repaid with interest at 3 or 4 percent.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is 100 percent of that cost charged to the users?

Mr. LEAVY. Of this cost; yes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be given an additional minute so that I may propound a question of him.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BEITER. The gentleman has referred to a public-owned transmission line. In the State of New York there is a proposal now to construct a \$25,000,000 public-owned transmission line from New York City to transmit surplus power from New York City to Messina. That line would have been built by private interests. I wonder if there is anything in this bill or any appropriation in this bill which would appropriate \$25,000,000 for this proposal.

Mr. LEAVY. I do not think there is.

Mr. BEITER. None of the funds in this bill could be used for the construction of that proposed line?

Mr. LEAVY. I do not think so.

Mr. ANGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I compliment the gentleman for calling attention to the facts in this regard, and also wish to call attention to the fact that on yesterday, at page 9446 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I commented on the report and also gave some additional facts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote to recommit this bill, H. R. 6159, and strike out the so-called lend-lease appropriation. I shall then vote for the bill with the understanding I am sanctioning only the appropriation for our own Army and Navy.

I continue to feel I cannot vote to give away billions of dollars of our taxpayers' money so long as foreign nations have between fifteen and twenty billion dollars in this country they could pledge as security for loans to them.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to interrogate the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY], who just spoke regarding certain power developments that are contained in this bill. I wish to draw his attention to page 25, where there appear two properties, one the Fontana

and the other the Douglas. I understand the Douglas operation is not to be appropriated for. It is stated on page 25 that the Fontana Dam is a new project and the schedule contemplates it will be ready for impounding water in the spring of 1944 and that the first generating unit will be installed in the fall of 1944.

Referring to the top of page 25, item No. 3 shows \$7,000,000 for hydroelectric units in 1942. For what purpose is that expenditure if there are no dams ready to take hydroelectric units until 1944?

Mr. LEAVY. May I state to the gentleman that while I am a member of the whole Appropriations Committee, I was not a member of the subcommittee that wrote this bill. This refers to a project down in the T. V. A., thousands of miles away from the ones in the Pacific Northwest that I am particularly interested in, and I am not sufficiently familiar with the break-down here to intelligently answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. DEWEY. Can the gentleman refer me to someone on the committee who can answer the question?

Mr. LEAVY. I am sure members of the committee can answer it. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] might answer it, or the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] might answer the question.

Mr. DEWEY. I thank the gentleman. May I interrogate the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] regarding this item of \$7,000,000—item No. 3 on page 25 of the report? I cannot find where they are going to need any hydroelectric units because there are no dams ready.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. At existing dams, I may say to the gentleman. It is additional hydroelectric installation at existing dams.

Mr. DEWEY. It is tied up with items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, which presumably refer to Fontana and Douglas.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is a separate item. The Douglas Dam is not in here. Those are additional installations at dams that have heretofore been constructed. At nearly all of these places the installed capacity is greater than the present machinery that was put in there. Looking to the future, there might be occasion to add additional installations.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, he is referring to that steam-plant item?

Mr. DEWEY. No. This is hydroelectric.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

ARMY OF THE PHILIPPINES

For all expenses necessary for the mobilization, operation, and maintenance of the Army of the Philippines, including expenses connected with calling into the service of the armed forces of the United States the organized military forces of the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, and expenditures incident to pay, allowances, operation, maintenance, and other activities of units and personnel of said organized military forces, and for the emergent mobilization and training of such forces, may be made without regard to the provisions of law regulating the expenditure of or accounting for funds of the United States, but shall be expended and accounted for in a manner prescribed by the President of the United States,

\$269,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1943, which shall be available for payment to the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines upon its written request, either in advance of or in reimbursement for all or any part of the estimated or actual cost, as authorized by the Commanding General, United States Army Forces in the Far East, of necessary expenses for the purposes aforesaid, except that none of such moneys shall be available for the pay and allowances of personnel of said organized military forces of the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, when serving in the Philippine Islands, in excess of the pay and allowances authorized by Philippine law and regulations, and of which not to exceed \$15,000,000 may be restored to the emergency fund for the President, created by the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942, in reimbursement of a like amount advanced therefrom: *Provided*, That any expenditures heretofore or hereafter made from said appropriation "Emergency fund for the President" for the purposes and in the manner authorized under this heading in this act are hereby authorized and validated: *Provided further*, That any appropriation for the Military Establishment may be applied to the purposes aforesaid subject to reimbursement by transfer from this appropriation of the value of such property or service as may have been or may thereafter be applied to such purposes, and any amount so transferred shall be available for expenditure for the purposes of the appropriation so reimbursed during the fiscal year in which such amount was received and the ensuing fiscal year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last seven words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the committee for including the Philippine item of \$269,000,000 in the bill. Some weeks ago General Gerow and two of his assistant officers appeared before the Insular Affairs Committee in support of House bill 5825, which is referred to on page 47 of the committee hearings by General Marshall in his testimony.

At that time General Gerow was asking that Congress provide some \$55,000,000, this sum to come from the so-called gold-profit fund to the extent of about \$23,000,000 and about \$32,000,000 out of the sugar excise-tax funds which have been accumulating in favor of the Philippine Islands Commonwealth, all to be used partly for the purposes for which this \$269,000,000 is now provided. I suggested to the general and his staff that they go before the Appropriations Committee and seek these funds.

May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or someone who can speak for him whether or not this \$269,000,000 makes unnecessary the passage of House bill 5825, which General Marshall has referred to, and which is now on the Consent Calendar for consideration?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wanted that confirmed, because when H. R. 5825 was called up here last Monday I objected to its passage, and I believe the gentleman from Montana also objected to the passage of the bill. I think we have here the proper way to handle it. I was certainly opposed to using any of the gold profit for this purpose, and I was opposed to using the sugar excise-tax funds, which should be used for the purpose of

rehabilitating the economic status of the Philippines in the event they acquire their independence.

As I understand the situation in the Philippines at the present time, their economy, generally speaking, is being badly interfered with, if not almost completely wrecked, by reason of the war activities in the Far East and the participation the United States is taking in the general war approach. I see no way at all how those people over there can go ahead with any kind of a military program without principal assistance from the Treasury of the United States.

Again I wish to compliment the committee on handling this matter in this way, and under permit to include in my remarks certain editorials from the Manila Bulletin, I first wish to submit one which deals with this very problem we are dealing with here today:

[From the Manila (P. I.) Bulletin]

CONGRESS IS CONFUSED

The United States Congress shows itself in a confused state of mind as regards Philippine finances. This is an outstanding revelation in connection with congressional approach to pending legislation pertaining to the financing of Philippine defenses.

A clear message is found in the records of the debates and votes in committees of the two Houses of Congress on pending legislation providing for diversion of special funds for defense purposes. It is perfectly clear that the overwhelming sentiment in Congress favors doing what is necessary for Philippine defense, but complications arise in committee hearings through proposals to utilize special funds, such as the gold-devaluation fund and sugar-excise-tax funds. It must be said in defense of the American lawmakers that their confusion grows out of a state of affairs and a policy for which Congress is only partially responsible.

The pending legislation relating to the financing of the defense program carries implications which Congressmen can fully understand only when they have a clear understanding of the future of Philippine-American economic relations. Congress is partially to blame for the fact of a great deal of misunderstanding and lack of understanding on this point, but the whole responsibility does not rest with Congress—far from it. It does not all lie in Washington. Manila also is largely responsible.

One cannot read the news reports on the House and Senate committee hearing on the pending legislation dealing with Philippine defenses without being impressed with the ever-evident willingness and clear decision to support the Philippine defense program, to make available the necessary funds. The picture as it is revealed in this connection is encouraging on the score of an appreciation in Congress of the need for strong defense, on the score of a readiness to accept responsibility for the needed defenses and on the score of determination to carry through, at whatever cost, the enormous defense program already undertaken. However, there are undisputable evidences of a hesitation in Congress to handle the finances in such manner as to confuse the future financial set-up. In other words, Congress hesitates to vote legislation without knowing the implications as to existing and prospective funds and the relation of these funds to the whole problem of Philippine-American relations.

Favorable is the fact that Congress is averse to backing into lasting commitments through emergency legislation. It is lamentable that this attitude of Congress should delay action on urgent legislation in an emergency period,

but the background of this whole case is so confusingly complicated that blind haste becomes distinctly dangerous.

Mr. Chairman, although the Filipinos cannot provide for these vast military and naval expenditures, there are certain performances they can carry out. I now refer to a very practical operation in which I believe the Filipinos are greatly deficient and, I may say, negligent. It is the matter of tilling their own soil and producing tons and tons of food for the population. The Filipinos are too greatly inclined to be lawyers, politicians, theorists. They are too much inclined to wait for the other nationals to till the soil, operate the merchandising establishments, and perform those other activities so necessary to make a strong, reliant, dependable nation. After all, Mr. Chairman, every group must have its numbers who will perform the practical and what we might term "menial tasks" so necessary in times of trouble. I am convinced that the Filipino in general operates on the basis that he can get some other person to do that for him. In times of adversity that general approach may prove to be fatal. I now submit for the RECORD another editorial from the Manila Bulletin:

[From the Manila (P. I.) Bulletin of October 17, 1941]

ON THE FOOD FRONT

Numerous reports indicate substantial progress on the food front in the Philippine emergency campaign. Increased interest and increased planting of vegetables are reported. Progress is encouraging.

However, it must be admitted that only a small start has been made if we reckon progress on the basis of the extreme backwardness before the start of the emergency campaign to awaken the country to a realization of vulnerability to the blockading of the channels of food imports. All the vegetable plantings so far effected would hardly do more than provide a temporary relief in event of a real emergency. Much more is needed to assure the people of the islands that they may not have to go hungry and suffer the weakness that results from dietary unbalance.

One of the most important points about the food campaign is the fact that if it is successful the benefits will be lasting, whether or not an emergency comes in acute form.

A recent arrival in the Philippines expressed great surprise over failure to find extensive vegetable gardens such as are to be found surrounding most cities the size of Manila. This visitor inquired about the source of supply for the tables and the reserve stocks of foodstuffs and commented on the dangers of further curtailment of shipping. When some of the newly planted emergency gardens were pointed out the visitor made the candid comment that if the showing is so small under emergency pressure the supplies must be next to nothing in normal times.

And that comment is far too close to the actual fact.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to secure some information. On page 5, under "Ordnance Department," the bill calls for the sum of \$2,464,984,000 for ordnance service and supplies. In the hearings testimony was given which would indicate that the War Department plans to contract for 400,000 Springfield rifles at \$60 per rifle from the Remington Arms Co. It is not possible to tell from

the hearings whether or not such a contract has been entered into. I should like to have the chairman of the committee enlighten us on whether or not it has been entered into.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is a supplementary order providing for rifles, all of which are to be sent to England. None of them is for our own troops. It is all lease-lend material.

Mr. CLASON. Do I correctly understand from the gentleman's statement that already the Remington Arms Co. has a contract to supply Springfield rifles through either the lease-lend program or any other program of the Government?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This is merely supplementary.

Mr. CLASON. But the Remington Arms Co. at the present time has a contract with the Government for Springfield rifles? If so, how many?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The operation is already under way, and this merely supplements contract already in force.

Mr. CLASON. What number of rifles does the contract call for?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are paying contract price of \$60 per unit for these rifles.

Mr. CLASON. I only wish to know the number of rifles.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The number to be provided by the manufacturers is 400,000.

Mr. CLASON. That is on this supplementary order?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. CLASON. What is the original which that supplements?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have no information on that.

Mr. CLASON. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not the Remington Arms Co. is making these rifles, or is it securing parts by subcontracts?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Such details are not brought to the attention of the committee, but the information could be readily secured from the Department. That is minutiae into which the committee does not go.

Mr. CLASON. It seems to me it is very important at this time in connection with this item involving such a large sum of money, because the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] has already brought out information to indicate that the Remington Arms Co. is not contracting directly with subcontractors, but is buying through brokers, who are making as high as 22 to 30 percent commissions on these contracts. If these rifles are going to England under the lend-lease program and there is any intention, provided the rifles are not returned, to charge England for them, it does not seem to me the Government is looking out properly for the interests either of its own citizens or of the British subjects.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The policy of the Department has been, wherever possible, to assist the small manufacturer through subcontracting. If for any reason this particular item does not comply with that policy we would not be apprised of the fact. We have no information on that phase of it.

Mr. CLASON. Somebody should get some information as to that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The general policy of the Government is to favor the utilization of subcontractors in order to help small business. Presumably all contracts and contractors follow that policy unless some special circumstance interferes. If the gentleman will ask of the War Department about this particular case they can give him the information he asks.

Mr. CLASON. Has the Government at the present time entered into any agreement with the British Government whereby any repayment for or any plan for disposing of articles furnished under the lend-lease program after the war has been determined upon?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Negotiations are now in progress with Great Britain and with all other nations we are supplying with lend-lease material. Negotiations have been concluded with three or four countries whom we are supplying with a smaller volume of material.

Mr. CLASON. Have they been concluded with England?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have not yet concluded negotiations with Great Britain, but when we do, ample provision will be made for reimbursement and compensation in accordance with the provisions of the lend-lease law.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. That was the same answer that was given with regard to the agreement with Great Britain on lend-lease materials when the last bill was up for consideration. When do you expect this agreement to be reached with Great Britain?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course, it is impossible to adjudicate such complicated questions overnight. As the situation develops, provision has to be made for contingencies which cannot be foreseen and which require intricate consideration and adjustment. It will necessarily be some time yet before negotiations can be concluded, but we may be certain that nations to which supplies are delivered will be required to account for and to make provision in payment for benefits received.

Mr. CLASON. Does the chairman expect that the United States Government will be paid in full for these items costing billions of dollars that are loaned or leased to foreign countries?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We expect ample recompense, either tangible or intangible, for all we are supplying.

Mr. CLASON. Would the gentleman think it is fair to charge England \$60 for a rifle if Colonel FADDIS brings out that the United States permitted a broker to step in and make 20 percent profit which had nothing to do with the matter of supply?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Our committee does not deal with that phase of

operations, we know nothing about such details. That is for the committee investigating expenditures, and I am certain all such questions will have their careful attention.

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

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes more.

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

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

Mr. CLASON. Yes.

Mr. FADDIS. The gentleman has raised a legitimate and pertinent question in connection with this item. I am glad to assure the gentleman and to assure the Committee that the special subcommittee No. 3 of the House Committee on Military Affairs will go into this matter very thoroughly and I am sure I am safe in my statement that if it is found that the Remington Arms Co. or any other company is jacking up prices unnecessarily in connection with Government contracts, the proper steps will be taken to recover this money. The items we have already discovered have been rather inconsequential items in a way connected with parts for the making of cartridges, but I again assure the gentleman and the members of the Committee that this matter will receive very thorough and searching investigation in all of its aspects.

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

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for an additional 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts has had several extensions of time, and we would be glad to give him more but we are behind schedule on this bill. I shall not object, but I trust we can close debate on the item and move along, as we are anxious to pass the bill this afternoon.

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

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

Mr. CLASON. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts put a very direct and searching question to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in charge of this bill. He inquired whether or not any of these billions would be repaid. He does not seem to be as well informed upon the subject as Mr. Anthony Eden of the British Government. When that question was put to him the other day about piling up debts in favor of the United States, he said that nothing had been said about any accounting, and no accounting had been made or report made.

Mr. CLASON. I want to answer the gentleman from Kentucky. It seems to me that after all these months, and in view of the tremendous sums of money

involved, that it is not a very satisfactory answer to the Members of the House to say every time such a bill comes up, that negotiations are under way, but nothing specific can be said, not even that progress is being made in connection with the matter. Undoubtedly, it is most difficult to draft such an agreement, but let us enter into a fair proposition amicably now and not leave loose ends to create hard feelings after the war is over.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Anthony Eden seemed to indicate clearly that there were no negotiations, and that no accounting has been called for.

Mr. CLASON. I am in favor of the expenditure of the money contained in this bill under the Lend-Lease Act for war materials for Britain, Russia, Turkey and China. I have voted for each appropriation bill for this purpose.

I am in favor of giving them all the aid we can possibly give them. I believe it is a good investment for our own national defense and may save the lives of countless American boys.

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

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Can you conceive of any reason why a commission should be paid by this Government or by manufacturers in order to get a Government contract at this time?

Mr. CLASON. No. That is what I was asking about.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the newspaper statement to which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] refers was called to my attention and I directed an inquiry on the matter to the Secretary of State. The Secretary in a letter which I ask to include in the RECORD, supplies the information which the gentleman requests. The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, December 3, 1941

MY DEAR MR. CANNON: In your letter of November 28, 1941, you call my attention to a statement made by Mr. Eden in the House of Commons to the effect that under the lend-lease arrangement there is no accounting and no debt is piling up and suggest that the exact tenor and purport of Mr. Eden's remarks be examined by the State Department in order that the Congress may not misunderstand the situation.

An examination of Mr. Eden's statement in its context shows that he was replying to a misinformed and unjust criticism of the purpose and effect of the Lend-Lease Act in which the accusation was made that the recipients of Lend-Lease aid were being placed in bondage to repay debts which were accumulating. Mr. Eden's remarks were made in the course of repudiating any such intention or effect in the operation of the Lend-Lease Act.

The procedures under the act and its purpose are clear. An exact record is kept—as is shown from the quarterly reports made by the President to the Congress—of all aspects of the transactions and transfers occurring under the act. The act provides in section 3 (b) that the terms and conditions upon which any foreign government receives any aid shall be those which the President deems satisfactory, and the benefit to the United States may be payment or repayment in kind or property or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory. The very name of the act and the

explanations of its underlying purposes made before the committees of Congress and upon the floor of both Houses during its discussion make abundantly clear that its purpose was in the true sense to lend our aid to the nations resisting aggression and upon terms of benefit and value to the United States to be determined in accordance with the varying circumstances and possibilities of each situation.

As has been stated to your committee by an officer of this Department, negotiations are now under way with the British Government concerning the terms of the transactions and the nature of the benefits to the United States. I can state both that there is no purpose in these negotiations to propose terms such as were intemperately charged in the statement to which Mr. Eden was replying, and also that the discussions are concerned with considerations of value to the United States, tangible and intangible.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder if the chairman can make any statement in regard to the announcement in the paper the other day in connection with the extension of the one billion dollar lease-lend loan to Turkey, that the extension was to be made to Great Britain who would in turn be able to take care of her commitments to provide military aid to Turkey, by passing it along to Turkey?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That matter has not come before the committee, because the question had not developed at the time the bill was reported to the House.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder if the chairman would care to state whether in his opinion it would be better business for us to make these extensions directly to the several countries rather than to make them to Great Britain and let her get the credit with these individual nations, and have just one creditor, or would it be better for us to spread our creditors?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is purely an executive matter under the authorization of the Lease-Lend Act.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. RICH. With reference to the question asked by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] it certainly would be to the advantage of the United States to have many creditors, because we know that in the last World War the only creditor that has seen fit to pay us was little Finland, and England repudiated her debt. So that if you except all the debts of all of the other countries and take only Great Britain, you know you are not going to get anything.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to refer to the language at the top of page 7 of the bill, which reads:

When serving in the Philippine Islands, in excess of the pay and allowances authorized by Philippine law and regulations.

In connection with this \$269,000,000 can the gentleman say whether or not it is the intent of the military authorities in charge of the Philippine Constabulary and the Philippine forces to increase

the pay of those men so that it will conform to the same rate of pay which is paid to men in the United States Army? I am informed that there is a very strong movement in Manila at the present time to have the Commonwealth Legislature raise the pay of the Philippine officers and men so that that pay under their law will conform to the same rate of pay which is drawn by our men in our service, and thereby meet the requirements of this bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is specifically provided for in the bill itself. The gentleman will note on pages 6 and 7 it is provided that "no such moneys shall be available for the pay and allowances of personnel of said organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, when serving in the Philippine Islands, in excess of the pay and allowances authorized by Philippine law and regulations."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I may say to the chairman, the question I raise is this: Is there a movement on, in the military policy of the Philippine Commonwealth, to make the rate of pay which these men draw by legislative act over there conform to the pay which our men draw in the service of the United States?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As the gentleman has noted, there has been some mention in the newspapers of the possibility that the Philippine Legislature may take some such action. Of course, any action by the insular legislature is entirely out of our province. That is a matter of their exclusive jurisdiction. But I will say, however, that the rate of pay and allowances, as provided here, amounts to about one-half the pay of our own forces.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I understood.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I have not spoken in the House since I went on a tour of duty as a Reserve colonel in the Army maneuvers, and since I have returned I have been somewhat busy with grand jury proceedings. In view of the fact, however, that we are now considering a national-defense measure, I wanted to take this occasion to report very briefly on what I saw at the Army maneuvers. In the first place, I want to go on record as saying that the morale of our soldiers is exceedingly high, that their spirit and their cheerfulness is excellent, and that they have been undergoing in those maneuvers a very rigid and constructive

training under fine Army officers from top to bottom. It was one of the biggest Army maneuvers—the biggest, probably—ever held in the United States, if not in the world, and, as far as I could see and learn, I believe it was conducted from beginning to end in a very fine military manner. I have come home with the absolute conviction that the American soldier is the equal of any soldier in the world; and there is every reason for that when you analyze it, because the American boy physically, mentally, and morally is not only the equal but, I believe, the superior of any boy in the world, and given the training they have had in these maneuvers they become trained soldiers, and with about 6 months' further training, and particularly with supplies and equipment which are lacking in some cases, our Army by the 1st of July, at least for defensive purposes, will equal any army in the world. If any army in the world—Nazis included—ever comes over here looking for trouble, we will give them all the trouble they are looking for and give them a first-class licking as well. I could go on at some length on this subject. I also want to say I was assigned while there by General Drum to the new tank attacker unit. I consider General Drum to be one of the best commanding officers we have had in our Army.

I believe General Griswold, his opponent, is also a fine officer; and General Devers, head of the tank force, is one of the very best officers in our Army. General Marshall, our Chief of Staff, is likewise an able, efficient, and outstanding officer. I think we ought to be proud of the leadership of the Army of the United States.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I may say to the gentleman that it was my privilege also to be in the maneuver area several times. I think one of the outstanding things, in addition to what the gentleman has commented on, is the fine way in which the people of the South received the boys who participated in these maneuvers.

Mr. FISH. Yes. We got wonderful cooperation and welcome from all the people of the South.

I was assigned by General Drum to the antitank unit, or what we call the tank-attacker group, a new kind or almost a secret weapon at that time, although now, of course, it is well known as an important combat unit which General Drum devised. The tank-attacker groups are composed of mechanized and motorized troops with 75's, 3-inch guns, 37-millimeter guns, machine guns, tanks, engineers, signal corps, and so forth. The units of that group are supposed to find enemy tanks, follow them, and fight them. It was a great experience, and perhaps as great as I wanted for the time being, because I averaged about 4 hours' sleep a night during the time I was attached to tank-attacker unit No. 1 under Col. John T. Kennedy. But the scheme worked; they found the tanks; they attacked them and stopped them.

