TO BE LIEUTENANTS

Robert S. Lecky
Emmet T. Calahan
Joseph F. McCue

TO BE COMMANDERS

Paul K. Perry
William J. Kossler
Merlin O'Neill
Norman H. Leslie
Norman R. Stiles

TO BE CHIEF BOATSWAINS

Osmond C. Faulkingham
Luther H. Muse
Peter F. Shea
John A. Turmala
William J. H. Siekemeyer

TO BE CHIEF MACHINISTS

Theodore G. Munson
Louis J. Perry

TO BE A PROFESSOR (TEMPORARY)

Jerry Barton Hoag

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1940

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Our Father in Heaven, we can only speak to Thee with faltering lips because of our human frailties. Enable us to commit our ways unto the Lord—any pure purpose, any worthy ambition, and any road we have to tread, be with us in every needful hour. Allow not, dear Lord, our labors to be checked by thought grinding against thought and desire against desire; we pray for Thy guiding presence at the very beginning of this day. In Thy gracious design take us and keep us under Thy direction; be Thou the link that forges our unity and cooperation. Inspire us with the faith that conquers doubt and that gives the calm conviction that this is God's world and underneath are the everlasting arms; oh, be our refuge from all life's illusions and adverse conditions. While it is yet day, help us to walk in the steps of Him who is the way, the truth, the life, and Thine shall be the praise. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 306

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
September 4, (legislative day, August 5), 1940.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN, late a Senator from the State of Minnesota.

Resolved, That a committee of four Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

OPERATION OF HOUSE RESTAURANT

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 590), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 590

Resolved, That effective October 1, 1940, until otherwise ordered by the House, the management of the House restaurant and all matters connected therewith shall be under the direction of the Architect of the United States Capitol under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe for the operation and the employment of necessary assistance for the conduct of said restaurant by such business methods as may produce the best results consistent with economical and modern management.

SEC. 2. The Committee on Accounts after the close of business, September 30, 1940, is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the jurisdiction of the Architect of the United States Capitol all accounts, records, supplies, equipment, and assets of the House restaurant that may be in the possession or under the control of the said committee in order that all such items may be available to the Architect of the United States Capitol toward the maintenance and operation of the House of Representatives restaurant.

The resolution was agreed to.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his question of privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will not make a lengthy statement——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. In order to get recognition on the question of the privilege of the House it is necessary for a Member to offer a resolution first?

The SPEAKER. That is the rule.

Mr. RANKIN. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Must I offer the resolution before I state my question?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must offer his resolution first, under the rule.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Very well, but I desire to be heard on the question. However, I will not take more than 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman. The Clerk will report the resolution.

House Resolution 591

Whereas the gentleman from the Second District of Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT], referring to the gentleman from the Twentieth District of Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY], stated on the floor of the House on September 4, 1940, as appears in the [daily] RECORD on page 17450, "I said I did not want to sit by a traitor to my country;" and

Whereas such words were a violation of the rules of the House and, as reprinted in the RECORD, charge the Member from Ohio with a lack of patriotism, and with disloyalty to his country, reflect upon him in his representative capacity and upon the dignity of the House: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the words, "I said I did not want to sit by a traitor to my country," be expunged from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the RECORD this morning contains that statement. Most of the Members of the House are familiar with what occurred last night. It is not my purpose to take the time of the House to discuss the question of the privilege of the House. I will present the resolution, and then move the previous question. The facts upon which the question of the privilege of the House which I raise are these:

Yesterday, September 4, 1940, on the floor of the House, the following occurred:

The gentleman from the Second District of Kentucky rose and made the following statement, as appears from the official transcript of the reporter:

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I served in the World War, and the World War, as I understood it then and as I understand it now, was fought because we were being attacked by submarines and women and children murdered on the high seas. To say that my President of that time brought on that war to me was an untruth and the whole statement the gentleman made here I resent very much.

When he came down to sit with me, I got up and moved, as I shall continue to move as long as I am a Member of Congress of the United States and he is a Member of Congress. I was attacked in my office a few days ago by a bunch of Communists and I drove them out of my office. When he sat down there, I got up and moved. I said I did not want to sit by a traitor to my country. Then he attacked me and you know what happened.

Following the word "happened," the gentleman from the Second District of Kentucky continued:

I have no apology to make—

And followed that by a sentence consisting of 18 words, which were subsequently deleted from the stenographer's copy sent to the printer.

Then the following occurred:

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand recognition on a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the words of the gentleman who just left the floor be taken down, because they violate the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the words complained of.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the last sentence of my statement.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to withdraw the statement. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I object, Mr. Speaker.

When the gentleman from the Second District of Kentucky asked unanimous consent to withdraw certain statements, I state upon my responsibility as a Representative that I was standing in front of the first row of seats in the Chamber of the House, to the left center of the Speaker. Immediately upon my right was the gentleman from the Second District of Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], who was also standing, seeking recognition. Still farther to the right was the Representative from the Eleventh District of Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY], who was also upon his feet, seeking recognition; that, immediately upon the making of the request by the gentleman from the Second District of Kentucky, the gentleman from the Second District of Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] made objection; that, upon the putting of the request of the gentleman from the Second District of Kentucky, I said, "Mr. Speaker, I object," and, immediately following the objection made by me, the Member from the Eleventh District of Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] made objection. Other Members of the House were upon their feet at the same time, seeking recognition.

Later, the following occurred:

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order and a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago certain words were uttered by the gentleman on the floor of the House which I demanded be taken down. No report was made of those words. I demand the regular order—the taking down of the words, the report of the words, and the reading by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Subsequently, unanimous consent was granted for the words to be withdrawn.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no, Mr. Speaker; three Members were on their feet—I was one of them—and objecting to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That was the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair, then.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is not a ruling; it is just an answer to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no; I am appealing from the ruling awhile ago.

If it be true that there was no objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from the Second District of Kentucky, that consent, according to the printed RECORD and according to the reporter's record, was as follows:

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the last sentence of my statement.

The last sentence of the statement was the sentence consisting of 18 words and, had unanimous consent been granted to withdraw the last sentence of the previous statement made by the gentleman from the Second District of Kentucky, there was no consent to withdraw the words, "I have no apology to make."

The striking out of those words from the official transcript furnished by the reporter and the failure to print them in the record of the House renders the RECORD inaccurate and untrue.

The words, as they now appear in the daily printed RECORD, September 4, page 17450—

I said I did not want to sit by a traitor to my country—

Were a violation of the rules of the House and, as reprinted in the RECORD, charge the Member from Ohio with a lack of patriotism, and with disloyalty to his country, reflect upon him in his representative capacity and upon the dignity of the House.

These words were objected to; a demand was made that they be taken down; and, under the rules of the House, they should either have been taken down or unanimous consent should have been obtained to withdraw them from the RECORD.

Unanimous consent to withdraw these words just quoted—that is—

I said I did not want to sit by a traitor to my country—

Was not given. The words were not taken down and read to the House. They now appear in the RECORD. They reflect upon the Member from Ohio. They bring disrepute upon the House and reflect upon the integrity of the House, if permitted to remain in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore move the adoption of the resolution, and, upon that, move the previous question.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject The Country Needs John J. O'Connor Back in Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1941

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 10263) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10263) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 35, and 38.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47, 49, and 52; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from the disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$43,315,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 18, 20, 22, 39, 45, 46, 48, 50, and 51.

EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
C. A. WOODRUM,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
EMMET O'NEAL,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

ALVA B. ADAMS,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
FREDERICK HALE,
JOHN TOWNSEND,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10263) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941,

and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

On amendment No. 1: Increases the amount that may be expended for personal services in the War Department proper, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments Nos. 3, 4, and 5, relating to military posts: Increases the amount of contractual authority from $12,000,000, as proposed by the House, to $14,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; makes $3,000,000 of the appropriation and $2,000,000 of the contractual authority available for storage of aviation gasoline, as proposed by the Senate, and waives the requirement, proposed by the House, that the Attorney General give advance approval to proceeding with construction on privately owned land prior to his approval of title thereto.

On amendment No. 7: Strikes out the appropriation of $249,000 proposed by the Senate for flood-protection project at East Hartford, Conn.

On amendment No. 12: Changes a section number.