General Drum has discovered a definite way, I believe, of stopping tanks.

I want to take the few moments remaining to me this afternoon, if I may, to make some comments not only as an individual Member of this House, but as the ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, on the statement that appeared in the public press yesterday that someone in the Army or the Navy, and possibly the President was preparing for an American expeditionary force of 5,000,000 and an army of 10,000,000 men. I am unwilling to believe that the President has given his support to any such program providing for an expeditionary force of 5,000,000 men. In fairness to himself he should deny it immediately. I want to go on record as saying that I believe there would be few, if any, Members of Congress who would get up on the floor of the House or go back to their districts and say they were in favor of an expeditionary force of 5,000,000 Americans. That proposal of a new A. E. F. has been disavowed by every party platform, it has been repeatedly disavowed by the President himself and by almost every Member of Congress. I am not accusing the President of anything, but I want the people back home to know that there are few, if any, Members of Congress who are in favor or who would dare to say they are in favor of an American expeditionary force of 5,000,000 soldiers fighting all over the world.

We are now confronted with a crystal-clear issue. All other issues are minor, such as the repeal of the Neutrality Act, lend-lease bill, and all the rest; they are water over the mill dam. Now we have reached the main issue and that is, Shall we go into this war or shall we stay out? Shall we have an expeditionary force or shall we not? And, furthermore, Shall Congress decide the war issue in the American and constitutional way, or shall it be decided by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or someone else for us? These three issues are one and identical. They constitute but the single greatest issue before the American people, and I am only asking the Members of the House to decide this issue by one yardstick and one yardstick alone: What is best for America? Not what is best for the British Empire, the Communists, or the Chinese.

It is not asking too much of you Members of Congress to think this issue through upon that one basis, what is best for America. I do not care which side you are on or what your decision is as long as you think it through. We must bring the war issue up on the floor of the House, discuss it, argue it, and debate it, because it involves the safety, the security, and the destiny of America, the greatest nation in the world.

I want to say one thing further, and I want you to believe what I am saying to you comes from my heart, and from the mind; it comes from every fiber in my body. I have believed it for 20 years. War is the greatest criminal folly and the height of all futility, and I believe the day we go into war we will have lost, although we may be victorious in 5, 10, or 20 years, as Senator PEPPER said, and

at a cost of \$100,000,000,000 a year. One or two years of war would bankrupt America. We would have an impoverished nation.

I am not talking about lives. Today's paper refers to an army of 10,000,000. There would probably be 3,000,000 killed and 3,000,000 more maimed and disabled, to come back to a living death. Not a single family in America could escape death, blood, and tears, even if we won, even if we crushed Hitler. I am for crushing Hitler by aiding the democracies. I have no use for the Nazis, and I have voted for the appropriations for lend-lease supplies for Great Britain. I repeat, if we enter the war and finally destroy the German Army, we can only do one thing and that is to revive communism, and help establish communism in Germany, Italy, Poland, France—all of Europe—with American lives and treasure. We are now asked to go out and spread the four freedoms even in Soviet Russia. It seems obvious to me that if we crush Germany, Germany will go communistic. The Russian Army will then overrun Europe and Europe will be communistic. We in America will be impoverished and bankrupt. We will have revolution, chaos, destruction of our liberties, we may even lose our form of government and have a dictator such as has never been known. That is the alternative, communism abroad, and the loss of our free institutions, bankruptcy, impoverishment, and ruin and disaster at home.

All I ask is that we think this thing through on that one yardstick, what is best for America.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. CANNON?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In connection with the very interesting statement which the gentleman has made, and the confidence which he has expressed in the President's opposition to any such mythical expeditionary force as has been mentioned, has the gentleman found any substantiation of the report pertaining to an expeditionary force of 5 or 10 million men, or any other number, or any plan for raising such a force, beyond a statement by one newspaper agency and that without factual proof or corroboration?

Mr. FISH. I hope the gentleman is correct, but if the gentleman is not correct I trust this issue will be taken to the public and to the American people in the next campaign.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman concedes that such an expedition could not be made without legislation by Congress, and that the inference drawn by the commentator in the one newspaper article which is the sole basis for all of this discussion, is wholly unwarranted by the documents it purports to quote?

Mr. FISH. Does not the gentleman think then the President ought to disavow it himself?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the President of the United States, or the Chief Executive of any other nation attempted to disavow every misrepresentation made by the columnists of the daily newspapers, he would have no time to devote to any other interest, either foreign or domestic.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISION

SEC. 102. Whenever the President deems it to be in the interest of national defense, he may authorize the Secretary of War to sell, transfer title to, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of, to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, any defense article procured from funds appropriated for the Military Establishment since March 11, 1941, in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 11, 1941 (Public, No. 11). The value of defense articles disposed of in any way under authority of this paragraph shall not exceed \$500,000,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have listened most interestingly to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. I am at quite a loss. Perhaps it is due to my dullness of comprehension, and, if so, he is in no way responsible for my bluntness. But did I hear him say, or did you hear him say, that he took no stock in this report of an expeditionary force and that he could not believe the President had sanctioned such a thing? Moreover, that he did not know of any Member of Congress who favored such a thing? In the very next sentence did you hear him say, or am I mistaken, "Now I come to the main issue; that is, whether or not we shall have war and an expeditionary force"?

What is there about an issue if there is nobody on the other side? Did he not say that? Read the Record, unless he changes it. He said he did not believe the President said that and he did not believe any Member of this body favored it. "Now we come to the main issue," he stated; and what is the issue? There is nobody on the other side. Instead of a flat repudiation of the papers that published it, in answering the question of the gentleman from Missouri, he said he wanted to go to the country with it. He wanted to go to the country with what? I thought when you went to the country with something it was on a controversy that at least the Congress was divided about. I never heard before of anybody wanting to go to the country with an issue, having the people vote on something, when there was nobody on the other side. If he did not say that I will eat the page of the Record on which his statement appears. When asked a pointed question, whether or not he believed that the report was false, he crawled a little bit after he got back to his seat, but he wanted to go to the country with it. He said here he did not believe it, yet he wants to go to the country with

it to have a referendum, I guess, to find out whether or not the people believe it. That would be an issue, perhaps, a referendum.

I want to apologize if I have misunderstood his language. If I am correct, he should make some clarification, either when he corrects his remarks or later. [Here the gavel fell.]

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNS: On page 7, line 22, strike out lines 22 to 25, inclusive, and on page 8 strike out lines 1 to 7, inclusive.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether or not you have given very much thought to the matter of appropriating here for lend-lease purposes, but if you will figure it up you will find that with the \$7,000,000,000 we have already appropriated and the \$5,985,000,000 later appropriated, plus the \$1,556,496,264 and the \$500,000,000 I am just now asking to strike out, there is a grand total of \$15,043,496,264.

I was thinking this morning as I passed down the aisle here voting on an amendment to increase an appropriation from \$10,000,000 to \$15,000,000 in order that the boys might come home in order to see their fathers and mothers and brothers and sisters and sweethearts just what these fathers and mothers are going to think and what these sweethearts and brothers and sisters are going to think back home when they find out that we voted that down and are now going to give some foreign countries \$500,000,000 of the money of these fathers and mothers. That is something for us to think about here. Just exactly how long can you maintain the morale of the boys who are now in the service if you continue a process of this kind?

A few days ago we paid out in 1 day over \$5,000,000 for interest on the obligations of this country, and we were asked this morning to increase the appropriation to \$15,000,000. Nobody around here thought that these boys would come back if they got the \$15,000,000, because there is no bill here that provides for them to come back at all. There would be an appropriation to increase the amount to \$15,000,000, with no authority to bring the men back. The bill is still in committee, and everybody knows that the bill will not come out of the committee.

I am interested in the question I asked the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations yesterday. It was a direct question, and I could have had a direct answer if the chairman had seen fit to answer it, if he knew. It may be that he does not know. This is the question I asked him, and here is his answer:

Mr. JOHNS. Just one more question, if the gentleman will permit. This appropriation contains an additional amount for lease-lend. Can the gentleman inform the House just how much money of the original \$13,000,000,000 has already been spent? I do not mean how much has been allocated under contract, but what has been actually spent? The Treasury reports show something over \$600,000,000.

On December 2 the report of the Treasury of the United States showed that we

had actually paid out of the \$13,985,000, -000 exactly \$654,923,462.97.

What is the reply of the chairman to that question? Did he answer it? He said:

We are expanding as we go ahead. It is proceeding at an accelerated tempo. Expenditure is now at the rate of \$200,000,000 a month. It takes some time to get underway. In many cases we have to build facilities in order to get production started. As of the 13th day of November we had allocated the entire \$7,000,000,000. As of December 1 about 40 percent of the \$5,985,000,000 which was made available on October 28 had been allocated.

I want to know just exactly how much of this money has been paid out. I am not interested in any promises of contracts to somebody; neither am I interested in how much has been allocated to anybody. No one around here will say anything about to whom this is allocated. I do not know whether it is allocated to somebody to build some nice little fence or whether it is allocated to England or Turkey or Russia or whom. I think the people of this country ought to know where this money is going and how much of it is going to certain places.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. I was very much interested, of course, in the letter the chairman had here this morning which he said denies the statement the gentleman from Kentucky made here about the statement made by Anthony Eden in the House of Commons. I am not like what my good friend and colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] says about the President. I think that Anthony Eden actually said in the House of Commons just exactly what is reported. I do not know anything about this letter. If it is here, I hope the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will put it in the RECORD today, so that the American people can make up their own minds as to what was said over in the House of Commons.

The Milwaukee Sentinel, published at Milwaukee, Wis., on December 3, 1941, said this:

The most illuminating, and certainly the most honest, acknowledgment of American prodigality in the present war was made in a recent Commons debate by Britain's foreign secretary, Anthony Eden.

Mr. Eden spoke in answer to a critic of the British Government, who said:

"When this is all over the United States will hold us in financial bondage."

To which Mr. Eden replied:

"That is not true.

"Under the lease-lend arrangement there is no accounting and no debt piling up."

Immediately conscious of probable American reaction to this frank declaration, other British sources hastened to explain.

But the explanation merely confirmed the Eden declaration.

It said Britain "is, of course, committed to return or replace everything she receives, and everyone knows this is an obligation which must and will be met. Mr. Eden sought to assure the British people that there

would not be another gigantic war debt to be paid off with money they don't have and won't have, and thus there won't be the re-creations that followed the last war."

If there is no accounting of what Britain receives, how can there ever be return and replacement?

If there is to be no debt for which Britain is accountable to America after the war, what constitutes the obligation "which must and will be met"?

Surely it must be enormously reassuring to the British people that the lease-lend arrangement is not another "hiring" of money and materials, as Calvin Coolidge described the previous arrangement.

Mr. Eden probably spoke "out of turn," but he spoke honestly and in strict accordance with the facts.

It might be wished an equally representative and authoritative American statesman would speak as honestly to the American people and at least give them an accurate understanding of the lease-lend arrangement on a level with Mr. Eden's assurance to the British people.

I am not going to follow this any further, but I said on this floor when this first started, that it is just as well that the American people know that they are not going to get this money back as it is to fool them, as they were fooled in the last war, when we loaned them millions of dollars, and they never paid it back, and the people of the United States still feel they ought to have it, and up until this war started, they expected that they would get it back. That is the situation confronting us. Billions of dollars have been appropriated, but nobody knows where it is going, or how much of it has already been spent, except the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, or how it is being allocated. I think that we are getting ready for this expeditionary force that was reported in the newspapers yesterday, and that we are getting these appropriations ready, so that when the time comes the money may be used when the people will not be in such good mood to appropriate it as they are now.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order against the section.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield for that purpose?

Mr. JOHNS. I do.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I refer to section 102. I make the point of order that it is not in order because it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on that point of order. The point of order comes too late, debate having been had on the proposition. The Chair overrules the point of order.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, 10 minutes to be allotted to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman's suggestion that I put this information in the RECORD, if the gentleman had been giving any attention at all to the proceedings here on the floor this afternoon, he would have known that the information

has already been placed in the RECORD in the form of a letter from Secretary Hull, than whom no man in America more completely enjoys the confidence of the Congress. His letter is a complete answer to the gentleman's inquiry, and has already been inserted in the RECORD in full.

As to the second point raised by the gentleman, relative to lend-lease expenditures, when the gentleman asked his question yesterday, I took for granted that he was submitting a constructive question, and that he was really seeking information. So I gave him the information applicable to the question which he raised. As the House knows, the controlling factor is not the amount expended, but the amount allocated.

So far as expenditures are concerned, operations are proceeding as rapidly as facilities permit. There is nothing Congress—or anybody else—can do that is not being done. The real gage is in the allocations. There is the bottleneck, if any. In order to expedite; in order to carry out the program; in order to keep its production going and supplies moving, allocations must be kept current, and that means keeping appropriations current and funds available.

All funds have now been allocated and eventually production will stop unless further funds are provided. For this reason it is imperative that we make appropriations now; and for this reason I gave the gentleman what I thought he requested. However if he merely wanted to submit an oratorical question, I cite him to page 9430 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where, in the last half of the first column of my remarks, the figures to which he so emphatically refers are to be found. If he had glanced through the RECORD he would have noted that:

From March 27, 1941, to June 30, 1941, \$21,000,000 was actually paid out. From July 1 to November 29, a total of \$633,000,000 had been paid out, making a total since March 27 of \$654,000,000.

There is the information about which the gentleman is so deeply concerned.

As to the gentleman's argument in behalf of his amendment, it is difficult to answer specifically, because at no time did he give any reason for eliminating the appropriation, or any facts in support of his amendment. He simply wants to strike it out, because the House rejected some other amendment he thought ought to go in. That is the only reason he advances as warranting the mutilation of the bill.

Now, what would be the effect of the gentleman's amendment if the House in a moment of mental aberration should agree to it? Much has been said about avoiding the necessity of sending an expeditionary force abroad. And it is my understanding that the gentleman takes that view. The best way in the world to avoid the necessity of sending an expeditionary force abroad is to provide this money and send weapons over to arm foreign soldiers and enable them to keep the war over there. By that means we will keep the war out of America and America out of the war. But if the gentleman is opposed to sending arms and wishes to deny these men fighting to protect their

hearthstones from the invader, the arms with which to defend themselves and their homes, his amendment is the way to do it. Nothing will do more to crush the nonaggressor armies which stand between America and Hitler than the passage of the gentleman's amendment cutting off funds for arming our Allies abroad.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Missouri were asked to explain this \$654,000,000, as to where the merchandise which comprises that item went and to what countries it went, he could not tell you. He does not know. He cannot give you a definite statement.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Well, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is entirely in error in that statement. If he will consult Senate Document 112, the report of the President, made at the last date provided by law, under the operation of the Lend-Lease Act, he will find a complete report of every expenditure in detail.

Mr. RICH. I will say we tried to get this information from the War Department and the War Department will not give it to us. They say they do not know. They will not give it to a Member of Congress. That was stated in the report.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will merely refer to the document, he need not phone anybody. It is all here.

Mr. RICH. I do not yield any further, because the gentleman cannot answer the question.

Now, this section in controversy gives the President the power to grant to the Secretary the right to sell, transfer title to, exchange, lease-lend, or otherwise dispose of. It gives the President an opportunity to do away with \$500,000,000 worth of merchandise and equipment that is now for our own national defense in any way and manner he sees fit. He now has too much power. I say to the House of Representatives that our house is not in order. We have not taken care of our national defense. Everything we are doing now is for foreign countries. We are shipping out of this country the things that were manufactured for our own defense, and we could not defend our own shores if we were attacked.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to offer an amendment to strike out title 3 of this bill, and I am going to ask unanimous consent that I may eliminate the whole title at one time, but if unanimous consent is not granted, then I am going to be compelled to offer 10 amendments in order that we might accomplish that.

I do not know how the House feels about taking care of our own national defense. I am for America 100 percent, and I want to build up our own national defense before we ship out everything that we have got in this country to defend our country with, and then permit some enemy to come and attack us.

Now, that is the situation in which we find ourselves today. It is a deplorable condition. Certainly we should not permit the President of the United States to

take all the things that are being manufactured and most of them now contracted for under the Lend-Lease Act and give it to other countries.

It was stated here we have contributed through lend-lease, which includes the \$1,556,000,000 in section 3, a total of \$14,541,000,000. If this resolution is passed today it will amount to \$15,041,000,000 for lend-lease. That is a terrible sum. That means \$112 for every man, woman, and child in America. The people have to go down in their own pockets at some time in the future to raise this money in order that the President of the United States may give it to countries which he may deem advisable.

Then I notice in the paper the British are to make war on Finland; the only country we have loved, up to 3 months ago, for taking care of their obligations. Now Great Britain is going to declare war on them. When they do that the United States, through Secretary Hull, has demanded them to stop their aggression on Russia. What did Russia do to Finland a year ago? It was a terrible situation. Every Member of Congress disapproved of the acts of Russia. Now you are going to turn a somersault and try to prohibit Finland from defending herself. Where are we going to? We certainly do crazy, funny, unethical things.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. What I want to say is, the biggest thing before the country today is not this seven- or eight-billion-dollar appropriation bill, but the biggest thing before the country this December day is whether this thing that came out yesterday is true or false. That is the biggest thing.

The gentleman from Missouri, the distinguished chairman of this committee, is the only man I can think of who spoke yesterday who declared there was nothing to it; that it was just a newspaper timing proposition, with no foundation at all. I think he is the only man who went that far. Following him was our distinguished leader, JOHN TABER, who agrees with him on the war policy, who said that all the quotes he thought were substantially true. Now, there is the difference. There was not anybody else who said it but the gentleman from Missouri.

We know from the news releases of last night that there were hurried conferences between the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the President yesterday to find out who it was that leaked.

Now, who was it leaked? That was important. I think it is unfortunate that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] referred to the campaign of next year. My goodness! This question of being in this war is going to be over before the November election of next year. It will be too late to make an issue out of this 10,000,000-man expeditionary force next November.

One of the reasons I am against this bill is because most of this money is intended to be used for the purpose of getting this Army of 10,000,000 men ready. I believe they are really counting on it. If this is not true why did not

the President deny this thing? Why does he not deny it?

There are just two reasons for this information getting out, in my opinion: Either somebody let this leak out in order to cower Japan, or they saw that it got out to sort of apprise the American people gradually and softly of what was coming, or just what is in their minds.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I think we have reason to believe that if this story of an A. E. F. were not true the President would deny it.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Certainly.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Because when the same newspaper published a story about a women's defense organization the President within 24 hours called it a cockeyed lie, to use his expression, although some of us women Members had documentary evidence of the truth of the story in our desks.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The other day the President took the time in his press conference to jump on one little magazine which said something unkind about a President in South America and called the story a lie. I think it is safe to assume that they did this to cower Japan, and it is the truth. We have been buying socks and shirts for 10,000,000 men. We know that we are equipping an army of 10,000,000 men, yet we go right ahead and do it. Now, if this was not let out to cower Japan, then it was done to let the people know kind of easy like—because the President is not denying it at all—that we are getting ready for an army of 10,000,000 men. I am against this bill, because this ordinance, the biggest item in this bill, is a getting-ready for this army of 10,000,000. They are fooling us. Let us wake up on this thing. Do not say the President would not consider any such thing, for the President is committed to crush Hitler, and the Army told him that to crush Hitler would take 10,000,000 men.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the remainder of the committee's time be allotted to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the discussions relative to a report indicating the possibility of an expeditionary force, and in view of the fact it is conceded the President knows nothing of the report, that the Secretary of War has no idea of authorizing such a force, that the Secretary of the Navy has no knowledge of it, the question arises as to whose idea it could be. Who is it that first suggested the possibility of an expeditionary force of 5,000,000 men?

I am wondering whether or not the emissaries of Hitler in this country could have been responsible for the suggestion in order to get the reaction of Congress and the people. It has been intimated that 2 years ago, before Hitler undertook to overrun Europe, the question was asked in this country whether there would be an expeditionary force. We knew that England and France had not paid us for

our aid in the World War. It was suggested we would be foolish to again be caught in the same trap. I do not know whether it was propaganda or not, but we subscribed to the suggestion and said, "No," all the way from the President of the United States down to the humblest citizen. We said "No," there would be no American expeditionary force in Europe. Of course, this was exactly what Hitler wanted to know before he arranged his campaign to overrun Europe. Now, since he has practically rearranged the map of Europe and before charting his plans to enlarge his operations for next year in his world-domination program, he would like to know whether the United States would be willing to send an expeditionary force of 5,000,000 men to foreign soil. Therefore, in view of Nazi propaganda in this country for the last 3 years, and in the absence of anyone who is willing to say that he or she is responsible for circulating that report, I can see that it may be the Nazi emissaries trying to find out whether we have changed our minds or not. Perhaps Hitler and his associates would like to know in advance just what the sentiment is in this country and just what we are planning to do so they will be able to chart their program for the next few years.

I think it is just as reasonable to make this assumption as it is, in the absence of any additional information, to say it comes from the President, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of the Navy, because we all know that this Congress has already gone on record by legislative edict as opposing an expeditionary force. We have said that it cannot be done under any circumstances without further action of the Congress. We said that last year when we passed the Selective Service Act. Then why, why should we be putting up a straw man now only to knock him down? Why should we be putting up this idea and call it an issue, in order to discuss it?

To my mind, the issue suggested comes from other sources. It does not come from the fertile brain of Members of Congress, because we know it is futile, we know it is absurd, we know it is absolutely uncalled for in view of the definite, positive action we have heretofore taken. Does it come from the emissaries of Hitler, and then leave to us to peddle it?

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNS), there were—ayes 19, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—NAVY DEPARTMENT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. I would like to know what the reading of section 103 means.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a citation, that is all. It is a citation for the purpose of identification. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY

Care of the dead, \$100,000, of which amount \$10,000 shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred during the fiscal year 1941.

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries an appropriation of around \$8,000,000,000 making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943. This is a gigantic amount of money, and when it is passed and the money made available we will have made available for national defense around \$68,000,000,000 in the last 2 years. We of the Appropriations Committee are certain that next February or next March there will be additional appropriations for the same purpose. I know there is not now and there has not been objection toward making appropriations for actual national defense. I am pleased that our investigating committees are working and bringing to light the efforts to sabotage our defense by those who are trying to make big profits out of national-defense expenditures. The public demands that we get a full dollar's worth of defense for every dollar we are spending. Therefore I hope these committees be continued until all of these alleged "rackets" are eliminated.

It was my privilege to attend the recent Army maneuvers in North and South Carolina, and I wish to compliment the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] and his committee members for attending these maneuvers and for the fine reports they have made. Those of us attending those maneuvers had the opportunity of visiting with many of the officers and enlisted men and discussing with them their various problems. We visited with General Drum and General Griswold and their staffs. We attended the critiques following each day's activities in the field. We went with the men into the field, and we ate with them and visited their tents and places of abode. I wish to take this opportunity of telling you that I am proud of the men and officers whom I saw in action in those maneuvers. They displayed the best spirits possible. Their morale was excellent and their cooperation was ideal. I believe they represent the finest manhood in the world, and when eventually trained will be the best soldiers in the world.

It was a real pleasure, Mr. Chairman, to find our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Colonel FADDIS, actively engaged in the field with his troops, and we were pleased to be given a fine report of the work done by our other colleague the gentleman from New York, Colonel FISH, who was also engaged with his troops in the same maneuvers.

One thing that impressed me was the close friendship between officers and men. To find that in critiques the noncommissioned officers were to be brought together with the commissioned officers in order to work out the various war problems indicated a great advance in our Army psychology. I believe that this co-

ordination between officers and men on the great problems confronting them from day to day will aid in bringing our Army up to the modern standard toward which it is working.

While we found the men and officers in the best of spirits, Mr. Chairman, we found a shortage of very important modern mechanized matériel. There is sufficiency of shoulder arms, but there seems to be a lack of small-arms ammunition, which the soldiers seemed to miss, because they appeared to want that part of the activity which makes war games more realistic.

Mr. Chairman, these maneuvers are over. It was a great war game, and I hope it has resulted in much good training for both men and officers. But I hope that this training is directed at actual national defense and the defense of the Western Hemisphere. In this debate there is so much talk about another American expeditionary force. I hope there is no truth in these reports. I pray that nothing like that is planned now. Our people do not want it. The cold fact is that our Army is not ready for it. We just do not have the trained men nor the necessary personnel for any such undertaking. The Army experts to whom we talked in these maneuvers told us that we are far behind in being ready for such a thing. Even some of the foreign military experts who were there indicated that fact to us. Our confidential meetings with the War Department experts also indicate that we are not ready. So let there be an end to the talk about another American expeditionary force. Let us here concentrate on building up our own defense and the defense of our own hemisphere and include something toward winning the economic war which is bound to come in the post-war period. That problem is not discussed here today, but it will be a serious problem.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Senator LODGE, who has been in training in the South, stated in Worcester on Tuesday last, "There is a shortage of ammunition." Does not the gentleman deplore the fact that we are so far behind in our small arms and ammunition? I mean cartridges from .30s to .50s?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There are many plants that could be used. There are many plants in my district that could be used, but those plants have not been used. Lowell produced more cartridges during the World War than any other community. Those buildings are ready for use today with highly trained labor available, power, railroads, and sidings, heat, and light.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentlewoman is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is a tragic thing.

Mr. STEFAN. The Army, in my opinion, is cognizant of that fact and is trying to bring up the necessary supplies.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They are not acting very quickly on it.

In fact, there has been an incredible delay. If available facilities had been used, the shortage of cartridges would not exist today.

Mr. STEFAN. Perhaps that is true.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to something that came to our desk in the last day or two. I refer to the advance copy of *Fortune*. I recommend that all Members read it. That article on *How Good Is Our Army?* should be the handbook of the Army and Navy and the people of America who are interested in really developing an army for real national defense or any other emergency.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—DEFENSE AID

SEC. 301. To enable the President, through such departments or agencies of the Government as he may designate, further to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, and for each and every purpose incident to or necessary therefor, the following sums for the following respective purposes, namely:

(a) For the procurement, by manufacture or otherwise, of defense articles, information, and services for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, and the disposition thereof, including all necessary expenses in connection therewith, as follows:

(1) Ordnance and ordnance stores, supplies, spare parts, and materials, including armor and ammunition and components thereof, \$830,507,246.

(3) Tanks, armored cars, automobiles, trucks, and other automotive vehicles, spare parts, and accessories, \$583,139,000.

(5) Miscellaneous military and naval equipment, supplies, and materials, \$17,850,000.

(6) Facilities and equipment for the manufacture, production, or operation of defense articles and for otherwise carrying out the purposes of the act of March 11, 1941, including the acquisition of land, and the maintenance and operation of such facilities and equipment, \$125,000,000.

(b) In all, \$1,556,496,246, to remain available until June 30, 1943.

(c) Each of the foregoing appropriations shall be additional to, and consolidated with, the appropriations for the same purposes contained in section 1 (a) of the Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1941, and section 101 (a) of the Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1942, and the proviso in section 101 (f) of such latter act shall be applicable to such consolidated appropriations.

SEC. 302. Any defense article procured pursuant to this title shall be retained by or transferred to and for the use of such department or agency of the United States as the President may determine, in lieu of being disposed of to a foreign government, whenever in the judgment of the President the defense of the United States will be best served thereby.

SEC. 303. This title may be cited as the Second Deficiency Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1942.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, in order to expedite the consideration of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title III be considered as read, and that amendments be in order to any paragraph of the title.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against title III that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman point out for the benefit of the Chair what there is in the title that is legislation?

Mr. RICH. It reads as follows:

To enable the President, through such departments or agencies of the Government as he may designate, further to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States.

It gives the President of the United States power here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Missouri on the point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, that is merely a repetition of what is in the act of March 11, 1941, which fully authorizes every item in the title with the exception of section 302, and that paragraph is no longer subject to a point of order because consent has been given to consider it and allow amendments to be offered to it. Section 3 of Public Law No. 11 of the Seventy-seventh Congress provides in full for the authorizations necessary to the consideration of this title.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has examined the act of March 11, 1941, which authorizes the appropriations contained in this title, and the Chair overrules the point of order.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RICH moves to strike out all of title III, beginning in line 6, page 11, and ending on line 25, page 12.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this title and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman—and I shall not object—I call attention to the fact that if we intend to get through with this bill today we must expedite action. If we do not complete the consideration of the bill today, it will only delay the hope of the leaders that we shall be able to get away substantially prior to Christmas. If the consideration of this bill goes over until Monday, it will only hold back on the other end. I make this observation in the hope that the consideration of the bill will be completed today.

Mr. MOTT. How far this side of Christmas does "substantially" mean?

Mr. McCORMACK. I should like to make it next Friday or Saturday; a week from today.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation and the authorizations for 1941 and 1942 for national defense and lease-lend amount to over \$69,000,000,000. Think of that, over \$69,000,000,000 you have appropriated and authorized at this session of the Congress, the greatest sum of money ever appropriated by any body in the world in the same time. For lease-lend under the act of March 27, 1941, you appropriated \$7,000,000,000;

under the act of October 28, 1941, you appropriated \$5,985,000,000; and the amount in this bill is \$1,556,000,000 for lease-lend, a total of \$14,541,000,000. Adding in the \$500,000,000 you appropriated in section 102 a few minutes ago makes the total \$15,041,000,000, or \$112 for every man, woman, and child in America. The President can and will give it away. It is other people's money, and he is used to it. Do not forget that.

We are giving the President of the United States power to make a distribution to the various countries as he sees fit, and you call it national defense. Again I say, I am for the national defense of America 100 percent, but I do not believe that this is for our national defense.

It is only for the aid and assistance of foreign countries, to the detriment of the American citizen, the American taxpayers. I am against this bill and I am against this section because I have no idea that this administration is now going to cut it out. When the administration wants a thing you vote it through. Remember, this will rise up to plague you.

The gentleman from Michigan a while ago tried to accuse the Republicans of making these huge appropriations. What bunk. You will find when the roll is called on this bill, as you have on all other bills, that this administration is responsible. You New Dealers furnish the majority vote.

The death knell of American liberty, American independence, and American freedom is being sounded. You are going to wreck America on the rocks of financial distress. No truer words were ever spoken than those uttered by the President of the United States, and I quote:

The credit of the family depends chiefly upon whether that family is living within its income. And that is equally true of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good.

If Government lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily at reasonable rates. But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, if it extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, then it is on the road to bankruptcy.

No truer words were ever said, but no one is doing more to put this country into bankruptcy than the President of the United States and this Congress. What are you going to do about it? Where are you going to get the money? You will find out when you go back to your taxpayers that they are going to raise hulla-balloo with you because you are putting them in this position. You are nation wreckers, not builders. I do not see how your constituents and mine are ever going to stand the burden you are placing on them. I am sure the majority of the Members of Congress think the same as I do and realize that they are going deeper and deeper into the slough of despond and into bankruptcy; yet you are willing to take the recommendation of the President without due consideration, giving him billions and billions and piling them up on our national debt without any recourse. It certainly will be a sorrowful time for America.

Let me quote this little piece of poetry:

BUILDERS OR WRECKERS

I watched them tearing a building down,
A gang of men in a busy town.
With a ho-heave-ho and a lusty yell,
They swung a beam and the side wall fell.
I asked the foreman: "Are these men skilled,
And the men you'd hire if you had to build?"
He gave a laugh and said: "No, indeed,
Just common labor is all I need.
I can easily wreck in a day or two
What builders have taken a year to do."
I thought to myself as I went my way,
Which of these roles have I tried to play?
Am I a builder who marks with care,
Measuring life by the rule and square?
Am I shaping my deeds to a well-made plan?
Patiently doing the best I can?
Or am I a wrecker who walks the town,
Content with the labor of tearing down?

Your forefathers built up a great Nation in 154 years, and the New Deal will tear it down in 12 to 15 years so that your liberty will be gone, your freedom lost; your wealth dissipated and a dictator will rule, in place of the people under the Constitution. I say it will be too bad for our people and our country, I am against the bill, for it is another step of eight billions nearer bankruptcy and a dictator.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that there is much use of saying anything more to the House about my opposition to this appropriation. I am still of the opinion that all we have spent of the \$13,000,000,000 or \$12,985,000,000, is \$654,523,462.97. That is all that has been shown we have spent of the original appropriations, although we are asking here now to appropriate over \$2,000,000,000 more, to be given as a blank check to the President of the United States to give to anyone he desires. I know that the people of this country do not want anything of that kind, and I know that we are going to pay the penalty, and the time is not far away when we will hear in no unmistakable terms from the people of the United States. I have stood in the Well of the House and fought these large appropriations ever since I have been in Congress. I expect to continue to do so, and some of these days—and it is not very far away—you will hear from the people back home, and you will hear from them in a way that some of you will not overlook or misunderstand what is being said. With this total appropriation here, if you pass it you will have \$15,043,432,264 that can be given away to any foreign country that the President wants to give it to. There is no doubt that it will be handed out to anybody that the President believes ought to have it. The taxpayers will have to pay for it. When March 15 comes next year, then for the first time the Members of Congress will hear from back home, and they will hear in understandable language.

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

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that we do not have time today to discuss a bill such as this, involving the expenditure of the mere sum of eight and a quarter billion dollars for national defense. It may be of interest to the members of the Committee to learn at this time that in the fiscal year ending

June 30, 1941, the entire revenue collected by our Government amounted to \$7,370,108,377, or about one billion less than this single appropriation bill provides.

Yesterday in Colorado funeral services were held for one of the most distinguished Members of the United States Senate, who passed away last Monday. This man was a loyal, patriotic American, who had been privileged to serve as the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, which has considered these deficiency appropriations. Probably the last statement which Senator Adams made prior to his death was quoted in the New York Times on November 20, when he called attention to the fact that we were being asked to appropriate for war supplies "far in excess of the needs for American defense," and that the military production program was being conducted with "incalculable waste."

This newspaper article continues:

Senator Adams thought that Congress should scrutinize this bill with extreme care, voting only such funds as the Army and Navy were able to show were needed at this time. He cited testimony taken by his committee on previously approved money bills as showing that Army and Navy appropriations, taken together with \$13,000,000,000 provided for the lease-lend account, would keep all of the industries of the country presently manufacturing munitions busy until the end of 1943.

The addition of another \$7,000,000,000, he said, could only mean an even greater dislocation of private industrial activity, with consequently greater repercussions when the private firms were asked to pick up the manufacturing load after the war ended.

I say to you at this time that title III has no place in this bill. Heretofore Members of this House who have been in disagreement over whether the lease-lend aid is an essential part of our national defense, have had an opportunity to vote on all of the essential defense items dealing with our own defense program. Now such defense items are merged with lease-lend, for the first time.

In appropriating these billions, we should pause to consider the financial conditions which will obtain in the post-war period. Chaos and bankruptcy will confront the Nation, and we may discover that the four freedoms which we are seeking to preserve in foreign lands will have disappeared here. I favor all sound defense measures, but contend that we must not be unmindful of our responsibilities to develop an impregnable preparedness on this continent, and then to preserve the liberties and security of the American people. This should be our first concern.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a tragedy if this amendment were to be adopted. I did not vote for the Lease-Lend Act, but I think that for us now, after having gone where we are, to say that we are not going to make this appropriation for the lease-lend policy would be folly as far as the Nation is concerned.

I have not been too happy about the way in which the discussion has gone

on here with respect to the article which appeared in the papers yesterday. I do not believe we are going to win this war by bluffing, but when we do say we are going to do something I cannot see that anything is to be gained by pulling our punches.

If, as has been stated so positively by leading spokesmen for the majority party that an expeditionary force is not contemplated and will not be sent, I have no objection to plain words on that point. I want them to be plain—to our own people and to the world. In fairness to England and Russia and China there should be plain speaking on that point.

On the matter of production and the supplying of arms, however, the country has spoken and our word has been given. And, indeed, when you start handing a man guns to shoot somebody else, you better hand him aplenty and be sure he has plenty of ammunition, and be sure you are getting set to defend yourself if anything goes wrong with him. That is what this bill seeks to do.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; I am not going to yield in my limited time.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see why there should be any disguising the fact that this bill does carry some body blows for Mr. Hitler. The chairman of the committee during the hearings made this plain statement to the committee, that previous appropriations had provided production facilities for 4,000,000 men and some funds were asked in this bill to provide some additional production facilities.

We were told in plain language by representatives of the War Department that this bill would provide a reservoir of ammunition and critical supplies over and above that needed for an army of the size we now have. We were told that the aim was to produce or to put ourselves in position to produce whatever was needed to insure the safety of the United States. We were told that more estimates will be before us in January.

I hope that this bill is a body blow to Mr. Hitler and that it is only a part of what is to come. Why should we hesitate to face the fact that we are going to appropriate \$150,000,000,000 or \$200,000,000,000 if necessary before we get through with this?

Why not be frank with the people and let them know what this program will cost? Why try to soften the blow and cripple the program?

It should be remembered that these lend-lease goods are not transferred until they are completed and that even then, by the provisions of section 302 of this bill the President is directed to retain them for our own use when our defense will be best served thereby.

In the hearings on the Army appropriation bill for 1941 the question was asked by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] and myself, and we were told by representatives of the War Department that it would take \$100,000,000,000 for us to match the preparedness that Mr. Hitler already had. That was 2 years ago. Do you think we can catch up with him under high-cost conditions without spending more than that? Why should we worry about the figures in this bill or

what was published in the paper yesterday when every Member of the House has been circularized by a letter and when the papers last July carried a statement by the Federal Power Commission in which it was said that our defense expenditures would be \$3,000,000,000 a month by the middle of 1943?

The time to have worried about the cost of becoming policeman for the world was when we took on the job, and some of us did worry about it. I wish the entire cost of war, pensions and all, could be brought before us so that while we prosecute our part in it we would endeavor to end it, but I do not see why we should get excited and say we are going to pull our punches, or intimate that we are pulling our punches, when we are not.

Before me is a Member of the House who recently called my attention to a newspaper article in which the Governor of my State made a speech in Milwaukee. He was quoted as saying that the sentiment in my State was overwhelmingly isolationist, but intimated that the House and Senate delegation was divided and that I was on the fence. Let me assure him or anyone that when it comes to a question of the security and defense of the United States, I am neither on the fence nor on the wrong side of the fence. I support what I think is at that time the best way for the United States to maintain her independence and security.

I did not vote to get started down this road. I tried to suggest a different course for America. I would keep my eyes open for a road into the clearing today—and for the whole world. But by all that I have I am not going to try to cut off the supply of gasoline now that we are on this road. I do not want to see us stranded. I want the United States to get through.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARE. Are we permitted to offer amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending to strike out the title, but the gentleman may offer an amendment to the amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARE: On page 12 at the end of line 23, strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and add the following:

"Provided, That any person acting for or in behalf of the United States Government found guilty of knowingly disbursing or expending any of the funds herein appropriated for an obviously inconsistent purpose other than that for which appropriated shall be subject to a fine not exceeding \$10,000 or imprisonment for more than 3 years, or both within the discretion of the court."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I am compelled to make a point of order against the amendment. I will be glad to reserve the point of order and give the gentleman an opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield for that purpose?

Mr. HARE. I do.

Mr. RICH. May an amendment be offered to a paragraph when there is an amendment pending, when it is not an amendment to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is to strike out the title. The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] is a perfecting amendment.

The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment I am not unmindful that a point of order may properly be raised against it, but I want to say it is very discouraging and disheartening to Members of Congress, particularly to the members of the Appropriations Committee, who give days and weeks and sometimes months in an effort to analyze and properly interpret the justifications for appropriations; to find that frequently, according to testimony recently submitted to some of the committees of Congress, these appropriations are expended for purposes contrary to what they were intended.

My primary purpose in bringing this to the attention of the House is to emphasize to committees that have already been authorized to investigate the manner in which these defense appropriations have been expended, particularly the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Committee on Military Affairs, and the special committee provided for yesterday. Many reports are current to the effect that large sums of money have been spent contrary to the purposes and intention of the Congress and your Appropriations Committee. We would like to see these committees bring to Congress at the earliest possible date legislation that will not only take care of those who are violating the purpose and intention of the acts of Congress but give to them such punishment as their actions may warrant.

I understand, of course, that the amendment I have offered cannot be placed on this bill for the reason that it would be legislation on an appropriation bill, which is contrary to the rules of the House; but there is no reason why such legislation cannot be enacted at an early date if the investigations are made and facts are found to justify it. As stated at the outset, my purpose is to emphasize the necessity for immediate action.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I do not like the size of these appropriation bills. On the other hand, we have taken part in the war. Shooting is going on. Unless we are going to be obliged to send

troops over into Europe and Africa and have troubles all over the world, we are going to be obliged to supply Great Britain with the things with which to fight.

I can see nothing in opposition to this title except a determination on the part of those who oppose it at this time that our own boys shall be actually involved in the shooting in actual military hostilities as quick as we can get there; and I cannot see any question but what it is an invitation to everybody else to pick on us. I do not want to see that situation. I want to see America go on and defend herself in the best way, and I think that that is the safe way.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Not at this time.

The things here in this bill are not on so large a scale as some have stated. If you wish to see what is intended turn to page 90 of the hearings where you will find a statement in the middle of the page by General Brown that tells you just what these estimates will do. The facilities, the essential items, are only for 1,725,000 men. They do include certain critical items of equipment for 3,000,000, and they include production facilities to take care of 4,000,000 men, but not the equipment, not the things to work with. The thing is not as unreasonable as it has been made to appear.

I hope the House will sustain the committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I feel that there is little use in detaining the Committee in speaking against this amendment to strike the title which further extends the lease-lend policy; but echoing somewhat the sentiment of the distinguished gentleman from New York, it is exceedingly hard for me to understand the reasoning of some of our colleagues and some of our other distinguished American citizens who hate war so much, who are so horrified at the thought of the bloodshed and devastation that follows war, but who yet are unwilling to make an economic contribution to the people who are giving their lives and giving their destiny to try to stop the thing we want to see stopped before it gets to our own shores. Certainly a man must be hard of comprehension if he does not understand by now that if we do not have to meet the forces of aggression now rampant in Europe and Asia there will only be one reason, and that is because they are stopped before they get here. Now, if that be true—

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It is not true.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is only the gentleman's opinion, and the gentleman, fortunately, is in a great big minority.

If that be true, then it is my opinion, and the opinion, apparently, of a great many other Americans, that this war is going to be settled in the industrial production of America and our ability to put those implements in the hands of the people who are fighting.

It has been slow, there have been disappointments, there have been things to criticize, strikes have delayed them. I could occupy hours talking about those things, but the other side of the picture is that in a period of less than 2 years we have accomplished miracles in America. The industrial establishments of this country are turning from their lines, tanks, planes, and ships. We are building a ship a day. Every time the sun sinks, a vessel slides into the water for the purpose of carrying our commerce and carrying defense materials; and we are just now on the point, as Mr. Knudsen tells us, where we are about to blossom out with all of this production for which we have been appropriating money, building factories, building tools, and training men.

Now, do we want to avoid war? Then sustain the hands of the men who have stopped Hitler; and they have stopped him, in my humble judgment. Adolf Hitler is on the downward path and we, largely because of the sustaining strength and the moral influence of this great country that stands for liberty and freedom, heartened the British people; we not only sent them tanks and planes, but we told them that this great Nation was standing behind them and willing to contribute to the defense of their country. We heartened the Russian people, we heartened the Chinese people. Contrary to the expectation and prediction of our military experts Adolf Hitler is bogged down in Russia tonight. If we can go forward with our industrial production Adolf Hitler will continue to go the downward path and we shall be spared the ravages of war.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield. Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. In the Rostov area where the Russians have driven the Germans back, as the gentleman says, it is impossible for troops to operate except when the ground is frozen or in the middle of the summer and early fall. The best military information is they cannot reorganize in that area this winter but will have to wait until after the spring thaw and the summer before they can make an attack upon the Russian oil fields. If we can get the materials to them before next summer it means everything.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title IV—General appropriations.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: Page 13, after line 1, insert a new paragraph: "Legislative—House of Representatives: For a special employee for the majority at the rate of \$5,000 per annum, to be appointed by the Speaker. Fiscal year 1942, \$2,500. Such position is authorized to continue only during such period as it is occupied by the first incumbent thereof."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will accept this amendment. The minority has two similar positions, and the majority side is hopeful this position will be voted. I am sure if it is, the Members on all sides will be most pleased with the one who will be the beneficiary of this action.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is the third deficiency appropriation bill for this year, so far as general appropriations are concerned. You have heard much said about cutting down the regular appropriations for the Government. The country wants it. The committee in charge of this bill has seen fit to add to the bill for various departments of Government millions and millions of dollars.

It seems to me if we are going to cut down the regular appropriations of Government this committee should have had the courtesy to call on the subcommittees for the various departments, asking the members of each subcommittee if they thought these appropriations were necessary, but they did not do that. They have just included them in this bill. No well-regulated or well-organized business in the country would do such a thing as has been done by this Appropriations Committee. These items are brought to you today for your support. Are you going to cut down departmental expenses? If so, here is your chance. A vote against the bill is a protest; a vote for the bill and you are not for economy.

Every one of you said to your constituents: "We will cut down the regular appropriations for Government." Why do you not do it? You let the department heads come in here and ask for various sums—ever-increasing sums. The subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee know nothing about it until the bill is brought before the full committee. This is unsound committee procedure and unbusinesslike. You have asked for additional money for the Supreme Court, you have asked additional money for the independent agencies, you have asked for additional money for the Federal loan agencies, Public Health, the Federal Works Administration, the Department of Commerce, Department of the Interior, the various Territories, the Department of Labor, the Department of Justice, Department of State, the Treasury Department, and then you have also increased salaries.