On amendments Nos. 13 and 14: Appropriates $136,000 for miscellaneous expenses, office of the Secretary of the Navy, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $50,000, as proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 16: Appropriates $210,000 for the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 17: Appropriates $3,689,780 for the Naval Reserve, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,189,780, as proposed by the House, the increase representing a transfer from another head.

On amendment No. 19: Appropriates $67,293,000 for ordnance and ordnance stores, Navy, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $60,293,000, as proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 21: Appropriates $1,350,000 for Medical Department, Navy, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments Nos. 23 to 38, both inclusive, relating to Public Works, Navy: Appropriates $48,315,000, instead of $37,750,000, as proposed by the House, and $53,315,000, as proposed by the Senate, the agreed increased amount applying to all of the projects proposed by the Senate, without change, except the project—"graving drydock and accessory construction, New York Harbor", which has been omitted, and restores the House text with respect to cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts.

On amendments Nos. 40 to 43, both inclusive, relating to Aviation, Navy; Appropriates $180,000,000, as proposed by the Senate instead of $170,000,000, as proposed by the House; makes the appropriation available for mess outfits of aviation cadets and bachelor officers at air stations, as proposed by the Senate, and makes $1,000,000 of the appropriation, including contractual authority, available for the procurement of nonrigid lighter-than-air craft.

On amendment No. 44: Makes a minor textual change, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 47: Appropriates $20,000 for personal services, office of the Secretary of the Navy, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $13,680, as proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 49: Changes a section number.

On amendment No. 52: Changes a section number.

Amendments reported in disagreement

The committee of conference report in disagreement the following amendments of the Senate:

On amendment No. 2: Relating to the appropriation for military posts, Army.

On amendment No. 6: Relating to performance and payment bonds in connection with cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts.

On amendment No. 8: Relating to employment of Army Reserve Officers with the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

On amendment No. 9: Relating to the temporary advancement of officers of the Regular Army.

On amendment No. 10: Relating to the utilization of the Army Engineer Corps in Army construction work.

On amendment No. 11: Relating to advance payments to contractors.

On amendment No. 15: Making commandants of naval districts independent of commandants of navy yards and stations during the remainder of the fiscal year 1941.

On amendment No. 18: Relating to the employment on active duty of Naval and Marine Corps Reserve officers in a pensionable status.

On amendment No. 20: Authorizing contractual authority under Ordnance and Ordnance Stores, Navy.

On amendment No. 22: Relating to the appropriation "Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, Navy."

On amendment No. 39: Relating to the continuance on the rolls of non-civil-service employees engaged on the Navy public-works program.

On amendment No. 45: Relating to the detail of enlisted men to duty in the Navy Department.

On amendment No. 46: Relating to the repeal of the commandeering provision in Public, No. 671, Seventy-sixth Congress.

On amendment No. 48: Making an appropriation for housing of persons engaged in national-defense activities.

On amendment No. 50: Protecting the applicability of the Bacon-Davis and Walsh-Healey Acts to contracts to which properly applicable.

On amendment No. 51: Relating to wages of laborers and mechanics employed by contractors, including overtime.

EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
C. A. WOODRUM,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
EMMET O'NEAL,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report now before the House, if adopted, and if the recommendations of the conferees are concurred in, will complete action, insofar as the House is concerned, on the so-called $5,000,000,000 national-defense appropriation bill.

These estimates first came to the House of Representatives on July 10. On July 31 the bill was reported to the House. That is 3 weeks. Within that time there had been a recess for one of the political conventions. But within that time the Appropriations Committee had conducted careful and detailed hearings on these stupendous items. The bill passed the House on July 31, the same day it was reported. It was reported to the Senate on August 19 and passed the Senate on August 29, practically a month after it left the House.

The conference report on the bill as it finally comes here calls for $262,824,435 more than when the bill left the House. That is accounted for in practically two large items, $100,000,000 for the housing of persons engaged in national-defense activities, an amendment which was inserted in the Senate; and an additional amount of $128,107,115 for the housing of the National Guard. That estimate is pending in the Budget and may reach the Appropriations Committee today, but because of the great urgency and to get the program under way for the housing of the National Guard, a part of which already has been called into mobilization for training, the conferees have put this item in the bill.