If we are not on the road to bankruptcy, I do not know anything about this Government operation. With all due respect to the members of the Appropriations Committee—and I do respect the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], as well as other members of the committee—why, in the name of Heaven, do you not cut down the appropriations? Why do you let these bureaucrats come in here and add to the appropriations? I just cannot understand it. I just cannot see why you are losing all signs of trying to economize. We need men on the Appropriations Committee and in the House of

Representatives who can say "No," who will demand economy, who will cut out much of the work set up in the departments. Certainly it will mean a change, but it will be for the best interest of the Government.

Remember the President's promise to cut out unnecessary functions of government, to consolidate departments. Why is he not as good as his word? Why did he set up many, many more and add thousands and thousands of workers to the Federal pay roll, when he promised economy? Why? Why? Why? I cannot forgive him for promising economy, then becoming the greatest spender the world has ever known.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC ROADS ADMINISTRATION

Access roads: For the construction and improvement of access roads and for replacing existing highways and highway connections as described in and in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (Public Law 295) and for reimbursement of and transfer to the appropriation for Public Works, Bureau of Yards and Docks, Navy Department, not to exceed \$400,000, on account of expenditures from said appropriation for the purposes hereof, \$74,600,000, to remain available during the continuance of the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941; and in addition thereto authority is granted, during the continuance of such emergency, to enter into contracts for the above purposes in amounts not to exceed in the aggregate \$50,000,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am emphatically opposed to any effort to eliminate from this bill funds for starting the access-road program, or to any action that will further delay the starting of this work which is so important to our national-defense effort. I therefore urge that no objection be made to the road item that is now to be considered, and assure Members that every dollar in this bill is urgently needed.

The President has twice recommended that legislation be enacted providing funds for access roads to military and naval establishments, defense industries, and sources of needed raw materials. Testimony submitted to the Roads Committee during the consideration of the authorizing legislation explained in detail the very comprehensive studies that had been made throughout the country at the sites of these various defense establishments by representatives of the War and Navy Departments, the State highway departments, and the Public Roads Administration proves the acute need for this item.

Each proposed access-road project receives the most careful study and consideration before approval. No access-road project will be placed under construction until it has been certified as important to the national defense by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy.

Testimony of the Commissioner of Public Roads before the Appropriations Committee indicated that the total estimated cost of all access roads to certified Army and Navy and industrial establishments is \$300,000,000. The Army

now has 19 new posts that have not yet been certified as to access roads, and new industrial establishments for the production of defense materials are being created. The \$300,000,000 estimate of total cost of access roads has been divided into 3 groups. The first group includes those projects which are considered essential and are therefore of first priority, the estimated total cost of which exceeds \$122,000,000. The second group is listed as desirable projects, at a total cost of \$30,000,000. And the third group lists what are considered as useful projects, the estimated total cost of which exceeds \$147,000,000.

It is absurd for anyone to contend that our Army and Navy Establishments are now served with adequate highway facilities. Informed persons know that our defense effort is being impeded by the lack of such facilities. I quote the President relative to this matter:

The authorization for the construction of access roads to military and naval reservations and defense-industry sites upon certification of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy as to their military or naval necessity is unquestionably an authorization for the construction of roads urgently needed for the national defense. The Secretaries of War and Navy regard this authorization of primary importance and urgency.

Testimony submitted to the Roads Committee completely and emphatically supports the statement just quoted.

The Public Roads Administration and the State highway departments are ready to proceed with this vital work as soon as the funds are made available. Through a wise provision carried in the Hayden-Cartwright Act of September 5, 1940, surveys and plans have already been made for upward of 1,500 miles of these needed access roads.

While the bill under consideration will appropriate an almost unprecedented amount, the item for access roads, although relatively small, is one of the more important going to make up the total. The appropriation of \$75,000,000 and the authorization to let contracts for an additional \$50,000,000 will permit the access-road program to get under way without further delay. It is urgently important that this start be made now, and I again express the hope that there will be no opposition to this item of so vital importance to the Nation's defense.

The Clerk read as follows:

Development of landing areas: For an additional amount for development of landing areas, \$50,000,000, of which not to exceed \$2,375,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, fiscal year 1942, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1942: *Provided*, That the limitation upon the total number of public airports and other public landing areas in the program is hereby increased from 399 to 503.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 23, line 2, strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert "\$57,865,300."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to restore the Budget figure. I

think it is in harmony with the wishes of the committee as expressed in the report. The committee report states very specifically:

In making the reduction in the Budget estimate the committee does not indicate a desire to curtail the program or delay the prosecution of the necessary features of it.

This is the paragraph that provides the money for the airports that are to be developed by the Civil Aeronautics Authority on the selection of the Army and Navy. It contemplates the construction of 104 airports scattered through 32 States.

I have talked with the Civil Aeronautics people and they tell me that in view of their requirement that local communities must provide the land they would not feel free to operate unless the Budget figure is restored; that is, they cannot go to a community and say, "You vote bonds or take whatever steps are necessary to provide the land for these airports," until they are assured of having the money to carry out the improvements.

My amendment merely restores the Budget figure and is in harmony with the proviso in the paragraph increasing the number of airports to 503, which embraces these 104, an increase from the present 399. It is in harmony with the sentence in the committee report which states that it is not the intention of the committee to curtail the program. The adoption of the amendment is necessary if the airport program is to be carried out for the 104 airports.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. The Subcommittee on Appropriations will start its hearings on the regular appropriation bill for this Department in the next month. Why cannot this matter be considered at that time?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The reason it cannot go over until that time is that there would occur a delay in the acquisition of the land and the development of these airports. These airports are to be developed because of the military necessity.

I have in my hand a clipping bearing a London date line of November 16 which points out that the Royal Air Force is handicapped in its bombing efforts because it lacks sufficient air fields in the country that can handle the large planes. The difficulty comes in the return of ships. England's airports far outnumber ours. We are terribly deficient because fields have not kept pace with the increase of planes.

If the gentleman will examine the hearings on this question, he will find that these airports are wanted by the Army and the Navy for the purpose of developing airports that can accommodate the large ships that are moved across the country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, the cut of \$7,000,000 in this item was made because the committee felt that too much money was being spent for what we got; that the Civil Aeronautics Authority, by exercising a little better business management, could save \$7,000,000, or 10 percent of the appropriation, without the least bit of trouble.

I have seen a lot of these operations. I have seen where they have paid enormous prices for land. I have seen where they have paid enormous prices for buildings and for the operations connected with them. If the Civil Aeronautics Authority want to install business management, they can save much more than the \$7,000,000 and do much more than they said they could when they came before the committee. This does not reduce the number of the fields at all.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The cost of the land is not included in this, because the Civil Aeronautics Authority requires the local communities to provide the land in these projects. The testimony indicates that, and that is what the Civil Aeronautics people told me. They require the local communities to provide the land. This money is for the improvements.

Mr. TABER. This is for the improvements.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am quite sure the gentleman will find that no part of this fund or any of their funds is available for the purchase of land.

Mr. TABER. None of the money provided on page 23 is available for the purchase of land.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They cannot buy the land with any of their funds.

Mr. TABER. Not unless we specifically say so in the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I understand the gentleman, then, he is not seeking to cut down the number of civil airports which the Army and Navy people have said they wanted developed to be suitable for military planes, nor is he seeking to delay the starting of them. He believes, if I understand him correctly, that the Civil Aeronautics Board should go ahead and enter into commitments for the full number of airports indicated in the language which raises the present limitation from 399 to 503 but try to accomplish them within the funds carried in the bill?

Mr. TABER. Yes; and I believe they can do it if they will exercise a little better business judgment and a little more energy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE of South Dakota), there were—ayes 4, noes 45.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Tennessee Valley Authority fund: For an additional amount for the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, fiscal year 1942, for (1) beginning construction of an hydroelectric project on the Little Tennessee River near Fontana, N. C., (2) installing additional electric generating units with a total rated capacity of approximately 324,000 kilowatts in existing hydroelectric projects owned by the Authority, (3) installing an additional steam electric generating unit with a rated capacity of approximately 60,000 kilowatts in the Watts Bar steam plant and for developing units of other steam plants to their complete capacity as provided in the original plans of installation, (4) purchase or building of transmission facilities needed to connect this project and these units to the existing transmission system of the Authority, to interconnect the Authority's system with neighboring systems, and to deliver the power produced by this project and these units to the market, and (5) the acquisition of land necessary for and the relocation of highways in connection with the accomplishment of the above project; \$25,000,000, to be available for the administrative objects of expenditure and subject to the conditions specified under this heading in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the unanimous verdict of the 12 members of our subcommittee will be allowed to stand as the judgment of the House in respect to the construction of the Douglas Dam of the Tennessee Valley development.

In the conduct of our legislative operations the House, I think, very properly, gives a great deal of faith and credence to the decisions of its subcommittees and when a subcommittee reaches a unanimous decision its finding is especially impressive.

This is easily understood, for the subcommittee goes into the subject with great thoroughness, investigating every phase and angle of the matter involved. Our subcommittee patiently listened to a large volume of testimony, interrogated many witnesses, including two delegations from Tennessee who represented the opposite viewpoints of the controversy, and evaluated many pages of well-documented evidence on the subject. When it came to a vote, after we had heard all of this evidence, not a single hand was raised in our subcommittee in favor of proceeding with the construction of the Douglas Dam. In a very real sense we sat as a jury in this case. It so happens that our subcommittee has 12 members, the same as a jury. When a jury spends days upon days hearing exhaustive evidence and in pondering over a case and then reaches a unanimous decision there is a fair presumption, at least, in favor of the justice of its conclusion. I believe there should be in this instance.

At the beginning I want, if I may, to dispel the myth that those who oppose the construction of the Douglas Dam and the resultant ruin of a fertile em-

pire are handicapping national defense. That is not true at all. There are plenty of alternate ways of securing the equivalent of the power which the Douglas Dam would produce, without depriving the State of Tennessee of one of its most productive domains and removing from the tax duplicate thousands upon thousands of rich acres whose tax revenues are now a tower of strength in supporting local county governments.

To say that the men who came up from Tennessee to oppose this proposition and their associates at home are lacking in patriotism and insensitive to the needs of national defense would be a gross libel on as fine a body of citizens as can be found in the United States. As Judge J. T. Stokely, who headed their delegation, a splendid gentleman and a leader of the bar, said to our subcommittee, it is a matter of history that in the Civil War the first and second districts of Tennessee furnished more troops to the Federal armies than any other congressional district in the United States in proportion to population and the men who were not in the Federal armies were in the Confederate Army.

In 1898 and 1917 this record of patriotic response to the call of our country was repeated, and, bringing the record up to date, I am informed that Cocke County, Tenn., which would be ruined in considerable part by this dam, has not had to send a single man under the selective-service system, because the county quota has all been filled by volunteers. I am certain, as a matter of fact, that if this dam were really necessary for national defense the delegation from Tennessee would not have been here opposing it, and I am sure our subcommittee, which has gone to the very limit in co-operating with the Government for national defense, never hesitating and voting colossal sums for that purpose, would not have decided against it. We know from our intensive studies of the proposition that alternates can be provided that will do everything required.

There was nothing abstruse about the question that was presented to us. It was a plain, simple proposition as to whether we should approve a power project that would inundate a populous little empire as fertile as the valley of the Nile, or whether we should find a way to secure the equivalent or a greater number of kilowatts of electric power by some plan that would not bring about all of this ruin. Our subcommittee preferred the latter method, and it is my considered belief that our decision will stand up unchallenged in the court of public opinion when all of the facts are known and appreciated.

The picture we had before us was one of tragic ruin of an area affecting about 60,000 acres, including 31,800 acres which would be entirely flooded. This doomed area of 31,800 acres is a very valuable, thickly settled bottom land, mainly given over to trucking. One cannery is located in the area to be flooded and four other canneries derive their raw material mainly from that area. There are 4,000 people employed in connection with the production of crops on the lands which would be flooded, and

the processing of those crops in five canneries. Approximately 2,000,000 cases of vegetables are grown every year on the soil that will be covered with water if this dam is built. I think that what the construction of this dam would do to the immensely fertile and productive section that it would blot out is perhaps best told in a letter I have received from James A. T. Wood, a judge of the county court and an outstanding citizen of Dandridge, Tenn., and I ask you to listen to this graphic and realistic description:

NEWPORT, TENN., November 22, 1941.
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As we said at the hearing which your committee gave us, we have no fight on the other items for which the appropriation is requested, our objection being confined solely to the proposed dam on the French Broad River near Dandridge. Our appeal, to which the Tennessee Valley Authority has turned a deaf ear, is against the needless and wanton destruction of a small agricultural empire, the deprivation of the means of livelihood of some 4,000 of our citizens, and the flooding of our homes, our schools, our churches, and our cemeteries. In short, our appeal is against the needless destruction of a splendid civilization, built up over a period of nearly 200 years, by the courage, the toil, and the hardships of our ancestors, merely for the purpose of adding less than one-fourth of 1 percent to the power facilities of the United States, when steam facilities, which are available to produce the same power, can be installed in less time and at a small fraction of the cost of the proposed dam.

Very truly yours,

JAMES A. T. WOOD,
Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the area that will be doomed if the Douglas Reservoir is constructed is a very old settlement interwoven with many affectionate recollections of those who have lived there and whose rugged ancestors helped to create the State of Tennessee out of the wilderness. It is preeminently a community of homes. As one who attended all of the hearings when these good people appeared I could not fail to note, as they spoke to us, how the love of home was pressing and straining against their hearts. There are a number of very old cemeteries in the area and it was evident when witnesses were testifying that the golden strands of memory were leading them back to the silent cities of the dead, where their fathers and mothers sleep. In these very old cemeteries time has done its devastating work and it is doubtful whether the bodies could now be removed with any certainty of identity.

I will confess as one member of the subcommittee that there was something very sad and revolting to me in the thought of invading the sacred precincts of the dead. Then, too, there was the thought that the Creator made a world of incomparable beauty for us to live in and placed in it the means to sustain life, and it seemed to me little less than sacrilege that by any act of ours we should wipe out a very fair and extremely productive spot of God's creation. We must remember that this land when taken over for a reservoir is not put under water for 1942 and 1943 or any other limited time, but it is blotted out forever.

Surely a step as serious as that should not even be considered if it is possible to obtain the power needed for national defense in any other way, within a reasonable time limit. That this is possible I do not have a shadow of doubt. Surely, among all of the limitless power possibilities of this mighty country some place can be found, some method can be devised, to produce 100,000 kilowatts of additional power for national defense without dispossessing those good people in Tennessee, wiping out their schools and churches, lacerating their home ties, flooding their cities of the dead, and destroying their farming empire of matchless fertility.

I think I know right off-hand one combination by which this power could be produced without doing any such damage to property owners, and no doubt there are others. The plan I suggest is not a visionary one but is well buttressed by facts brought out at our hearings. It involves a combination of water and steam power, the construction of the so-called Holston Dam and the development of the Sheffield steam unit. The Holston Dam could be built without any appreciable damage to private property. It would furnish 90,000 kilowatts of continuous power as against 100,000 which they say the Douglas Dam would produce. The Holston Dam development would come into production in 24 months, which is some 6 or 8 months after the estimated time of completion of the Douglas Dam. But the Sheffield steam unit can be completed so that production there will begin in less than 12 months, or considerably earlier than at the proposed Douglas Dam. This combination of the Holston Dam and the Sheffield steam unit would produce 140,000 kilowatts of power, or 40,000 more than the Douglas Dam alone would be capable of producing.

Last summer two highly capable and efficient Indianapolis power engineers, Mr. Thomas N. Wynne and Mr. Thomas H. Hays, went to Tennessee and spent some time there making a thorough survey of the Tennessee Valley power development. These men are of eminent standing and well known in engineering circles throughout America. They came to the conclusion that steam was not being utilized nearly to the extent that economy and efficiency of operation would indicate to be advisable. At the Sheffield unit they found a large and well-engineered steam power plant built in 1918 during the previous World War emergency, with an ultimate capacity of about 125,000 kilowatts in which only 60,000 kilowatts had been installed. The plant building was provided, however, with the foundations, facilities, and space for an additional 50,000 to 75,000 kilowatts.

Through their knowledge of the power industry they located a turbine at the Detroit Edison plant and arranged with its owners to take it over and then they submitted a proposal to the Tennessee Valley Authority whereby they agreed to furnish this unit so that it would produce 50,000 kilowatts of continuous power, or one-half of the estimated production of the proposed Douglas Dam, and they offered to do this at the very low cost of

\$1,800,000 as against an estimated cost of \$37,700,000 for the Douglas Dam plant. In other words, they promised that if allowed to complete this steam unit they would furnish one-half of the amount of power that could be produced by the Douglas Dam at less than one-eighteenth of the cost. They found boilers already installed to connect up with the turbine. They found that the transmission lines for the Sheffield steam plant, as already constructed and in operation, were capable of carrying this additional load.

We were told in our hearings in October that the Detroit turbine had been assigned to magnesium production in Texas. Mr. Wynne went to Detroit to investigate and on November 25, 5 or 6 weeks after we were informed this assignment had been made he sent me the following telegram:

DETROIT, MICH., November 25, 1941.
Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Turbine still available on skids in Detroit Edison warehouse.

T. N. WYNNE.

A report is in circulation that this turbine is worn out and has no further possibilities of service, and on December 2 I wired to Mr. Hays asking him for a report on its condition. In reply I received the following telegram:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., December 3, 1941.

With reference to Detroit turbine, our proposition included complete overhauling and placing turbine in first-class operating condition. After proper repairs turbine good for 5 to 7 years' service. Owner contemplated installing turbine and using it if increased load warranted it. Electric Bond & Share offered to buy this turbine for their own use, but was withdrawn by present owner.

THOMAS H. HAYS.

Mr. Chairman, this would indicate that the Detroit turbine is still available under the contract of the Indianapolis engineers with the owner, but whether it is or not it would seem to be an inexcusable disregard of economy to fail or refuse to develop the Sheffield unit according to the original plans of installation. Even if this turbine is assigned, that would not affect the merits of finishing the steam plant at Sheffield in accordance with the proposal of my Indianapolis constituents.

The facts of the case are that the Office of Production Management has the entire authority to assign idle steam turbines to the various defense plants, and, of course, they could reassign this turbine to the T. V. A., or could obtain a new turbine that may be under production for some utility or power plant where the need for the same is not as urgent as it is for the T. V. A. property. It seemed to some of us that all of the Government authorities dealing directly with this problem of power are obsessed with the water-power idea and opposed to the steam-power plan of generating electricity for national defense, even when the cost differential in favor of steam is as startling as in the case of completing the Sheffield steam unit compared with the construction of the Douglas Dam. It seemed to some of us that the entire problem should be reexamined in the light of a greater utilization of steam. With that thought in mind our subcom-

mittee inserted in the language of the bill now before us the following provision:

And for developing units of other steam plants to their complete capacity as provided in the original plans of installation.

The question presently confronting us was whether we shall give the Office of Production Management an opportunity to think the matter over and present to us an alternate plan that will not devastate hundreds of homes, deprive thousands of employment, and wreck two or three counties in Tennessee. No great harm can come from this brief delay, as meanwhile we shall be proceeding with the construction of the Fontana Dam and the Watts Bar steam plant, which are authorized in this bill. In our zeal to make progress we should give some consideration, at least, to the humanities involved.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

For an additional amount for expenses of the Commission of Fine Arts, fiscal year 1942, including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1942, \$3,000; and the limitation of \$6,480 on the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia is hereby increased to \$6,710.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Page 24, after line 2, insert the following:

"NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

"COLONIAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK,
YORKTOWN, VA.

"The limitation contained in title II of the act approved July 1, 1941 (Public Law No. 146, 77th Cong.), with regard to the cost of buildings erected by the Civilian Conservation Corps shall not apply in connection with the construction, with existing funds, of a courthouse at Yorktown, Va."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, except for the importance of this amendment, I would hesitate to take the time of the committee on an amendment which is subject to a point of order.

The purpose of the amendment is to permit execution of an agreement entered into between the county of York and the National Park Service on June 19, 1941. It was agreed by a perfectly valid agreement that the Secretary of the Interior might designate as an historic site the lot on which there stood the courthouse in York County, Va., which was burned in 1940.

Under the Historic Sites Act, approved August 21, 1935, title 16, section 462, clause (e), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to contract and make cooperative agreement with States, municipal subdivisions, corporations, associations, or individuals with proper bond where deemed advisable to protect preserve, maintain, or operate any historic or archaeological building, site, object, or property used in connection therewith for public use, regardless as to whether the title thereto is in the United States, provided, that no contract or cooperative agreement shall be made or entered into which will obligate the general fund of

the Treasury unless or until Congress has appropriated money for such purpose.

Under this act the agreement referred to above was entered into between the United States of America by Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, and York County, a political subdivision of the Commonwealth of Virginia, acting by and through its board of supervisors and duly authorized officials.

It was recited in the preambles to said agreement as follows:

First. That the Yorktown Courthouse and grounds located on lot 24 in Yorktown, Va., are recognized as possessing national significance as a portion of the Town of York, besieged and captured by the American and French troops during the Revolution, and part of the battlefield of Yorktown commemorated by Colonial National Historical Park.

Second. That the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, at its meeting in Washington, D. C., on October 28-29, 1937, approved additions to Colonial National Historical Park as necessary for the proper development and interpretation of this area for the benefit and inspiration of the people of the United States, and it is proposed to carry out that recommendation by designating the Yorktown battlefield area, together with the courthouse lot, a national historic site.

Third. That it is the purpose of the National Park Service to preserve its structures and grounds in and about Yorktown in a manner consistent with the eighteenth century aspect of the town, and to facilitate such purposes it is desirable that public and other properties in Yorktown should be preserved or developed in a similar manner.

Fourth. That the county was desirous of securing assistance from the Department of the Interior for the reconstruction of the courthouse and related buildings on lot 24 in Yorktown known as the courthouse lot, in harmony with the historical setting of Yorktown; and

Fifth. That the Secretary desires to cooperate with the county in constructing a courthouse in harmony with the historical setting of Yorktown and to insure a more adequate protection for the priceless county historical records which are essential to the development of the Colonial National Historical Park, and also wishes to make possible archaeological excavations at the historic site of the Yorktown Courthouse.

The agreement provides that in consideration of the recitals above set out and pursuant to the authority contained in the act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666), entitled "An act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes," the said parties—that is, the United States of America, acting through the Secretary of the Interior, and York County, acting through its supervisors—have covenanted and agreed to and with each other and in consideration of the mutual promises above expressed as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior on behalf of the United States:

(a) That he will designate lot 24 in Yorktown, known as the courthouse lot, as national historic site;

(b) To cooperate with the county in the erection of a county courthouse and related buildings in keeping with the historical setting of Yorktown, within the limits of available funds;

(c) In his discretion, to expend such funds as may be available by appropriation or donation for the purpose of assisting the county in the appropriate restoration of its historic structures and their surroundings within the national historic site.

By article II of the agreement, the county of York agreed for itself, its successors, and assigns as follows:

(a) That the county will retain and preserve in perpetuity, so far as it is reasonably able to do so, the grounds and restored ancient structures which it owns on lot 24, which lot fronts on Main Street in Yorktown, Va., 132 feet, and extends in a northerly direction along Ballard Street 165 feet.

(b) The county will not erect or permit to be erected any new building or buildings on any portion of the grounds designated by the Secretary as part of the national historic site, without prior consultation with the Secretary: *Provided*, That after the said courthouse shall be erected, then the county will not erect or allow to be erected any new building on said lot No. 24 that does not harmonize with the colonial architecture of said buildings and will submit plans of any building to be erected within this area for his approval, and if the county and the Secretary cannot agree as to the architecture of said building, then the question shall be submitted to arbitration. The arbitrators shall be appointed, one by the county and one by the Secretary, and if the two so selected do not agree, then they shall select another, and a decision of the arbitrators shall be final; and it is further agreed that the arbitrators shall be disinterested persons.

(c) The county will advise with the National Park Service before permitting the erection or placement of any monument, marker, tablet, or other memorial in or upon the area designated by the Secretary as part of the national historic site.

(d) No alterations or repairs calculated to change the exterior of the courthouse and related buildings shall be undertaken by the county without prior consultation with the Secretary: *Provided*, That if the county and the Secretary cannot agree as to whether the proposed alterations or repairs would be in harmony with the historical setting of Yorktown, then resort shall be had to arbitration as set forth in article II (b) of this agreement. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to repairs or additions to the present clerk's office or jail until after the proposed new buildings shall have been erected in their stead.

(e) To permit the National Park Service to carry on archeological investigations on lot 24 and to study and measure such structures and objects as may be uncovered by the archeological investigations.

(f) The county will grant to the National Park Service the first right to scientific publication of the results of such archeological investigations and studies.

(g) Artifacts discovered in the course of the above-mentioned excavations shall remain the property of the county but shall be placed on indefinite loan in the National Park Service museum at Yorktown, subject to temporary removal from time to time in the event of special exhibitions or exercises held at the courthouse.

By article III it was mutually understood and agreed:

(a) That lot 24, together with all structures thereon, shall remain the property of

the county, to be used by it for courthouse and other public purposes.

(b) Whenever in this contract the Secretary is referred to, the term shall include his duly authorized representative.

(c) No Member of, or Delegate to the Congress or Resident Commissioner shall be admitted to any share or part of this contract or to any benefit that may arise therefrom, but this restriction shall not be construed to extend this contract if made with a corporation or company for its general benefit.

Pursuant to said agreement the Secretary of the Interior wrote the President of the United States under date of April 23, 1941, that one of the purposes of the National Park Service in developing and interpreting the Yorktown portion of the Colonial National Historical Park is to preserve its structures and grounds in and about Yorktown in a manner consistent with the eighteenth century aspect of the town; that to facilitate this purpose, it is desirable that public and other properties in Yorktown should also be preserved or developed in harmony with the historical setting of Yorktown; that the act of Congress approved March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1490), authorized \$2,000,000 to be appropriated for the purchase and development of lands and structures within the authorized limits of Colonial National Historical Park, which include the town of York and that of the \$2,000,000 authorized for land acquisition, only \$580,000 had been expended, leaving an authorization balance of \$1,420,000.

The letter further stated that although the authorization of \$1,420,000 appears to be liberal it would not go very far in purchasing city property within the limits of Yorktown; that it is, therefore, the opinion of our Secretary of the Interior that the National Park Service purpose at Yorktown can best be achieved by designating as a national historic site the Yorktown portion of Colonial National Historical Park and by adding thereto, as integral parts of the national historic site, such county-owned and privately owned areas and structures as may be covered by written cooperative agreements made with the owners under the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666); and that under this arrangement the buildings and structures would remain in county or private ownership, but their preservation or development in harmony with the historical setting at Yorktown would be guaranteed by the terms of the cooperative agreement covering them.

The letter further stated that owing to a fire which seriously damaged the county courthouse at Yorktown, Va., in December 1940, an opportunity has arisen to secure an agreement with the county commissioners—board of supervisors—under the terms of which the county will agree to the construction of a courthouse more in harmony with the historical setting of Yorktown and better equipped to protect the priceless county historical records which are essential to the accurate and authentic development of Colonial National Historical Park, and that moreover, at this time, the county commissioners would be willing to permit archaeological excavation of the county courthouse lot.

The letter further stated that through the medium of the C. C. C. camp now at Yorktown, the National Park Service is in a position to cooperate with the county in erecting on the county courthouse lot a county courthouse and related buildings of eighteenth century design. In return for this service, which will not obligate the general fund of the United States Treasury, the county is willing to donate to the National Park Service \$15,000, to be used by the Service for the purchase of Surrender Field and other key sites within the authorized limits of Colonial National Historical Park which must be purchased by the National Park Service before the land-acquisition program at the Yorktown battlefield can be considered complete.

In said letter addressed to the President of the United States authority is requested to negotiate with the county commissioners for the consummation of the attached cooperative agreement, which embodies the above plans and which had the approval of the said Secretary of the Interior as to form and substance.

On May 7, 1941, the President approved the recommendation evidenced by his signature to the letter.

Accordingly, the courthouse lot in Yorktown has been designated a national historic site and part of the work in consummation of this agreement has been done. The old courthouse has been torn down by the National Park Service. The salvaged brick is in the possession of the National Park Service and, in addition, the National Park Service has purchased about \$5,000 of material in order to carry out the agreement that has been entered into in good faith between the board of supervisors of York County (county commissioners) and the National Park Service.

Title II of the act approved July 1, 1941, Public Law No. 146, Seventy-seventh Congress, with regard to the cost of the buildings erected by the Civilian Conservation Corps, provides that the cost of any building erected under that act shall not exceed \$25,000. The act specifically provides for the use of the Civilian Conservation Corps in the construction, improvement, repair, and maintenance of buildings, but that the cost of any building erected thereunder shall not exceed \$25,000. When the cooperative agreement above referred to, executed between the Secretary of the Interior and the Board of Supervisors of York County, was executed—that is, on June 19, 1941—by the terms of which the Civilian Conservation Corps might be used in the work of reconstruction, the cost would not have exceeded \$25,000. Advancing prices since that time make it appear that the cost would aggregate around \$32,215.93, the items of which are: Skilled labor, \$9,395.63; material, \$14,820.30; with an evaluation of C. C. C. labor as \$8,000.

The amendment proposes to remove the limitation that prevents the execution of the agreement. If that limitation is removed, it is estimated that the cost would certainly not exceed \$35,000.

The plans for the building have been prepared. The C. C. C. labor is available

at Yorktown. The old building has been demolished. The salvaged brick from the old building is in the custody of the Park Service for use. The archaeological work provided for in the agreement has been performed. The money needed to perform the agreement is available. Material worth about \$5,000 has been purchased by the Park Service. No additional appropriation is needed.

York County is to pay to the National Park Service \$15,000 which will be used for the purchase of land within the authorized boundaries of the park. Congress has already authorized an appropriation for the purchase of additional land needed to round out the park, but there are no additional funds appropriated for that purpose. However, with the money paid by the county to the National Park Service amounting to \$15,000 there can be bought the surrender field, where the British laid down their arms, thus assuring American independence, and other land necessary for the purposes of the park.

The records of the county are priceless. They extend back to the year 1632.

I wish to emphasize again that no additional appropriation of money is needed. All that is necessary to carry out the definite and binding agreement which has been made between the National Park Service and the county of York is by the adoption of my amendment, which reads as follows:

The limitation contained in title II of the act approved July 1, 1941 (Public, No. 146, 77th Cong.), with regard to the cost of buildings erected by the Civilian Conservation Corps shall not apply in connection with the construction, with existing funds, of a courthouse at Yorktown, Va.

The county of York has now no courthouse and is using a temporary building. I hope that the amendment may be adopted.

The only thing that prevents the consummation of this agreement is this limitation of \$25,000 on buildings in the C. C. C. Act, and that only to the extent of about \$7,000. The county needs a courthouse.

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

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

Mr. HARE. Are funds requested to be appropriated for this purpose?

Mr. BLAND. No appropriation is requested. The funds are available, and it is only the limitation on the cost of the building that is holding up the complete performance of the cooperative agreement executed by the Secretary of the Interior and the Board of Supervisors of York County and approved by the President.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I feel obliged to make the point of order.

Mr. BLAND. I am sorry the gentleman feels constrained to make the point of order.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment involves legislation and the point of order is sustained.

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

Mr. Chairman, when final approval is given to the third supplemental national-defense appropriation bill now before us, and which totals over eight billions of dollars, we will have appropriated for national defense since July 1, 1940, in round figures sixty-eight billions of dollars. Included in this \$68,000,000,000 appropriation is fourteen and one-half billions of dollars in lend-lease funds.

Like many other Members of Congress, I have burned the midnight oil in reading the two volumes of hearings and analyzing this bill which, as you know, was not available in printed form until the past 24 hours.

It is my intention to support this latest appropriation of eight billions of dollars for national defense, despite the fact that the bill contains many items whose label as national defense is open to question. However, the real intent of this bill is to supplement our national-defense program by providing needed equipment and material for our armed forces, not alone in the United States and possessions, but likewise in Iceland, New Guinea, Bermuda, Greenland, Newfoundland, and on the high seas.

Whether or not we approve every item in this bill is beside the point when it is realized that, as a Nation, we owe a duty to the nearly 2,000,000 young men now in our armed forces to provide them with modern military equipment.

In supporting this appropriation, I am consistently carrying out my policy of approving and voting for every penny of the \$68,000,000,000, including all lend-lease appropriations, requested by President Roosevelt and his military advisers as necessary to the defense of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said of the lack of unity in our Nation. There has been no desire on the part of any Member of Congress to think or act in a manner detrimental to the best interest of America.

It is true that there has been an honest difference in policy as to what constitutes a step in the direction of war, and this is best evidenced by the deep consideration given to the question of arming merchant vessels and permitting them to enter war zones.

There can be no doubt that the American people are overwhelmingly opposed to America's active participation in the present war. While our sympathies are with those nations resisting aggression, and our money and supplies through lend-lease appropriations have been made available in huge sums, the American people are definitely opposed to another American expeditionary force being sent to Europe.

It has been no easy task to differentiate between aid to war-torn countries and a definite step toward war. It is refreshing to note that partisan politics have played no part in opposing measures considered as leading America to the brink of war. For an illustration, when the House of Representatives on November 13, 1941, voted on arming merchant ships and eliminating war zones, party lines were ignored as 57 Democrats opposed the administration

while 22 Republicans supported the stand of the administration. The vote recorded 212 Members as favoring revision with 194 against. Among the 194 opponents to the measure are listed many staunch Democrats and followers of President Roosevelt, all of whom are chairmen of important committees. They are as follows:

Hon. GUY L. MOSER, Pennsylvania, Census.

Hon. DAN R. McGEHEE, Mississippi, Claims.

Hon. ANDREW L. SOMERS, New York, Coinage.

Hon. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT, California, Useless Papers.

Hon. HUGH PETERSON, Georgia, Elections No. 3.

Hon. JAMES A. O'LEARY, New York, Expenditures.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE, Idaho, Irrigation.

Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS, Texas, Judiciary.

Hon. HARRY P. BEAM, Illinois, Memorials.

Hon. J. WILL ROBINSON, Utah, Public Lands.

Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH, New York, Revision of Laws.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina, Ways and Means.

Hon. JOHN W. RANKIN, Mississippi, World War Veterans.

Hon. JOHN H. TOLAN, California, Special Committee on National Defense Migration.

In addition to the above-named chairmen of important House committees, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable JOSEPH MANSFIELD, chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors and chief exponent in Congress of the St. Lawrence project as a national-defense measure, is listed as being absent when the vote was taken on sending armed merchant vessels into war zones but recorded as being opposed to the measure. In like manner, the gentleman from New York, Mrs. CAROLINE O'Day, absent through illness, is also another staunch administration follower who is recorded as being opposed to sending armed merchant vessels into war zones.

Mr. Chairman, we have as Members of the House of Representatives 150 veterans of the Spanish-American and World Wars. Party lines mean nothing to these men who know and understand war from first-hand experience. It is interesting to note on the vote to send armed merchant vessels into war zones 82 voted against such action, 57 voted in favor of it, and 7 were recorded as not voting. Among the 82 voting against sending armed merchant vessels into war zones 2 were veterans of the World War, both holders of the Distinguished Service Cross awarded them as a result of heroism on the field of battle. I know every one of the 82 veterans who opposed sending armed merchant vessels into war zones and their vote was the result of their honest conviction that such action was a definite step toward war.

As a further indication that party lines mean nothing when the question of keeping America out of war is being consid-

ered, an analysis of the vote on repealing the neutrality law discloses that while the measure carried by a margin of 10 votes those in favor of sending armed merchant vessels into war zones represented 45,000,000 American citizens, while those in opposition to the legislation represented 71,000,000. This analysis is further substantiated by the Gallup poll, which reveals the majority of the American people are opposed to America's entrance into the present war which in plain language means another American expeditionary force to Europe.

Returning to a discussion of the \$8,000,000,000 appropriation now before us, much has been said in debate of the cost of our national-defense program. However, it must be remembered that modern warfare is more costly and that with approval of the measure before us we will have an appropriation twice the cost of our participation in the first World War and yet no actual declaration of war has been made.

This time next year our national debt may be \$150,000,000,000 and taxation already becoming an increasing burden on the taxpayers of America is further pronounced by the constant increase in the cost of living.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that the American people will cheerfully make every possible contribution in time, effort, and money to the upbuilding of an adequate national defense, conscious of the fact that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness cannot be measured in mere dollars and cents.

In conclusion, I repeat my assertion that I intend to support this \$8,000,000,000 appropriation in the interest of national defense and, in so doing, maintain a perfect record of having voted for every dollar for national defense as requested by the President and the military leaders of our country.

As a representative of nearly 300,000 American citizens, the majority of whom oppose another American expeditionary force to Europe, I reserve the right to determine any policy as to whether it is actually aiding war-torn countries or designed to plunge this Nation into war. After all, the welfare of America should be our first consideration and when legislating let us pause and ask ourselves, Are we by our actions keeping faith with our fellow Americans?

The Clerk read as follows:

Flood control, general: For an additional amount for flood control, general, fiscal year 1942, including the objects and subject to the conditions specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1942, \$17,600,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: Page 28 line 15, after the figures "1942" strike out "\$17,600,000" and insert "\$17,800,000."

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will simply increase the appropriation by \$200,000 for the initiation of construction of flood-control works at Prattville, Ala., which we have been working on for 4 years, and which has

been fully considered by the committee but which, because the absence of a Budget estimate, was not approved.

These flood-control works are not only needed to save a lovely little city from destruction, but also to protect plants important to national defense. This fact is set forth in the report of the authorization bill and certified by the Navy's Chief of Ordnance.

The budget estimate has now been filed, and I understand that this amendment to provide \$200,000 to enable the Army engineers to begin immediate construction on this authorized half million dollar project will be accepted by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the Budget estimate was not received at the time the committee acted upon this, and has since been received, the committee accepts the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—CLASSIFICATION ACT, SALARY ADVANCEMENTS

For supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, on account of the enactment of the act of August 1, 1941 (Public Law No. 200, 77th Cong.), amending the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and Executive Order No. 8882, issued September 3, 1941, under the authority of said act, and on account of Executive Order No. 8842 issued August 1, 1941, to be added to and become a part of the appropriation available during said fiscal year under the following appropriation titles, namely:

LEGISLATIVE ESTABLISHMENT

For "Salaries, Office of Architect of the Capitol, 1942," \$1,178.

For "Capitol Building and repairs, 1942," \$2,900.

For "Improving the Capitol Grounds, 1942," \$1,650.

For "Maintenance, Legislative Garage, 1942," \$150.

For "Maintenance, Senate Office Building, 1942," \$2,625.

For "Maintenance, House Office Buildings, 1942," \$3,200.

For "Capitol Power Plant, 1942," \$2,755.

For "Salaries, Botanic Garden, 1942," \$450.

For "Salaries, Library proper, Library of Congress, 1942," \$8,995.

For "Salaries, Copyright Office, Library of Congress, 1942," \$1,140.

For "Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, 1942," \$270.

For "Distribution of card indexes, Library of Congress, 1942," \$2,615.

For "Index to State legislation, Library of Congress, 1942," \$585.

For "Union catalogues, Library of Congress, 1942," \$465.

For "Salaries, library buildings, Library of Congress, 1942," \$3,240.

For "Salaries, Office of Superintendent of Documents, 1942," \$6,050.

In all, legislative establishment, \$38,268.

THE JUDICIARY

For "Salaries, Supreme Court, 1942," \$1,760.

For "Care of Supreme Court Building and Grounds, 1942," \$390.

For "Salaries, United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, 1942," \$875.

For "Salaries, Court of Claims, 1942," \$1,518.
 For "Probation system, United States courts, 1942," \$7,075.
 In all, the judiciary, \$11,618.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENTS

For "Salaries and expenses, Office for Emergency Management, 1942," \$13,012.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Board of Tax Appeals, 1942," \$4,400.
 For "Salaries and expenses, United States Employees' Compensation Commission, 1942," \$9,553.
 For "Federal Power Commission, 1942," \$20,000.
 For "Salaries, General Accounting Office, 1942," \$185,747.
 For "Salaries and expenses, National Archives, 1942," \$11,382.
 For "Salaries, National Labor Relations Board, 1942," \$20,310.
 For "Salaries and expenses, National Mediation Board, 1942," \$2,273.
 For "Salaries and expenses, National Railroad Adjustment Board, National Mediation Board, 1942," \$3,090.
 For "General expenses, Smithsonian Institution, 1942," \$4,144.
 For "Preservation of collections, Smithsonian Institution, 1942," \$9,398.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Veterans' Administration, 1942," \$642,125.
 For "Salaries, Office of Administrator, Federal Security Agency, 1942," \$1,737.
 For "Salaries, Division of Personnel Supervision and Management, Federal Security Agency, 1942," \$2,343.
 For "Salaries, Chief Clerk's Division, Federal Security Agency, 1942," \$450.
 For "Salaries, Office of General Counsel, Federal Security Agency, 1942," \$8,802.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Food and Drug Administration, Federal Security Agency, 1942," \$26,315.
 For "Salaries, Office of Education, 1942," \$4,848.
 For "Salaries and expenses, vocational education, Office of Education, 1942," \$3,188.
 For "Salaries and expenses, vocational rehabilitation, Office of Education, 1942," \$1,280.
 For "Cooperative vocational rehabilitation, residents of the District of Columbia, Office of Education, 1942," \$600.
 For "Salaries, Freedmen's Hospital, Federal Security Agency, 1942," \$8,105.
 For "Salaries, Office of Surgeon General, Public Health Service, 1942," \$1,605.
 For "Pay of other employees, Public Health Service, 1942," \$3,493.
 For "Pay of personnel and maintenance of hospitals, Public Health Service, 1942," \$47,400.
 For "Disease and sanitation investigations, Public Health Service, 1942," \$3,260.
 For "Saint Elizabeths Hospital, Federal Security Agency, 1942," \$12,605.
 For "Selecting, testing, and placement, defense workers, Social Security Board (national defense), 1942," \$12,445.
 In all, Executive Office and Independent Establishments, \$1,063,910.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

For "Salaries, Office of Secretary of Agriculture, 1942," \$4,555.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Office of Solicitor, Department of Agriculture, 1942," \$22,860.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Office of Information, Department of Agriculture, 1942," \$2,620.
 For "Salaries and expenses, library, Department of Agriculture, 1942," \$215.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Office of Experiment Stations, 1942," \$2,684.
 For "Special research fund, Department of Agriculture, 1942," \$6,300.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Extension Service, 1942," \$7,925.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 1942," \$29,610.

For "Salaries and expenses, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, 1942," \$2,125.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, 1942," \$117,935.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Dairy Industry, 1942," \$7,172.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Plant Industry, 1942," \$35,426.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Forest Service, 1942," \$161,221.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering, 1942," \$9,533.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, 1942," \$49,667.
 For "White Pine blister-rust control, Department of Agriculture, 1942," \$7,560.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Marketing Service, 1942," \$47,388.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Home Economics, 1942," \$3,485.
 For "Enforcement of the Commodity Exchange Act, 1942," \$6,765.
 For "Beltsville Research Center, Department of Agriculture, 1942," \$1,245.
 In all, Department of Agriculture, \$526,291.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

For "Salaries, Office of Secretary of Commerce, 1942," \$905.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, 1942," \$3,230.
 For "Field Office Service, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, 1942," \$2,395.
 For "Customs statistics, Department of Commerce, 1942," \$635.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Social Security Act, Bureau of the Census, 1942," \$360.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, 1942," \$42,825.
 For "Operation and administration, National Bureau of Standards, 1942," \$2,225.
 For "Testing, Inspection, and Information Service, National Bureau of Standards, 1942," \$8,195.
 For "Research and development, National Bureau of Standards, 1942," \$8,945.
 For "Standards for commerce, National Bureau of Standards, 1942," \$1,166.
 For "Magnetic and seismological work, Coast and Geodetic Survey, 1942," \$295.
 For "Salaries, Coast and Geodetic Survey, 1942," \$10,910.
 For "Salaries, Patent Office, 1942," \$30,565.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, 1942," \$45,280.
 For "Maintenance and operation, Washington National Airport, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, 1942," \$3,645.
 In all, Department of Commerce, \$161,576.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

For "Salaries, Office of Secretary of the Interior, 1942," \$5,000.
 For "Salaries, Office of Solicitor, Department of the Interior, 1942," \$4,797.
 For "Salaries, Division of Territories and Island Possessions, Department of the Interior, 1942," \$1,325.
 For "Expenses, Commission of Fine Arts, 1942," \$45.
 For "United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, Department of the Interior, 1942," \$1,425.
 For "Salaries, General Land Office, 1942," \$14,000.
 For "Salaries and expenses of Land Offices, 1942," \$1,000.
 For "Prevention of fires on public domain in Alaska, 1942," \$300.
 For "Salaries, Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1942," \$5,000.
 For "Expenses of organizing Indian corporations, etc., 1942," \$650.
 For "Administration of Indian forests, 1942," \$4,710.
 For "Expenses, Sale of timber (reimbursable), 1942," \$1,790.