I do not think there is any objection to it. I do not believe the minority members of the conference committee will have any objection to it.

Those two propositions carry the bulk of the increase embraced by the conference report. I do not know of any controversy insofar as the conference report is concerned.

There are one or two amendments reported in disagreement because, under our rules, they have to be acted upon separately in the House. Unless the gentleman from New York desires some time, I am disposed to move the previous question on the conference report.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield a second——

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Would the gentleman like me to yield him some time?

Mr. TABER. I do not care for time. I do not see any item that is included in the conference report over which there should be any controversy. It seems to me that the items that are included should unquestionably be put through about as the report recommends. I do not think it is necessary for me to take any time under these circumstances.

Mr. RICH and Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts rose.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield first to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. This bill appropriates about $5,000,000,000. We passed one tax bill this year that will raise $1,007,000,000, and another one more recently which it is estimated will yield about $300,000,000 the first year and $700,000,000 the next. We are $3,000,000,000 in the red on the operations of the Government last year. As one of the prominent members of the Appropriations Committee, does the gentleman know about what amount we shall be in the red at the end of 1940 and also 1941?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know, but insofar as this particular bill is concerned, this is an expenditure that

has got to be made and should be made; and when the bill is presented we shall have to pay it and will permit the gentleman to have a part in that proceeding.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman tell us how he is going to raise the money for these expenditures? Where are we going to get the money?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We will raise it by a tax bill, and we will put a tax on all prosperous industries in proportion to their ability to pay.

Mr. RICH. That is right; I am in favor of that kind of tax bill, but this is a serious matter. All we have been thinking about in the last 7 years is spend, spend, spend. The gentleman knows it means ultimate chaos unless we raise more money. The gentleman says we are going to have another tax bill. When does he think we shall get it?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman will have to see the Ways and Means Committee about the tax bill. Right now I am interested in this defense program, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman believe we are treading on dangerous ground in the appropriations we have been making in the last 10 years?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think it will be very much more dangerous if we do not arrange this defense program at the earliest possible moment. Then we can worry about domestic matters. [Applause.]

Mr. RICH. We are thinking in terms of defense; we are taking up all our time with it; but we are not trying to reduce Government expenditures, something we have been harping on and hammering at for the last 7 years.

It seems to me this administration in its preparation for national defense should cut everywhere it could to reduce these extravagant expenditures and the debt burden it so ruthlessly piles on the shoulders of our people. We should cut down appropriations for things that do not amount to a tinker's hook. That is what we ought to do, and this Congress is responsible if we do not.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. What items in this report would the gentleman cut out?

Mr. RICH. I am not talking about this defense bill; I am talking about the expenditures of Government that are not necessary. That is what we should take into consideration.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Right at the immediate time I am talking about the defense bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman advise us how long it will take to construct the buildings to house the National Guard? I am very much interested in this question.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The program for housing the guard will be a very rapid one. The War Department advises us that within 4 to 6 weeks they will be under way; and certainly if this bill is passed promptly the housing will be ready when it is needed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The housing is of a type that can be constructed very quickly, in other words?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; it is of a type that lends itself to rapid construction.

Mr. TABER. That is not included in the report. That is a separate item to be acted on separately.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is a separate item, which will be voted upon separately.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. FADDIS. Will the gentleman explain amendment No. 9? I would like to have some explanation relative to the temporary advancement of officers.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That will be voted upon separately, and I ask the gentleman to let me explain that at that time.

Mr. FADDIS. Certainly.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Will the gentleman explain the $100,000,000 item for housing?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That will be voted upon separately, and I will take it up then if the gentleman does not mind.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. That will be all right.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 16, strike out "$70,001,915" and insert "$73,001,915."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert the following: "$201,109,030, of which $128,107,115 shall be for emergency construction."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this amendment increases the amount for housing by adding $128,107,115, the amount estimated by the Bureau of the Budget as being necessary for housing the National Guard. That is all there is to it. I do not know anything else to say.