For "Obtaining employment for Indians, 1942," \$500.
 For "Agriculture and stock raising among Indians, 1942," \$7,000.
 For "Indian school support, 1942," \$26,525.
 For "Indian boarding schools, 1942," \$15,355.
 For "Indian schools, Five Civilized Tribes, 1942," \$1,335.
 For "Education of natives of Alaska, 1941-43," \$3,980.
 For "Conservation of health among Indians, 1942," \$23,705.
 For "Administration of Indian property, 1942," \$25,000.
 For "Construction, etc., buildings and utilities, Indian Service," \$1,455.
 For "Geological Survey, 1942," \$23,980.
 For "Salaries and expenses, National Capital Parks, 1942," \$3,000.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1942," \$9,915.
 For "Contingent expenses, Territory of Alaska, 1942," \$165.
 For "Wagon roads, bridges, and trails, Alaska (receipt limitation), 1942," \$1,000.
 For "Salaries and expenses, government of the Virgin Islands, 1942," \$1,000.
 In all, Department of the Interior, \$183,957.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

For "Salaries, Administrative Division, Department of Justice, 1942," \$7,000.
 For "Salaries, Tax Division, Department of Justice, 1942," \$6,000.
 For "Salaries, Claims Division, Department of Justice, 1942," \$3,500.
 For "Salaries, Bureau of Prisons, 1942," \$2,500.
 For "Protecting interests of the United States in customs matters, 1942," \$1,300.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Bond and Spirits Division, Department of Justice, 1942," \$1,700.
 For "Examination of judicial offices, 1942," \$600.
 For "Salaries and expenses, veterans' insurance litigation, Department of Justice, 1942," \$5,000.
 For "Salaries and expenses of District Attorneys, etc., Department of Justice, 1942," \$24,000.
 For "Penitentiaries and Reformatories, Maintenance, 1942," \$26,800.
 For "Medical center for Federal prisoners, maintenance, 1942," \$2,300.
 For "Federal jails and correctional institutions, maintenance, 1942," \$13,900.
 For "Prison camps, maintenance, 1942," \$1,800.
 For "Medical and hospital service, penal institutions, 1942," \$4,200.
 In all, Department of Justice, \$100,600.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

For "Salaries and expenses, Division of Public Contracts, Department of Labor, 1942," \$3,195.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1942," \$3,590.
 For "Occupational outlook survey, Bureau of Labor Statistics (national defense), 1942," \$1,480.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau, 1942," \$3,825.
 For "Salaries and expenses, child-labor provisions, Fair Labor Standards Act, Children's Bureau, 1942," \$2,723.
 For "Salaries and expenses, maternal and child welfare, Social Security Act, Children's Bureau, 1942," \$6,332.
 For "Salaries and expenses, Women's Bureau, 1942," \$895.
 In all, Department of Labor, \$22,040.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the postal revenues)

For "Salaries, Office of Postmaster General, 1942," \$1,585.
 For "Salaries, Office of First Assistant Postmaster General, 1942," \$6,565.

For "Salaries, Office of Second Assistant Postmaster General, 1942," \$6,100.

For "Salaries, Office of Third Assistant Postmaster General, 1942," \$10,905.

For "Salaries, Office of Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, 1942," \$3,730.

For "Salaries, Office of Purchasing Agent, 1942," \$395.

For "Salaries, Bureau of Accounts, 1942," \$1,590.

For "Post office inspectors, salaries, 1942," \$20,050.

For "Railroad Transportation and Mail Messenger Service, 1942," \$585.

For "Railway Mail Service, salaries, 1942," \$17,450.

For "Operating force for public buildings, Post Office Department, 1942," \$211,730.

In all, Post Office Department, \$280,685.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

For "Salaries, Department of State, 1942," \$30,320.

For "Passport agencies, Department of State, 1942," \$1,245.

For "International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada and Alaska and Canada, 1942," \$577.

For "Salaries and expenses, International Joint Commission, United States and Great Britain, 1942," \$400.

In all, Department of State, \$32,542.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

For "Salaries and expenses, Foreign Exchange Control, 1942," \$3,075.

For "Salaries, Division of Research and Statistics, Treasury Department, 1942," \$2,045.

For "Salaries, Division of Personnel, Treasury Department, 1942," \$1,070.

For "Salaries, Office of Chief Clerk, Treasury Department, 1942," \$2,600.

For "Salaries, operating force, Treasury Department Buildings, 1942," \$6,600.

For "Salaries, Division of Printing, Treasury Department, 1942," \$1,755.

For "Salaries, Bureau of Accounts, Treasury Department, 1942," \$4,850.

For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Public Debt, 1942," \$21,365.

For "Salaries, Office of Treasurer of United States, 1942," \$16,835.

For "Collecting the revenue from customs, 1942," \$250,855.

For "Salaries, Office of Comptroller of the Currency, 1942," \$2,220.

For "Collecting the internal revenue, 1942," \$377,975.

For "Salaries and expenses, Processing Tax Board of Review, 1942," \$840.

For "Salaries, Secret Service Division, 1942," \$405.

For "Salaries, Office of Director of the Mint, 1942," \$1,480.

For "Salaries and expenses, Mints and Assay Offices, 1942," \$4,855.

In all, Treasury Department, \$698,825.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For "Executive Office, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$955.

For "Purchasing Division, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$1,140.

For "Department of Inspections, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$5,435.

For "Poundmaster, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$225.

For "District Buildings, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$2,455.

For "Assessor, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$5,595.

For "Collector, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$700.

For "Auditor, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$1,930.

For "Alcoholic Beverage Control Board, District of Columbia, 1942," \$40.

For "Chief Clerk, Engineer Department, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$555.

For "Municipal Architect, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$950.

LXXXVII—599

For "Department of Insurance, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$520.

For "Surveyor, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$375.

For "Commission on Mental Health, District of Columbia, 1942," \$188.

For "Board of Indeterminate Sentence and Parole, District of Columbia, 1942," \$315.

For "Administrative expenses, compensation to injured employees in the District of Columbia, 1942," \$1,005.

For "Register of Wills, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$1,513.

For "Recorder of Deeds, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$1,466.

For "Motor vehicles, District of Columbia, 1942," \$95.

For "Free Public Library, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$6,560.

For "Collection and disposal of refuse, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$1,315.

For "Public schools, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$23,760.

For "Metropolitan Police, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$2,995.

For "Fire Department, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$45.

For "Health Department, general administration, District of Columbia, 1942," \$1,302.

For "Health Department, medical services, District of Columbia, 1942," \$5,650.

For "Health Department, laboratories, District of Columbia, 1942," \$650.

For "Health Department, inspections, District of Columbia, 1942," \$2,465.

For "Tuberculosis, Sanatoria, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$10,163.

For "Gallinger Municipal Hospital, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$3,105.

For "Juvenile court, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$1,390.

For "Municipal court, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$1,005.

For "Division of Child Welfare, detention of children, District of Columbia, 1942," \$345.

For "Workhouse and reformatory, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$10,403.

For "District Training School, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$2,920.

For "Industrial Home School for Colored Children, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$810.

For "Municipal Lodging House, District of Columbia, 1942," \$135.

For "Temporary Home for Former Soldiers and Sailors, District of Columbia, 1942," \$135.

For "Transportation of indigent nonresident persons, District of Columbia, 1942," \$165.

For "Militia, District of Columbia, 1942," \$525.

For "Public parks, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," \$7,355.

In all, District of Columbia, exclusive of highway and water funds, \$108,755.

Highway fund, gasoline tax and motor-vehicle fees: For "Department of Vehicles and Traffic, salaries, highway fund, District of Columbia, 1942," \$2,535; and for "Trees and parkings, salaries, highway fund, District of Columbia, 1942," \$540; in all, \$3,075, to be paid wholly out of the special fund created by the act entitled "An act to provide a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924 (43 Stat. 106), and the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937.

Water service: For "Washington Aqueduct, District of Columbia, 1942," \$4,185, to be paid wholly out of the revenues of the Water Department of the District of Columbia.

The foregoing sums for the District of Columbia, unless otherwise specifically provided, shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and the Treasury of the United States in the manner prescribed by the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942.

In all, District of Columbia, including highway and water funds, \$116,015.

In all, title V, \$3,236,327.

The restrictions contained in appropriations or affecting appropriations or other funds available during the fiscal year 1942 limiting the amounts which may be expended for personal services or for other purposes are hereby waived to the extent necessary to meet the increases in compensation under said act of August 1, 1941, and said Executive Orders No. 8842 and No. 8882: *Provided*, That all appropriations and funds, including the appropriations herein made, available during the fiscal year 1942 for the payment of salaries of civilian officers and employees who are subject to the provisions of said act of August 1, 1941, and said Executive Orders No. 8842 and No. 8882, shall be available from and including October 1, 1941, for the payment of within-grade salary advancements as of October 1, 1941, or any subsequent date on which such officers and employees became, or will become, eligible for such advancements in accordance with said act and Executive orders: *Provided further*, That the head of any department, establishment, or agency is hereby authorized to allocate from the sum herein appropriated under any appropriation title administered by him to any subappropriation included under such title such amount as he may determine to be necessary to meet expenditures for within-grade salary advancements in accordance with the provisions of said act or Executive orders.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The first section of title VI carries a provision for restoring Mr. David Lasser, one-time president of the Workers Alliance, to the good grace of this great Government, so that he might come back on the pay roll. When I first read the provision I thought of that old song, Will You Love Me in December As You Did in May? Of course, that is a little short of the distance—by 1 month—but I am wondering whether or not this Congress, after it removed David Lasser from the pay roll in June, proposes to restore him in December. He appeared before the committee and made a case, after a fashion. Representative FLANNAGAN appeared in his behalf and Representative VOORHIS, of California, sent a memorandum to the committee in his behalf. Mr. Millard W. Rice, a representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, appeared in his behalf. It should be stated, however, that Mr. Rice appeared as an individual and not as a representative of the V. F. W. or the D. A. V. He frankly informed the committee that he did not recall the number of the chapter of the D. A. V. to which Mr. Lasser belonged; that he knew little about Mr. Lasser; that he had no regular contact with him; and that for the most part his information was obtained around a lunch table in the Senate restaurant.

Mr. Lasser in his statement to the committee indicated that he had spent several months contacting Members of Congress after his separation from the Federal service, in which he was holding a position in the W. P. A. at a salary of \$4,400 per year. It is, however, singular to me that, since I was an author of the amendment whereby Mr. Lasser was separated from the Federal roll, that he at no time contacted me or called my office.

Now, let us turn to the basic case against Mr. Lasser. I admitted in June that it was rare procedure to remove an

individual from the Federal rolls by an amendment to an appropriation bill. It is so obvious, however, that it becomes quite impossible to remove undesirable people from the Federal service by any other method.

It is here proposed to restore Mr. Lasser to the rolls by a legislative provision in an appropriation bill. It is clearly subject to a point of order. I, however, do not propose to make that point of order. I prefer to let this matter be disposed on its merits and I am only too glad to see it resubmitted to the Whole Committee with such action as the Committee cares to take.

Let me remind you that Mr. Lasser appeared before the W. P. A. investigating committee of the Appropriations Committee in April 1939. His testimony and that of the secretary-treasurer, Mr. Herbert Benjamin, covers 150 pages of the hearings.

On page 42 Mr. Lasser freely admits that he attended the twentieth anniversary celebration of the Soviet revolution in Russia. Why was he there? On April 13, 1937, he issued a release as president of the Workers Alliance characterizing those Members of the Congress who brought about a \$50,000,000 cut in W. P. A. appropriations as resorting to "misrepresentation, outright lies, tricks, bluffs, and tricks."

He was associated with Mr. Benjamin, the secretary-treasurer, from 1936 to 1939, and this is the same Mr. Benjamin who, on page 135 of the hearings, testified:

I would say in connection with all this that my membership in the Communist Party is, of course, no state secret.

Is it not strange that while Mr. Lasser has disavowed any connection with the Communist Party, that in April 1937 he contributed a signed article to the Daily Worker over his own signature and begged for contributions to the cause of his alliance. I exhibit here to you copies of the Daily Worker of April 1937 which came from the files of the investigating committee. If Mr. Lasser was so intent on ridding the Workers Alliance of Communists, why was he using the official organ of the Communist Party in an appeal for funds?

Now consider Mr. Lasser's answer to the question from Mr. O'NEAL as recorded on page 178. Mr. O'NEAL asked, "Do you consider the Communist Party a subversive organization?" Mr. Lasser's answer was, "My impression from reading the material that Mr. Benjamin has furnished is that it is not."

If Mr. Lasser entertains this idea about the Communist philosophy, the Congress has, indeed, been wasting precious funds and much time to seek out the Communists in the country and separate them from the rolls of the Federal Government. If Mr. Lasser entertained such a view, then certainly there is double reason why he should be prevented from reentering the service of the Government.

On pages 65 and 66 of the hearings the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] made repeated efforts to se-

cure an answer to the question as to whether or not Mr. Lasser was a Communist. He objected to this question. He said, in fact:

I am here before this committee in a purely official capacity as president of the Workers Alliance of America. I would like to state that I believe the question is not a pertinent one. I have nothing to hide of my political beliefs, but I believe my personal political beliefs are not germane to the question here at issue any more than my religious beliefs.

In answer to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], Mr. Lasser said:

I am not prepared, nor do I believe this is the time and the place nor the committee, to determine the relative merits of communism or say whether it is or is not pertinent to the administration of the Government.

After this sidestepping, Mr. Lasser finally stated that he was not a Communist. But how can one reconcile that denial with his refusal to return a forthright answer with his observation that from the material which he examined communism was not subversive, with his signed contribution to the official organ of the Communist Party, and with such other evidence as appears in the investigation hearings?

Are we now to go soft and restore Mr. Lasser in December after removing him in June? The time has arrived to become earnest and determined and to remain earnest and determined in dealing with communism if we are to do a job.

Finally, let me make this observation while it is fresh in my mind. Only yesterday and today a subcommittee of one of the committees of this House of which I am a member has been taking testimony from one of the large agencies of Government, and from the Administrator of that agency who has \$100,000,000 per year to spend. When the chairman of the subcommittee asked the Administrator point blank whether he would remove a Communist from the pay roll, his answer was, "I would have to take that under consideration. After all, Mr. Chairman, Russians are dying on the battlefields today." The chairman of that subcommittee expressed his amazement at the reply. I, too, was amazed, and I am frankly concerned when the administrator of a Government agency frankly states to five Members of Congress that he would have to take under consideration the removal of a Communist from the Federal pay roll. We have moved far on the pathway of self-destruction when the matter of separating Communists from the Federal rolls must be taken under advisement.

That same Administrator was not familiar with the prohibition on Communists and bundists in the appropriation under which he operates until he was refreshed when the chairman of the subcommittee read to him the pertinent provision in the Departmental Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1942.

Is it not time that we become rather steadfast and deal earnestly with this moving problem before it engulfs the Government?

Let me repeat what I stated before, I shall make no point of order against the provision which would restore Mr. Lasser to the Federal rolls. I am willing to see

the merits of the matter tested in this body this afternoon.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. The second proviso of section 1 (a) of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1942, which reads: "Provided further, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of David Lasser," is hereby repealed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that the paragraph is legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and have them appear at the point where we discussed the item relative to highway appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. 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 the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAMSPECK, 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. 6159) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Kansas.

The Clerk read as follows.

Mr. LAMBERTSON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to strike out all of title III.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DWORSHAK) there were—ayes 31 and noes 97.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 56, nays 252, not voting 122, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

YEAS—56

Andersen, H. Carl	Heldinger, Hill, Wash.	Reed, N. Y.
Andersen, August H.	Howell	Rich
Arends	Hull	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bradley, Mich.	Johnson, Ill.	Robison, Ky.
Burdick	Jones	Shanley
Butler	Jonkman	Smith, Ohio
Chipperfield	Knutson	Smith, Wis.
Clevenger	Lambertson	Stratton
Coffee, Nebr.	Landis	Sumner, Ill.
Crawford	Mason	Tinkham
Crowther	Moser	Vors, Ohio.
Curtis	Murray	Wheat
Day	O'Connor	Wilson
Dewey	O'Hara	Winter
Dworshak	Oliver	Wolcott
Engel	Paddock	Woodruff, Mich.
Grant, Ind.	Ploeser	Youngdahl
Hall	Rankin, Mont.	
Edwin Arthur Reed, Ill.		

NAYS—252

Allen, La.	Crosser	Gilchrist
Anderson, Calif.	Culkin	Gillette
Angell	Cullen	Gillie
Arnold	Cunningham	Gossett
Barden	D'Alesandro	Graham
Barnes	Davis, Ohio	Granger
Barry	Davis, Tenn.	Grant, Ala.
Bates, Ky.	Delaney	Guyer
Bates, Mass.	Dickstein	Gwynne
Baumhart	Dingell	Hall
Beam	Dirksen	Leonard W.
Beckworth	Disney	Hancock
Beiter	Ditter	Hare
Bender	Domengeaux	Harness
Blackney	Dondero	Harrington
Bland	Doughton	Harris, Ark.
Bloom	Downs	Harris, Va.
Boggs	Duncan	Hart
Bolton	Durham	Harter
Boykin	Eaton	Healey
Brooks	Eberharter	Hébert
Brown, Ga.	Edmiston	Hendricks
Brown, Ohio	Elliott, Calif.	Hess
Bryson	Ellis	Hobbs
Burgin	Elston	Hoffman
Camp	Englebright	Holmes
Canfield	Faddis	Hook
Cannon, Mo.	Fellows	Houston
Carlson	Fish	Hunter
Carter	Fitzgerald	Imhoff
Cartwright	Fitzpatrick	Izac
Case, S. Dak.	Flaherty	Jackson
Clason	Fogarty	Jacobson
Claypool	Folger	Jarman
Cochran	Forand	Jarrett
Coffee, Wash.	Ford, Thomas F.	Jenkins, Ohio
Cole, Md.	Fulmer	Jenks, N. H.
Collins	Gamble	Jennings
Colmer	Gathings	Jensen
Cooley	Gavagan	Johnson
Cooper	Gearhart	Luther A.
Copeland	Gehrmann	Johnson
Courtney	Gerlach	Lyndon B.
Cravens	Gibson	Johnson, Okla.
Creal	Gifford	Johnson, W. Va.

Kean	Myers, Pa.	Sheppard
Keefe	Nelson	Sheridan
Kelley, Pa.	Norrell	Sikes
Kelly, Ill.	O'Brien, Mich.	Simpson
Kennedy	O'Brien, N. Y.	Smith, Pa.
Martin J. Kennedy	O'Toole	Smith, Wash.
Kennedy, Michael J.	Pace	South
Keogh	Patman	Sparkman
Kerr	Patrick	Spence
Kilday	Peterson, Fla.	Springer
Kinzer	Peterson, Ga.	Starnes, Ala.
Kirwan	Pheiffer	Stearns, N. H.
Kocalkowski	William T.	Stefan
Kramer	Pierce	Sullivan
Lanham	Pittenger	Taber
Larrabee	Plauché	Talle
Leavy	Poage	Tarver
LeCompte	Powers	Tenerowicz
Lesinski	Priest	Terry
Lynch	Rabaut	Thom
McCormack	Ramsay	Thomas, N. J.
McGehee	Ramspeck	Thomas, Tex.
McGregor	Randolph	Traynor
McKeough	Rankin, Miss.	Van Zandt
McLaughlin	Reece, Tenn.	Vinson, Ga.
McLean	Rees, Kans.	Wadsworth
McMillan	Rivers	Walter
MacIora	Robertson, Va.	Ward
Mahon	Rockefeller	Wasielewski
Manasco	Rodgers, Pa.	Weaver
Marcantonio	Rogers, Mass.	Weiss
Martin, Iowa	Russell	West
May	Sabath	Whitten
Merritt	Sanders	Whittington
Meyer, Md.	Sauthoff	Wickersham
Michener	Scanlon	Wigglesworth
Mills, Ark.	Schultz	Wolfenden, Pa.
Monroney	Schulte	Wolverton, N. J.
Mott	Scott	Worley
Mundt	Secrest	Wright
	Shafer, Mich.	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—122

Allen, Ill.	Gregory	Richards
Anderson, N. Mex.	Haines	Rizley
Andrews	Halleck	Robinson, Utah
Baldwin	Hartley	Rogers, Okla.
Bell	Heffernan	Rolph
Bennett	Hill, Colo.	Romjue
Bishop	Hinsaw	Sacks
Boehne	Holbrook	Sasser
Boland	Hope	Satterfield
Bonner	Johnson, Calif.	Schaefer, Ill.
Boren	Johnson, Ind.	Shannon
Bradley, Pa.	Kee	Short
Buck	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Buckler, Minn.	Kilburn	Smith, Va.
Buckley, N. Y.	Kieberg	Smith, W. Va.
Bulwinkle	Klein	Snyder
Burch	Kopplemann	Somers, N. Y.
Byrne	Kunkel	Steagall
Byron	Lea	Stevenson
Cannon, Fla.	Lewis	Sumners, Tex.
Capozzoli	Ludlow	Sutphin
Casey, Mass.	McArdle	Sweeney
Celler	McGranery	Thill
Chapman	McIntyre	Thomason
Chenoweth	Maas	Tibbott
Clark	Maciejewski	Tolan
Cluett	Magnuson	Treadway
Cole, N. Y.	Mansfield	Vincent, Ky.
Costello	Martin, Mass.	Voorhis, Calif.
Cox	Mills, La.	Vreeland
Dies	Mitchell	Welch
Douglas	Murdock	White
Drewry	Nichols	Williams
Elliott, Mass.	Norton	Woodrum, Va.
Fenton	O'Day	Young
Flannagan	O'Leary	
Flannery	O'Neal	
Ford, Leland M.	Osmer	
Ford, Miss.	Patton	
Gale	Pearson	
Gore	Pfeifer	
Green	Joseph L. Plumley	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Bennett for, with Mr. Woodrum of Virginia against.

Mr. Short for, with Mrs. Smith of Maine against.

General pairs:

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Boland with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Gore with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Kunkel.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Osmer.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Cox with Mr. Leland M. Ford.

Mr. Burch with Mr. Thill.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Johnson of California.

Mr. Flannery with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Whelchel with Mr. Hope.

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.

Mr. Gregory with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Chenoweth.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Kee with Mr. Gale.

Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Rizley.

Mr. Pearson with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Tibbott.

Mr. Ludlow with Mr. Rolph.

Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Bishop.

Mr. Steagall with Mr. Cluett.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Hill of Colorado.

Mr. Lewis with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Thomason with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Mills of Louisiana with Mr. Buckley of Minnesota.

Mr. Casey of Massachusetts with Mr. Costello.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Haines.

Mr. Boehne with Mr. O'Leary.

Mr. Romjue with Mr. Capozzoli.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Young.

Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Patton.

Mr. Klein with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Green with Mr. O'Day.

Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Mr. Maciejewski.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Celler.

Mr. Sasser with Mr. Anderson of New Mexico.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Nichols.

Mr. Chapman with Mr. Scrugham.

Mr. Wene with Mr. Cannon of Florida.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Robinson of Utah.

Mr. Buck with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.

Mr. Snyder with Mr. Lea.

Mr. Boren with Mr. Sutphin.

Mr. McArdle with Mr. Buckley of New York.

Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Kopplemann.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The doors were opened.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 310, nays 5, not voting 115, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—310

Allen, La.	Beiter	Camp
Andersen	Bender	Canfield
H. Carl	Blackney	Cannon, Mo.
Anderson, Calif.	Bland	Carlson
Andresen	Bloom	Carter
August H.	Boggs	Cartwright
Angell	Bolton	Case, S. Dak.
Arends	Boykin	Chipperfield
Arnold	Bradley, Mich.	Clason
Barden	Brooks	Claypool
Barnes	Brown, Ga.	Clevenger
Barry	Brown, Ohio	Cochran
Bates, Ky.	Bryson	Coffee, Nebr.
Bates, Mass.	Bulwinkle	Coffee, Wash.
Baumhart	Burdick	Cole, Md.
Beam	Burgin	Collins
Beckworth	Butler	Colmer

Cooley	Hook	Pheiffer,
Cooper	Hope	William T.
Copeland	Houston	Pierce
Courtney	Howell	Pittenger
Cox	Hull	Plauché
Cravens	Hunter	Ploeser
Creal	Imhoff	Poage
Crosser	Izac	Powers
Crowther	Jackson	Priest
Culkin	Jacobsen	Rabaut
Cullen	Jenkins, Ohio	Ramsay
Cunningham	Jenks, N. H.	Ramspeck
Curtis	Jennings	Randolph
D'Alesandro	Jensen	Rankin, Miss.
Davis, Ohio	Johns	Rankin, Mont.
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Ill.	Reece, Tenn.
Day	Johnson,	Reed, Ill.
Delaney	Luther A.	Reed, N. Y.
Dewey	Johnson,	Rees, Kans.
Dickstein	Lyndon B.	Rivers
Dingell	Johnson, Okla.	Robertson,
Dirksen	Johnson, W. Va.	N. Dak.
Disney	Jones	Robertson, Va.
Ditter	Jonkman	Robson, Ky.
Domengeaux	Kean	Rockefeller
Dondero	Keefe	Rodgers, Pa.
Doughton	Kefauver	Rogers, Mass.
Downs	Kelley, Pa.	Russell
Duncan	Kelly, Ill.	Sabath
Durham	Kennedy	Sanders
Dworschak	Martin J.	Sauthoff
Eaton	Kennedy,	Scanlon
Eberharter	Michael J.	Schaefer, Ill.
Edmiston	Keogh	Schuetz
Elliott, Calif.	Kerr	Schulte
Ellis	Kilday	Scott
Elston	Kinzer	Secrest
Engel	Kirwan	Shafer, Mich.
Engelbright	Knutson	Sheppard
Faddis	Kocialkowski	Sheridan
Fellows	Kramer	Sikes
Fish	Landis	Simpson
Fitzgerald	Lanham	Smith, Ohio
Fitzpatrick	Larabee	Smith, Pa.
Flaherty	Leavy	Smith, Wash.
Flannagan	LeCompte	Smith, Wis.
Fogarty	Lesinski	South
Folger	Ludlow	Sparkman
Forand	Lynch	Spence
Ford, Miss.	McCormack	Springer
Ford, Thomas F.	McGehee	Starnes, Ala.
Fulmer	McGregor	Stearns, N. H.
Gamble	McKeough	Stefan
Gathings	McLaughlin	Stratton
Gavagan	McLean	Sullivan
Gearhart	McMillan	Taber
Gehrmann	Maciora	Talle
Gerlach	Mahon	Tarver
Gibson	Manasco	Tenerowicz
Gillette	Marcantonio	Terry
Gilchrist	Martin, Iowa	Thom
Gillie	Mason	Thomas, N. J.
Gossett	May	Thomas, Tex.
Graham	Merritt	Tinkham
Granger	Meyer, Md.	Traynor
Grant, Ala.	Michener	Van Zandt
Grant, Ind.	Mills, Ark.	Vinson, Ga.
Gregory	Monroney	Vorys, Ohio
Guyer	Moser	Wadsworth
Gwynne	Mott	Walter
Hall	Mundt	Ward
Edwin Arthur	Murray	Wastelowski
Hall	Myers, Pa.	Weaver
Leonard W.	Nelson	West
Hancock	Norrell	Wheat
Hare	O'Brien, Mich.	Whitten
Harness	O'Brien, N. Y.	Whittington
Harrington	O'Connor	Wickersham
Harris, Ark.	O'Hara	Wigglesworth
Harris, Va.	Oliver	Wilson
Hart	O'Neal	Winter
Harter	O'Toole	Wolcott
Hartley	Pace	Wolfenden, Pa.
Healey	Paddock	Wolverton, N. J.
Hébert	Patman	Woodrum, Va.
Heldinger	Patrick	Worley
Hendricks	Peterson, Fla.	Wright
Hess	Peterson, Ga.	Youngdahl
Hill, Wash.	Pfeifer,	Zimmerman
Hobbs	Joseph L.	
Holmes		

NAYS—5

Crawford	Rich	Sumner, Ill.
Lambertson	Shanley	

NOT VOTING—115

Allen, Ill.	Boland	Byron
Anderson,	Bonner	Cannon, Fla.
N. Mex.	Boren	Capozzoli
Andrews	Bradley, Pa.	Casey, Mass.
Baldwin	Buck	Celler
Bell	Buckler, Minn.	Chapman
Bennett	Buckley, N. Y.	Chenoweth
Bishop	Burch	Clark
Boehne	Byrne	Cluett

Cole, N. Y.	Lea	Scrugham
Costello	Lewis	Shannon
Dies	McArdle	Short
Douglas	McGranery	Smith, Maine
Drewry	McIntyre	Smith, Va.
Elliott, Mass.	Maas	Smith, W. Va.
Fenton	Maciejewski	Snyder
Flannery	Magnuson	Somers, N. Y.
Ford, Leland M.	Mansfield	Steagall
Gale	Martin, Mass.	Stevenson
Gifford	Mills, La.	Summers, Tex.
Gore	Mitchell	Sutphin
Green	Murdock	Sweeney
Haines	Nichols	Thill
Halleck	Norton	Thomason
Heffernan	O'Day	Tibbott
Hill, Colo.	O'Leary	Tolan
Hinshaw	Osmer	Treadway
Hoffman	Patton	Vincent, Ky.
Holbrook	Pearson	Voorhis, Calif.
Jarman	Plumley	Vreeland
Jarrett	Richards	Weiss
Johnson, Calif.	Rizley	Welch
Johnson, Ind.	Robinson, Utah	Wene
Kee	Rogers, Okla.	Welchel
Kilburn	Rolph	White
Kleberg	Romjue	Williams
Klein	Sacks	Woodruff, Mich.
Kopplemann	Sasser	Young
Kunkel	Satterfield	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Short.
 Mr. Boehne with Mrs. Smith of Maine.
 Mr. Costello with Mr. Bennett.
 Mr. McArdle with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.
 Mr. Green with Mr. Gifford.
 Mr. Bonner with Mr. Halleck.
 Mr. Boland with Mr. Treadway.
 Mr. Gore with Mr. Fenton.
 Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Douglas.
 Mr. Drewry with Mr. Kunkel.
 Mr. Richards with Mr. Osmer.
 Mr. Patton with Mr. Kilburn.
 Mr. Romjue with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
 Mr. Burch with Mr. Thill.
 Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Plumley.
 Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Johnson of California.
 Mr. Flannery with Mr. Stevenson.
 Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
 Mr. Nichols with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
 Mr. Welch with Mr. Maas.
 Mr. Murdock with Mr. Chenoweth.
 Mr. Casey of Massachusetts with Mr. Andrews.
 Mr. Kee with Mr. Gale.
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Baldwin.
 Mr. Dies with Mr. Rizley.
 Mr. Pearson with Mr. Cole of New York.
 Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Tibbott.
 Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Rolph.
 Mr. Lea with Mr. Bishop.
 Mr. Steagall with Mr. Cluett.
 Mrs. Norton with Mr. Hill of Colorado.
 Mr. Lewis with Mr. Vreeland.
 Mr. Summers of Texas with Mr. Hinshaw.
 Mr. Thomason with Mr. Welch.
 Mr. Mills of Louisiana with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
 Mr. Chapman with Mr. Hoffman.
 Mr. Byrne with Mr. Jarrett.
 Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Mrs. O'Day.
 Mr. Williams with Mr. Capozzoli.
 Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Young.
 Mr. Wene with Mr. Haines.
 Mr. Boren with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Anderson of New Mexico with Mr. Sasser.
 Mr. Snyder with Mr. Maciejewski.
 Mr. Weiss with Mr. Buckley of New York.
 Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Heffernan.
 Mr. Kopplemann with Mr. Tolan.
 Mr. Sutphin with Mr. O'Leary.
 Mr. Klein with Mr. Sweeney.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE AUTHORIZED TO CORRECT SECTION NUMBERS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk of the House may be authorized to correct the section numbers in the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill just passed may be permitted to extend their remarks in 5 legislative days.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN] to say that they are unavoidably absent from the House. If they had been present, they would have voted against the motion to recommit and in favor of the passage of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I much regret that I have to make a point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I asked unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I must call the attention of my friend from New York to the rule that it is not in order to announce how absent Members would have voted if present.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I want to be heard on that. It is not in order under the rules excepting where a Member gets 1 minute to address the House. Under those conditions he may say anything he wants to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Not even by that subterfuge. It has been held by Speakers of the House repeatedly that the procedure of the House does not permit it. It is a very bad practice, and we do not want it to get started. I much regret to have to raise the question of order.

Mr. MICHENER. I agree with the gentleman as to the correctness of his theory; but, as I understand it, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] asked unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute. He was given the unanimous consent of the House to proceed for 1 minute; therefore he is permitted to say anything so long as he uses parliamentary language.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am in warmest sympathy with

the statement of the attitude of the Members to whom the gentleman from New York refers. I wish there were some parliamentary way for this information to be made available to the House at this time. But it is a rule of long standing—and a very salutary one—and we cannot relax it for one and enforce it for others. As a matter of fact, a point of order is not required. It is the duty of the Speaker, and the practice of the Speaker to enforce it just as he would enforce the rule against an explanation of a vote during roll call or any other automatic rule of procedure. These gentlemen have their remedy. They can themselves rise at any session of the House and by securing the floor announce how they would have voted or on what grounds they would have voted or any other matter pertaining to their vote or their failure to vote, without attempting to vote by proxy. Knowing all three of these gentlemen as I do, I am certain they would prefer to observe the rules of the House rather than to violate the rules of the House even for this questionable advantage.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. Even though the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] had unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, when he began making the explanation he did, the Chair must sustain the point of order under all precedents.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The Speaker laid before the House the following communication which was read:

DECEMBER 5, 1941.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, United States House of
Representatives, Washington, D. C.
DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my
resignation as a member of the House Com-
mittee on War Claims, same to take effect
immediately.

Very respectfully,

MARTIN F. SMITH.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 379), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That MARTIN F. SMITH of Washington be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on World War Veterans' Legislation.

The resolution was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 380) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That ALFRED L. BULWINKLE, of North Carolina, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Printing.

The resolution was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY OF ANANTA KHITTASANGKA, A CITIZEN OF THAILAND

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 251, authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy, at West Point, Ananta Khittasangka, a citizen of Thailand.

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

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the same matter that was up before the House this morning?

Mr. HARTER. So I understand.

Mr. MICHENER. And it was withdrawn at the suggestion of the Speaker. Will the gentleman tell the House what has transpired since the time it was withdrawn this morning by the chairman of the committee at the suggestion of the Speaker and the present hour?

Mr. HARTER. I am unable to answer that question. I only know that this resolution and the passage of it is greatly desired by the Secretary of State. This young man is the son of the present Prime Minister of Thailand and will be in the Military Academy without expense to our Government. The State Department wishes this passed.

Mr. MICHENER. It is a good-neighbor gesture?

Mr. HARTER. That is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think I might contribute something in reply to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] talked to me an hour or so ago and told me that the matter would be brought up later in the day. At that time he told me he had consulted the Members on the minority side and thought that everything was all right. As I recall, rather than take up unnecessary time when the unanimous-consent request was submitted earlier in the afternoon, the Speaker requested that it be withdrawn. The gentleman from Kentucky told me that the gentleman from Ohio was going to submit the unanimous-consent request later and he thought that everything was all right. The impression I had was that he had conferred with the Republican Members who had manifested an interest when the matter came up earlier in the day.

Mr. MICHENER. As I recall, the matter was called up unexpectedly earlier this afternoon. No one on this side knew anything about it until the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] came in after it had been called up and said that it was all right.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want it understood that I insist that when a similar unanimous-consent request is submitted it be agreeable to the Republican members of the committee that the request be submitted, and that the leadership on the Republican side be consulted. I am very sorry that the leadership present today was not consulted. I assumed the leadership had been consulted.

Mr. MICHENER. We do not know anything about the bill, and it is now 6 o'clock and there is no one here. To call up by unanimous consent under such circumstances a matter about which the House has no information and which the House had no notion was going to be called up is just not good practice, unless it is an emergency matter which requires such treatment.

Mr. HARTER. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that this matter was considered by the House Committee on Military Affairs and practically all the members were present, including the Republican members. The matter was thoroughly discussed and gone over, and the resolution was unanimously voted out by the full committee.

Mr. MICHENER. Personally, I shall not object, but I do hope that matters of this type will not be brought up at this hour under like conditions.

Mr. HARTER. I can only confirm what the majority leader has said, that when I was requested to bring it up in the House at this time I was told that the leadership on the gentleman's side of the House had been consulted and that it was agreeable all around.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, may I ask if this is going to be a precedent for the entry into the Military Academy of Chinese and Russians?

Mr. HARTER. I am unable to answer that, but I do not expect that this sets any great precedent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 251), as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to permit Ananta Khittasangka to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy, at West Point: *Provided*, That no expense shall be caused to the United States thereby, and that Ananta Khittasangka shall agree to comply with all regulations for the police and discipline of the academy, to be studious, and to give his utmost efforts to accomplish the courses in the various departments of instruction, and that said Ananta Khittasangka shall not be admitted to the academy until he shall have passed the mental and physical examinations prescribed for candidates from the United States and that he shall be immediately withdrawn if deficient in studies or in conduct and so recommended by the academic board: *Provided further*, That in the case of said Ananta Khittasangka, the provisions of sections 1320 and 1321 of the Revised Statutes shall be suspended, and the provisions of law relating to age limitations upon the admission of candidates to the academy shall not apply.

The joint resolution 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.

EXPLOSIVES

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3019) to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution,

storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes, approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385)" with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SOMERS of New York, PETERSON of Florida, and ENGLEBRIGHT.

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1623) to suspend the export tax and the reduction of the quota prescribed by section 6 of the act of March 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 456), as amended, for a fixed period, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I feel that this bill is of such a character and of such importance that it should not be taken up tonight. I shall have to object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record in connection with the appropriation bill passed today, and to include a letter from Mr. Ezra B. Whitman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from volume 1, No. 1, of the Chicago Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks upon the bill passed this afternoon, and to include two editorials from the Manila Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of a short resolution which I introduced yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include an address delivered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] over the radio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

marks by the inclusion of an editorial on labor bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at the point in the debate this afternoon when the Tennessee Valley Authority item was under consideration, and to include therewith two brief editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE SENATOR SHEPPARD

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, today in the foyer of the Capitol there was unveiled a portrait of a great American, the late Senator Morris Sheppard. The presentation of that portrait to the Government was made by the chairman of the Texas delegation in the House, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN. It was a beautiful and a justly deserved tribute to that great man.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including the address delivered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks made this afternoon and to include a brief statement by the late Senator Adams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks made in the Committee and to include therein a table which I referred to in connection with those remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CLAYPOOL, for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. MILLS of Arkansas, for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. LARRABEE, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. THOMASON of Texas (at the request of Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON), for 1 week, on account of death in the family.

ORDER OF BUSINESS NEXT WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to ask the majority leader a question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Can the majority leader advise the House as to whether or not there has been any change in the program for next week since the last announcement?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; with this exception: I stated yesterday there would be two noncontroversial bills called up on Monday by the Committee on the District of Columbia. I wish to correct that. There may be four or five bills which are noncontroversial. There may be some explanation, but I am informed by the chairman of that committee that they are not controversial.

On Monday the bill (H. R. 6009) to provide pensions at wartime rates for officers and enlisted men of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard disabled in line of duty and as a direct result of armed conflict while engaged in extrahazardous service or while the United States is engaged in war, and for the dependents of those who died for such cause, and for other purposes. That has been reported out unanimously.

Mr. MICHENER. That is the Lesinski bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the Lesinski bill. I told the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] he should take the matter up first with members of his committee on your side and then with the gentleman from Michigan. I do not know whether he has, but I assume he has.

Mr. MICHENER. He has said that he was going to call it up on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I told him that under the circumstances, if agreeable to your side, I would have no objection to the Speaker recognizing him, and that bill may be called up. I understand there is no controversy over it.

Then, of course, the extension of the Soil Conservation Act will come up on Monday. With those two exceptions, there is no change from the announcement that I made yesterday.

Tuesday will be the Private Calendar and Wednesday will be the national defense housing bill.

Mr. MICHENER. The distinguished majority leader made a suggestion during the debate this afternoon that it was hoped to get away from here for some kind of a permanent adjournment the latter part of next week. Does the gentleman still entertain any such anticipation?

Mr. McCORMACK. Sometimes between entertaining and hoping there is a slight difference and sometimes a large difference. I have a very strong hope that we will do it, and I think I speak the sentiments of the Speaker and the leadership on your side. I am confident I do. I think it is only fair and just that it should be done.

I can assure the gentleman from Michigan that everything possible to accomplish that will be done. I do not want to raise any false hopes, but I can give one assurance: That everything possible will be done to try to attain that end.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has the hope but his suspicion is that the

event to which he refers will happen in the week beginning December 15.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is a fair statement, but I can assure the gentleman that I am going to do everything I possibly can to remove the suspicion.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an interesting letter I have received from Secretary Morgenthau relating to the tax on admissions to entertainments held for men in the military and naval service within the limits of training camps or sites. It is a very interesting letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COPPER FOR RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 35 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, at this late hour I hope I can condense my remarks into something less than 35 minutes, and I hope that if the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] is on the floor, he will remain and give me his attention inasmuch as I desire to discuss some of the matters mentioned by the gentleman from Kansas last Monday.

Mr. Speaker, I was reared in the country. Our family enjoyed the same privileges and underwent the same hardships that were experienced by the average American farm family. As I grew to manhood my family moved to town. I was presented with the opportunity to secure a good education and to train myself as a lawyer. For nearly 20 years I have practiced my profession in a city where I enjoy all of the conveniences of modern science, but I have not forgotten the days when I studied my lessons under the flickering light of a kerosene lamp, or the times when I hauled water in a barrel. I know from personal experience just how much lights and electric power mean to the comfort and health, as well as the material prosperity of the average family, and while I am now personally enjoying all modern conveniences, I cannot forget the fact that the great bulk of the farm families of my State are still without the convenience of either electric lights or running water.

However, in recent years these farm people have discerned a ray of light. The Rural Electrification Administration has enabled farmers to borrow money from the Government to build their own systems to bring lights to 58,810 Texas farm homes. In addition to these homes, the private utilities have, during the same period, furnished electricity to 42,000 rural customers, as against a total of 11,500 rural people who were getting electric service prior to the inauguration of the R. E. A. The greatest single step in the extension of electricity to rural people in Texas was made when the Brazos River Conservation and Reclamation District entered into a contract with the Brazos River Electric Transmission Cooperative, Inc., for the sale of all of the

power generated by the great Morris Sheppard Dam. Under the provisions of this contract all the power produced at this great stream-control dam, which was financed and built by public money, was made available for distribution to public and defense agencies over the lines of a publicly owned and operated transmission system, which is financed entirely by a loan from R. E. A.

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

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

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The gentleman will remember when my colleague, Mr. WINTER, had 30 minutes to speak on this subject earlier this week, he spoke about 5 minutes and then extended his remarks. I wonder if the gentleman from Texas would not care to do likewise?

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Texas wants to discuss a serious problem and expects to make a speech on the floor rather than to insert some remarks in the RECORD. Of course, he would be very flattered to have the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] listen to the entire speech because he knows that the gentleman from Kansas represents a great agricultural district whose people must be interested in the progress of the R. E. A., but if the gentleman from Kansas does not see fit to remain on the floor, the gentleman from Texas will be sorry, but will continue his speech.

To my mind this is a logical arrangement. The power produced by a publicly built dam is sold to and transmitted by a publicly owned and financed transmission system to be used exclusively in the public interest either for direct defense purposes or by publicly owned local distributing systems. These local distributing systems are owned by farmers. They receive no grant or gift from the Government. They borrow their money from the R. E. A., and they repay it. In fact, at the present time I am advised that of all obligations yet due on such loans, repayments are 127 percent of the amounts due, and that only 1 percent of the maturities over the Nation are delinquent.

At a meeting of the 79 R. E. A.-financed co-ops of Texas and New Mexico, held in Fort Worth, Tex., last week, it was shown that not one owed a dollar of overdue indebtedness. I consider this a remarkable record. The Brazos River Electric Transmission Cooperative, Inc., is financed by such a loan. It was organized in February 1941. It began construction last spring, long before anyone ever suggested a shortage of any kind of material. It first contracted for aluminum transmission lines. As soon as it was suggested that the Nation needed aluminum for defense the directors of this cooperative asked the contractor to substitute some other conductor. At that time the O. P. M. stated that there was plenty of copper and publicly announced that a very substantial amount of copper would be available for R. E. A. uses each month. Relying on the statements of the defense agency that is supposed to know about these things, the directors of the Brazos Transmission Cooperative

went ahead with their building program. About the same time the directors of the Farmers' Electric Generating Cooperative in east Texas did the same thing. The contractors who had contracted to erect these lines ordered the needed copper wire. Much of it was delivered, all openly, legally, and with the full knowledge of the O. P. M. It was delivered to the contractors, not to the cooperatives, as so many critics of the program have erroneously stated. Actually the wire that has been pictured as lying in cotton fields, and which the gentleman from Kansas referred to in his extension of remarks last Monday, is wire purchased by and delivered to Sandberg & Johnson, contractors, who bought this wire last spring to enable them to carry out their then existing and still existing contract to erect lines for the Farmers' Co-op. The fact that this wire is now in cottonfields is due to the fact that the lines of this farmer agency run through cottonfields, and the contractor has scattered the wire along the lines they are building. No, my friends, the gentleman from Kansas is mistaken when he so blandly repeats the very words of the power companies about hidden copper.

If the farmers of Texas were, as the gentleman from Kansas and the private utility companies state, actually hiding copper they would follow the example of the utility companies and hoard it up in a locked warehouse. For many months private utilities over the Nation have been receiving deliveries of copper. In fact, most private utilities now have vast stores of copper on hand, and in most cases are telling all prospective customers that they have the material to build any desired lines at a moment's notice, in spite of the fact that very few such private utilities have any available power to sell.