The emergency requires very quick action on account of the weather and on account of the fact that the guard has been called for active duty. It is very desirable therefore that the housing project get underway.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. That has to do with the housing of the National Guard. There is another item of a hundred million dollars in there for housing those who are helping on national defense. What is that?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is a later amendment and will come up subsequently.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. That has nothing to do with this housing program?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment comes to you without any Budget amendment therefor, although I understand it is on the way, and this is without legislative authority, as far as I know. It is to provide housing for the men of the National Guard and those draftees who will be welded into the National Guard system. I have tried to obtain information on the subject and, as near as I can make out, this provides, according to the Quartermaster, for the housing of 395,607 men. It provides for housing about half of them in the territory north of the south line of North Carolina in cantonments or temporary barracks, which cost about $400 per man, including the utilities which have to be placed on the ground. It provides for housing those south of the North Carolina line in tents with a wooden platform for the base of the tent. This type of housing is supposed to cost $285 per man, including administrative buildings, recreational centers, toilets, and all that sort of thing. Of course, these tents will not be needed.

Mr. Speaker, for my own part I have very great doubts about these tents being sufficient housing. I am afraid we are going to get into a lot of trouble if we put raw troops into that type of quarters in the winter time. The Army people said they did this last winter during maneuvers and did not have any trouble. There is no question but what these men are going to be called out and that it will take approximately 3 months to complete the cantonments and probably 60 days to complete the tent platform outfit and the utilities connected therewith. Therefore, I can see nothing to do but to provide the funds and go ahead.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I may say that we used that form of cantonment with the wooden floor and tents at Fort Benning last winter in connection with the maneuvers down there with complete satisfaction.

Mr. TABER. That is what the Army people say. On the other hand, that same sort of thing resulted in tremendous epidemics during the World War period and I do not want to take a chance on getting into that same sort of thing again.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Where are these wooden cantonments to be located?

Mr. TABER. The cantonments are temporary wooden barracks and they are north of about the south line of North Carolina.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Where are these tents to be used?

Mr. TABER. The tents are to be used south of that line.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. South of the south line of North Carolina?

Mr. TABER. Yes. That would include South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Arkansas, Texas, and some in the southern part of California.

I do not see anything to do except go ahead and provide the money, but I thought this statement ought to be in the RECORD so there would be some detail to show that the Congress had something to act on.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 8, after the word "war" insert: "*Provided further*, That the Secretary of War may, with respect to contracts for public works for the Military Establishment entered into upon a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis out of funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1941, or authorized to be entered into prior to July 1, 1941, waive the requirements as to performance and payment bonds of the act approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793; 40 U. S. C. 270a)."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia moves to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, as follows: "At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: '*Provided further*, That the fixed fee to be paid the contractor as a result of any such public-works contract hereafter entered into shall not exceed 6 percent of the estimated cost of the contract, exclusive of the fee, as determined by the Secretary of War'."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment provides for the waiving of surety bonds by contractors who are given jobs on a cost-plus basis. This is the situation. First, there is no great necessity for obtaining a surety bond from these people that they will complete their jobs, because this is a cost-plus proposition and they can go through. However, those bonds under the Miller Act provide protection to subcontractors on Government projects and to materialmen. If these bonds are done away with, while it will save a very moderate sum in the cost, and, as I understand, it runs about four-tenths of 1 percent, it will give absolutely no protection to the materialmen and the subcontractors that they will get their pay. We are going to have just one mess after another, nor will there be any protection that the contractor will do a good job except for what inspection our Quartermaster Corps will give.

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

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

Mr. RABAUT. Is any ceiling set upon these contracts at all?

Mr. TABER. There is none except the limits of appropriations.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. Who actually lets the contracts to the subcontractors? Does the Quartermaster General have anything to do with it?

Mr. TABER. No; the contractor.

Mr. THOMASON. The contractor who has the contract upon a cost-plus basis lets the contracts. Then do I correctly understand the gentleman to say that a subcontractor or a materialman would have absolutely no protection? If that is true, I am against the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Except what he could get out of the contractor by suit.

Mr. THOMASON. He would have no recourse upon the War Department?

Mr. TABER. Only on what fund happened to be due the contractor. He would have no guaranty under the bond that is given under the Miller Act, as I understand.

Mr. THOMASON. Then is the only reason or justification assigned for not requiring a bond the time element, or is it the cost element?