I have on my desk a copy of a letter from the Federal Power Commission dated November 6, 1941, stating in plain words that the large private utilities in Texas will not have enough generating capacity in 1942 to meet the loads that the companies themselves forecast. It is also pointed out that the companies' forecasts are less than the forecast of the Power Commission, and that they include in their estimate of available power for next year power to be produced in as yet unfinished plants that are now under construction. It is also interesting to note that the Federal Power Commission states that the Texas Power & Light Co. has scheduled a 30,000-kilowatt expansion to their Trinidad plant, and the Dallas Power & Light Co. has scheduled a 30,000-kilowatt new plant near Dallas. This in addition to a plant of approximately 10,000-kilowatt capacity, for which the O. P. M. recently granted the Dallas Power & Light Co. a priority order in the city of Dallas. When these facts are known, can it be doubted that new electrical energy is needed in Texas?

In view of this situation, the directors of the Brazos River Transmission Cooperative realized that if that agency was to render its maximum contribution to national defense it should do everything possible to furnish as much power as possible. It has always been recognized

that it would sooner or later be necessary to build a steam plant to firm up the river power in order to get the maximum value from the water power falling over Morris Sheppard Dam. This dam was not built primarily as a power dam but as one unit of a stream-control system. It does produce power, and that power should be used, but it needs a steam plant to make the maximum power available. It is evident from the announced building programs of the private power companies that they were making no provision for new power in central Texas; their new construction is centered around the city of Dallas. Thus, if the private power companies were left to monopolize the development of power in our State, all new industry would be forced to locate around the presently existing industrial centers. I feel that central Texas is entitled to at least an opportunity to compete for the location of defense industries. Without power our section of the State cannot hope to get any kind of industry. Apparently the private power companies want to concentrate every industry at Dallas. The directors of the Brazos River Electric Transmission Co-op felt that the rural people were citizens just the same as the people of Dallas. The R. E. A. in Washington felt that the erection of a steam-generating plant at the southern end of the system would be a safe investment and one which could be expected to liquidate itself.

With these facts in mind, the R. E. A. has agreed to make loans for steam generating plants at Temple and at Gilmer. The gentleman from Kansas stated in his extended remarks that the east Texas lines would not be needed for 2 years as there is no power with which to energize them. Of course, if the gentleman from Kansas and the Electric Bond & Share have their way there will never be any power to energize these lines, but this objection seems just a shade insincere when we consider the fact that the private power companies are getting priorities for steam generating machinery in Texas to serve the same general areas, and particularly when it is known that on December 1, the very day when the gentleman from Kansas inserted in the RECORD the utility company's claim that the east Texas lines could not be used for 2 years, the Texas Power & Light Co. went to the commissioners court in Dallas County seeking to prevent the construction of the lines necessary to connect the east Texas project with the lines of the Brazos River project. The Brazos River Co-op has a supply of power at Morris Sheppard Dam, about 100 miles from Garland, Tex. About half of the line to Garland has been built and construction is progressing on the remainder of the Dallas County line. The lines must cross about 15 or 20 miles of Dallas County. The city of Garland owns its municipal plant. Recently two new defense industries, the Guiberson Diesel engine manufacturing plant, and the Southern Aircraft Co., have been located at Garland. The city had to have additional power if these defense plants were to be served. The private utilities have alleged that they needed more generating capacity at Dallas. The Brazos River

project has the power today. The utilities have complained that it was being wasted.

The Brazos River Co-op has contracted to furnish power to the city of Garland and to connect at Garland with the lines of the east Texas project. If the gentleman from Kansas and the Texas Power & Light Co. do not succeed in stopping the construction of these lines, the entire east Texas project will be energized just as soon as the necessary lines and transforming stations can be built—within a few months—not 2 years as they would have you believe, and in addition, two vital national-defense industries will be supplied with power.

The gentleman from Kansas, the Dallas newspapers, and the private utilities would have you believe that these farmers' cooperatives in Texas seek to divert copper that is needed for national defense into nonessential channels. Such is not the fact. Within the past 10 days I have personally visited Mr. Donald Nelson, Mr. William Batts, Mr. Leon Henderson, and Vice President Wallace and discussed the copper situation with each of them. I have told each one of them that our people do not want and will not take a pound of copper that is needed for military purposes. That any day the Army or Navy tells us that they need the copper our farmers have in their R. E. A. systems that we are ready to tear down our lines and turn them over to the military authorities if the private utilities are required to do the same. But there is no such need for copper. I have been assured by all of the officials with whom I have talked that the Army and the Navy are receiving and will continue to receive all the copper they need, and that there will be in excess of half a million tons of copper per year for allocation to civilian uses.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Has not the gentleman taken the position all along that the rural electrification projects and the farmers that he so ably speaks for do not want to take one single pound of copper that can be used for national defense, but that after all national-defense requirements of every kind have been met he does expect an equitable distribution to be made of the remaining copper?

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly right. That is my position, and I am sure it is the position of the gentleman from Texas who has so ably expressed it. I know it is the position of the farmers in Texas who are the beneficiaries of the R. E. A.

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

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

Mr. TALLE. I want to assure the gentleman that that is also the position of the farmers in the State of Iowa.

Mr. POAGE. I will say for the farmers of Iowa that they have always been interested in this program.

As I see it, it is just as important to furnish power for the feed mill, the cream separator, and the silage cutter on the

farm as it is to furnish power for the convenience of the city dweller, who does nothing but sit at home and listen to his radio and run his vacuum cleaner, or for commercial advertising lights in Dallas. It takes copper wire to bring electricity to Highland Park in Dallas just as it does to bring it to the farm in Bell County. To my mind, the needs of the farmer who is producing the food and fiber needed for defense are entitled to prior consideration as between the two.

The present program of the Brazos Electric Transmission Cooperative involves the construction of something like 700 miles of transmission line and the erection of a steam-generating plant at Temple. The transmission lines extend from the Red River to Temple. About 200 miles of such lines are high-voltage lines, for which the wire has already been delivered, and much of which has already been constructed. The contracts for the construction of all of these lines were let many months ago. The local R. E. A. co-ops throughout central Texas are under contract to receive their electrical energy from these lines early next spring. If the private power companies can prevent the completion of these lines now they will be able to destroy practically all possibility of future completion. With the threat of competition removed, the private utilities would be at liberty not only to restore the outrageous rates they have so long charged, but they will also be in a position to absolutely control the location of any new industries that might come to the Southwest; and from the evidence now before us, those of us who live in the smaller cities of central and north Texas could only expect them to still further concentrate industry in the Dallas region. If the affiliates of the Electric Bond & Share are not attempting to bring about this kind of concentration, why do they object so violently to the erection of a steam plant at Temple? At the very same time that we were working on the plans for this Temple plant the O. P. M. granted a priority for material for the erection of a steam plant of approximately the same capacity in Dallas where the city charter allows a 9-percent return on the investment. The Temple plant will only charge enough to pay the cost of construction. It will not attempt to make a profit, but if private management is really so much more efficient, as the private utilities claim, then they should not fear this competition.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I have observed that the gentleman from Texas has always voted for necessary defense items. Does he not feel that agriculture is an essential defense item?

Mr. POAGE. I think the Secretary of Agriculture has well expressed it when he said that food will win the war and write the peace. It has been said that the outcome of the battle of Britain would be determined on the farms of America, and I think that is true. It is just as vital to have the food to supply the men in the lines as it is to produce

matériel to supply the guns. Neither can operate without the other.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I border Texas on two sides and I believe the farmers of Oklahoma are likewise interested in the R. E. A. for the farmers.

Mr. POAGE. I am sure the farmers of Oklahoma are interested. They have had a struggle with the same utility-control group, that we have in Texas, and were paying some of the highest rates in all this Nation, until the R. E. A. came along and gave competition.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. I read a very interesting report made by the Rural Electrification Administration a few days ago concerning the progress that has been made in electrifying rural areas in Texas. As a result of the leadership of the gentleman now occupying the floor and others of his colleagues of the Texas delegation, during the last 7 years I am informed we have increased the use of electricity in rural homes from 11,000 homes 7 years ago to approximately 100,000 homes today.

Mr. POAGE. One hundred and eleven thousand new ones.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. They are receiving electricity today and were not receiving it when this administration went into power.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. Speaker, can it be consistently urged that the power to be produced at Temple, Tex., is not needed. If the existing private power companies need to expand, and they say they do; if they are faced with a shortage of power, and they say they are; why should the R. E. A. be criticized for building a plant that will not only make available the rated capacity of the new plant but also "firm up" and make usable at all times approximately a like amount of river power that is at present unusable? Can the private utilities with a like expenditure of funds and materials produce a like amount of power anywhere in Texas? It is obvious that they cannot. Therefore, can their complaint that the R. E. A. is wasting defense material be made in good faith?

And what of the transmission lines that the Brazos Co-op is building? The private utilities suggest that the farmers of central Texas who are constructing these lines are not cooperating with the needs of national defense. They say that they could furnish the lines to transmit this current. Of course they could. I have no doubt that they either have or could easily get all the copper they would need, but they would have to build the new lines themselves, and I have been unable to understand how it helps national defense for the private utilities to use material that they say should not be used by the public agencies. There has been much misleading information in regard to the use of this power from Morris Sheppard Dam. The utilities have tried to give the impression that they could simply make a connection and all the power of this great dam would become instantly available.

In the first place, they have failed to tell the public that that connection would be between 20 and 30 miles in length, because no private utility has any high-voltage line to the dam site. They then fail to tell that if they built this connection, which would require just as much copper as if the public agency constructed it, that it would connect with a line that is already loaded almost if not completely loaded to capacity. Electric transmission lines are like water pipes—they can only carry a given amount of "juice"; and while the affiliates of the Electric Bond & Share do own lines that could transmit the power from a point about 30 miles from Morris Sheppard Dam to most points in Texas, these lines cannot transmit that power and the power they are now carrying. Nor have the private utilities told the public that before anyone can transmit power from this dam that it was necessary to build a transforming station. This station is now nearly complete, but there never has been a time as yet when anybody could transmit power from this dam, and yet the utilities and their officers have repeatedly tried to lead the public to believe that only the obstinacy of the public agencies has kept them from connecting with an available source of wasted power. As a matter of fact, the utilities are in no position to use this power at this moment themselves. They simply do not want the people of central and north Texas to use it.

This dog-in-the-manger attitude on the part of the private utilities is not hard to understand. They are in business to get all they can from the users of electricity. They now profess a great interest in the rural business, but prior to the establishment of the R. E. A. it was practically impossible for any farmer to get any private power company to sell him electricity at any price, and if he succeeded in getting it at all he had to pay most exorbitant prices for the current as well as pay utterly fantastic sums for the line to his residence. Only the very few could afford rural electricity. The companies said the rural business was unprofitable, but just as soon as the R. E. A. began to loan money to farmers to build their own power lines the private companies began to want the business. At first the private utilities in Texas refused to sell power to the R. E. A. co-ops, but when the R. E. A. began to offer to finance local generating plants, and when the city of Bartlett offered to sell the local co-ops power from the Bartlett municipal plant, the Texas Power & Light Co. and its affiliates decided to sell the power and established a rate of 15 mills, wholesale. This rate, which was about as cheap as the small generating plants could offer, was retained until a little over a year ago. Just after we began to work on creating the Brazos River Electric Transmission Cooperative, and the Farmers' Electric Generating Cooperative in east Texas, the power companies cut their rates. Each time we took a new step they cut their rates further until effective the day after the charter was granted to the Brazos Cooperative, the private companies cut their wholesale rates to the local co-ops to the pres-

ent figure of a little over 6 mills in the Brazos territory, or about 40 percent of what they were charging 7 months before. It seems to me that such a tremendous voluntary cut proves conclusively that the companies were previously overcharging the farmers.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Since the R. E. A. was organized for the benefit of the farmer, does not the gentleman feel that the benefits of the R. E. A. should be confined to the farmers?

Mr. POAGE. I do not know anybody else that is getting direct benefits of the R. E. A. I think the R. E. A. is primarily for the benefit of the farmer. But I think the providing of rural electricity in McLennan County is a benefit to the people of the city of Waco, my home town. I do not get rural electricity, but it helps me that my farmer neighbors do get it. It makes my home city a better town in which to live. It adds to the income of the people of Waco, Tex., because the farmers of the surrounding country are able to make a better income for themselves. So I would not want to say that the benefits should be confined simply to the farmers. I think the benefits permeate through all strata of society and I am glad they do.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is it not a fact that since the R. E. A. set-up, from which the farmer is getting the benefit, the man who lives in the city gets a benefit to the extent that the city rates have been lowered by reason of the rural use?

Mr. POAGE. No; unfortunately I do not think that is true.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is true in my town.

Mr. POAGE. That has not happened in the Brazos territory. The attorneys for the utility companies stated in my presence at the meeting with the Brazos River Board at Temple last spring that all of these rate reductions were simply the result of economies in generation and transmission which they had been able to effect and to pass on to the consumer. They further stated that it was the policy of the Electric Bond & Share companies to pass all economies on to the consumer. I raised the question then as to how it happened that the companies were able to effect economies coming to 60 percent of the total cost insofar as the power that was going to these particular rural co-ops was concerned, whereas no economies were effected in connection with that portion of the power generated at the same plants and transmitted over the same lines for sale in the cities of central Texas. I wondered then, and I still wonder, if the fact that the R. E. A. enabled these co-operatives to offer competition in rural areas while no competition was offered in cities like Waco and Temple did not account for the reduction. Certainly, if the T. P. & L. did effect economies amounting to 60 percent of their wholesale prices from September 1940

to March 1941 they were most unfair to Waco and all other cities in the central Texas area. We received no rate reduction in Waco, and yet today of all the 199 cities of more than 50,000 population in the United States only 18 have higher electric rates than Waco, Tex. The truth of the matter is that competition is not only the most effective but the only effective curb on electric rates in Texas today. The competition afforded by the Brazos River Electric Transmission Co-op has already resulted in a saving of \$75,000 per year to the rural co-ops of Texas, and unless the building program now under way is stopped it will certainly result in additional savings to other cooperatives throughout the area.

I do not mean that the public agency can sell electricity lower than the present competitive rates of the utility companies. Under the R. E. A. plan the co-ops must charge enough to pay all operating costs and in addition to repay the capital investment in their plants. They can and are meeting these payments on about one-half the rates previously charged by the private utilities, and when the plants are paid for they will belong to the farmers themselves. So the co-op charges are in fact collected in large part for the benefit of the farmers themselves. It must also never be forgotten that the present utility rates in rural areas in Texas would never have been established had it not been for the threat of public competition. Certainly these low rates will not be extended to other co-ops or even retained where they are now in force if the building program of the R. E. A. is halted. So we can see rather clearly the true motive that activates the private companies who find it so "wicked" for the R. E. A. to loan money to Texas farmers to build lines and generating plants. The utilities are simply using national defense as a smoke screen, but they are at least directly and openly interested.

The bitter criticism of the Dallas newspaper is not even excusable on the ground of self-interest. They profess to be non-partisan, although the city editor of one of the most bitter newspaper critics of the R. E. A. happens to have just left some 15 years employment with the Texas Power & Light Co., where he served as publicity man. Possibly he is finding it difficult to abandon his training. Practically all of the Dallas papers have been most intemperate and unfair in their uncalled-for attack on the efforts of our central Texas farmers to secure reasonably fair electric rates and a reasonably adequate supply of electricity for our part of the State. The Dallas papers have repeatedly stated that it is wrong to loan public money to the farmers to build power plants to produce power that is admittedly needed, or to build transmission lines that must be built by someone, if existing power is to be made available. At the same time every one of the big Dallas papers are urging every Member of Congress to support a proposition to authorize a project that will involve hundreds of millions of dollars of Federal money as an outright gift for improvement of the Trinity River, for the sole

purpose of reducing freight rates to Dallas. Incidentally, the organization that is in charge of this proposal is headed by the President of the Texas Power & Light Co. Of course, if freight rates are reduced between New York and Dallas and are not reduced between New York and Waco and Temple, the merchants in our central Texas cities are going to find it increasingly hard to compete with Dallas. Of course, there is no shortage of actual transportation facilities between Dallas and the Gulf of Mexico at this time.

There are today at least a half a dozen railroad lines between Dallas and the Gulf, all adequately equipped to transport any freight that needs to move. There are at least an equal number of well-equipped truck lines. The only question involved is that of cost, yet these Dallas papers insist that it would be a worthy project for the Federal Government to contribute hundreds of millions of dollars as a gift to get this project started with continued Federal contributions for upkeep, all to reduce freight rates to Dallas. At the same time they feel that it would be wicked and unpatriotic to let the Government loan less than 1 percent of that amount to build a generating plant in central Texas, which would use only a tiny fraction of the material that would be used by the Trinity project and which is intended not simply to batter down rates, but in addition to provide absolutely indispensable energy, which must be produced by someone if the farmers of the great central Texas region are to make their maximum contribution to the national-defense program.

In short, the private utilities were never interested in the rural market until R. E. A. was established. The power companies in Texas still charge some of the highest rates in the Nation, except where they have been faced with competition. Where the R. E. A. has made loans that enabled public agencies to offer competition they have reduced rates very drastically. The activity of the R. E. A. is solely responsible for these rate reductions. There is not enough power generating equipment in Texas to meet the anticipated needs for 1942. The private utilities have undertaken to build and are building new plants and new lines in Texas. No one has objected to their expansion. Their expansion is centered around the city of Dallas. Central Texas was left to shift for itself, but as soon as it was able to secure a substantial loan from R. E. A., the private utilities, with headquarters in Dallas, and the Dallas newspapers, all began to howl about the sinful waste of public funds. At the same time these same Dallas institutions are trying to get an outright Federal grant to aid in reducing freight rates to Dallas of more than 100 times the amount of the loan sought by central Texas. I take my stand with the farmers and with the smaller communities of central Texas. We do not want and will not take 1 pound of copper or \$1 of money that must come from supplies or funds needed for national defense, but we do insist that we be allotted material to build publicly owned generating and transmission

facilities just as long as the private utilities are receiving the same kind of materials, and we insist that the Government can well afford to lend the Brazos Electric Transmission Cooperative \$1,000,000 if it can give the Trinity project a subsidy of \$200,000,000. All we ask is equal rights for all and special privileges for none.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1060. An act to extend the 6-month death gratuity benefits, now paid only to dependents of officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, to dependents of all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army of the United States who die in line of duty while in active military service of the United States; and

S. 1826. An act to permit seeing-eye dogs to enter Government buildings when accompanied by their blind masters, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 8, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Monday, December 8, 1941.

Business to be considered: Hearings on H. R. 5695, a bill to amend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939 so as to provide for the training of civilian aviation mechanics.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, December 9, 1941.

Business to be considered: Resume hearings on the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of this committee at 10:30 a. m. Tuesday, December 9, 1941, on unfinished business and private bills.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1116. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 5, 1941, submitting a report, together with

accompanying papers, on reexamination of Sacramento and San Joaquin River system, with a view to construction of a fresh-water canal between Sacramento River and Suisun Bay, requested by resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted April 13, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1117. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the board of trustees, school district No. 20, Charleston County, S. C., a parcel of land situated in the city of Charleston, S. C.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1118. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, so as to authorize citizens of foreign countries who are graduates of air corps advanced flying schools and air corps service schools to wear aviation badges; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1119. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Canal Zone Code in relation to the control of marihuana; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1120. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of B. H. Wilford; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. PACE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 5739. A bill amending the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, so as to provide for agricultural conservation program payments to farmers whose crops have been acquired under the national-defense program; without amendment (Rept. No. 1477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BEITER: Committee on Labor. H. R. 5638. A bill to amend the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931; without amendment (Rept. No. 1478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 6182. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1479). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 5893. A bill to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1926; without amendment (Rept. No. 1480). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6163. A bill to prohibit parking of vehicles upon public or private property in the District of Columbia without the consent of the owner of such property; without amendment (Rept. No. 1481). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4779. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of June 10, 1922, so as to equalize the rates of pay of commissioned officers of corresponding grade and length of service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1482). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6120. A bill granting relief to certain agricultural producers in stricken areas who suffered crop failures in 1941 because of ad-

verse weather conditions, insect pests, or other uncontrollable natural causes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 5881. A bill to provide full and fair disclosure of the character of charitable, benevolent, patriotic, or other solicitations in the District of Columbia; to provide for regulation and control within the District of Columbia of such solicitations; to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to administer and enforce the provisions of this act; to authorize appropriations therefor; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1484). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4465. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands in Minnesota; with amendment (Rept. No. 1485). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6004. A bill to require parking facilities for the persons employed in Federal office buildings in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 1486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 248. Joint resolution to direct the Public Utilities Commission to make an investigation and survey to determine the feasibility of the construction of subways in the District of Columbia for both streetcars and vehicular traffic; with amendment (Rept. No. 1487). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6003. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and of the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 1488). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1535. A bill for the relief of the estate of John J. Murray; with amendment (Rept. No. 1476). 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. EDMISTON:

H. R. 6181. A bill to extend eligibility for appointments to the West Point and Annapolis Academies to the sons of service-connected World War veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 6182. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. Res. 378. Resolution requesting the President and the Secretary of State to negotiate for the purchase of a part of the Dominion of Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CARTER:

H. R. 6183. A bill for the relief of James Theodore Helm; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas:

H. R. 6184. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. E. P. Ball; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 6185. A bill for the relief of Father Michael O'Reilly; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 6186. A bill for the relief of Frederick Rush; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 6187. A bill for the relief of Henry Tachudy and family; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 6188. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Dennis; 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:

2123. By Mr. CULKIN: Resolution of the National Grange favoring application of economic devices as best means for holding down inflationary tendencies and opposing arbitrary price fixing unless necessary. If price fixing becomes necessary demands that all groups be included, action be taken to prevent profiteering, standards be provided to assure equity, and that Congress retain control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2124. Also, resolution of the Jefferson County Board of Supervisors, approving House bill 5912, for relief of agricultural producers whose crops were reduced by reason of drought or other uncontrollable natural causes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2125. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of the Carpenters Local Union, 1445, of the United Brotherhood of C. and J. J. of America, Topeka, Kans., requesting the immediate enactment of a just and adequate old-age pension law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2126. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the General Welfare Federation, Pasadena, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1941

The Very Reverend Zeb Barney T. Phillips, D. D., Chaplain of the Senate, offered the following prayer:

O Thou blessed Christ, Companion of our days, Mediator of the Infinite God and the Creator of a new world of being which men may know if they follow Thee and in which Thy tender love is ever available to lonely and despairing souls: Help us to find in Thee a sustaining sense of justice which shall become a passion for the amelioration of the wrongs of men, as honor calls us to the defense of every sacred ideal of our beloved country.

Keep us fine and true in our individual and corporate lives, steadfast in purpose that we may endure with patience and calm determination every trial, discipline, and sacrifice through which we