Mr. TABER. The cost element of four-tenths of 1 percent. It does not seem to me that we ought to leave all these materialmen in that situation. It seems to me that we would have more speed in the performance of these contracts—and time is of the essence—if we did not waive the bond, but required it.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Does the Government pay for the cost of materials or does the contractor contract to pay for the materials?

Mr. TABER. When a contractor takes a cost-plus contract the contractor would be the one who would be obligated. The Government would have to pay him what he had paid out, plus his percentage, whatever it figured. It is provided that the percentage cannot be more than 6 percent.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman from New York gives a lot of thought and study to matters of this kind. As I understand, the gentleman is opposing the amendment?

Mr. TABER. I am opposing it.

Mr. THOMASON. Cannot the gentleman suggest some means by which the subcontractor will at least be entitled to his rights if he is mistreated by a contractor? In other words, as I understand it, the subcontractor can be skinned out of his eye teeth, and there is no check on it at all, if he has an irresponsible chief contractor who has no bond. The gentleman knows that has happened time after time in this kind of work, which goes to show that the cost-plus theory is absolutely unsound in principle.

Mr. TABER. That is just the situation exactly. I do not see anything to do except to beat this amendment. If it is necessary to have some language that waives some of the provisions of these bonds, let them come in here when the deficiency bill comes up, which will be in only a few days, and provide for it.

Mr. THOMASON. Cannot the gentleman suggest some form of amendment that would protect the subcontractor should he be cheated out of his rights by a dishonest contractor? I insist that the subcontractor, the day laborer, and the materialman be given adequate protection.

Mr. TABER. I think I could.

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

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe the answer to that is simply to insist on the disagreement with the Senate and cut out Sen-

ate amendment No. 6 entirely, so as to keep intact the provisions of the Miller Act relating to all contracts, whether on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis or otherwise.

Mr. TABER. I believe if we knocked out the words "and payment," in line 14, on page 4, that would come pretty near doing it. I cannot see any other way that it could be done, although I frankly have nothing from the Department so that I could know just what could be accomplished in just that way. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I hope there will be no misunderstanding about the amendment which is now under consideration. The amendment seeks to put the Army in exactly the same situation that now exists with the Navy so far as this particular type of project is concerned. Over a year ago the Congress gave the Navy the right to have negotiated contracts, cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts. Now, there is a difference between a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract and a cost-plus contract. This amendment applies only to one type of contract, where they can waive the bond, and that is the contract where the contractor does the job at cost plus a fixed fee, that is agreed upon, and which may not be more than 6 percent.

The Navy has operated under this plan for more than a year without a particle of trouble and without any complaint and has saved money, so they claim. They are permitted to waive the bond, because contracts are only awarded to reputable contractors who have clearly established their financial responsibility. They have a long list of approved contractors and they have no trouble with their contractors, either the Army or the Navy, because they do not deal with those who are not dependable. Their inspectors are also in constant touch with each job, and there has not been a particle of complaint about it.

This amendment, if adopted as recommended by the conferees, would put the Army in the same situation that has existed for more than a year in the Navy.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. The money that is paid for these jobs that are performed in this way; is it paid directly to the materialman and to the subcontractor, or is it paid to the general contractor with whom the Government has entered into such an arrangement on a cost-plus, fixed-fee basis?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is paid to the general contractor, as I understand it, but the subcontractor has every opportunity to know what is going on and to protect his rights as the work progresses. There has not been a particle of trouble in more than a year of experience in the Navy.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. If the gentleman will permit one more question in that connection, the gentleman stated that the War Department has a preferred list of contractors. Does not that remove the opportunity for other contractors all over the Nation to bid upon this work and receive some of it through competitive bidding?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; this does not apply to competitive bidding at all. This applies to the type of contracts that the department has the right to make on a negotiated-contract basis. There are certain types of contracts where the Congress has given the War Department and the Navy Department the right to negotiate a contract in lieu of competitive bidding.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Congress has not let down the bars entirely so far as competition is concerned.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Absolutely not; this is limited entirely to defense projects where there is necessity to go forward immediately, and I did not mean to say that they had a preferred list. I said they had an approved list, a long list of contractors whom they have investigated and know to be reputable and dependable people.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Of course, they are not sure that every reputable contractor is included in that list.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is not an exclusive list.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I wonder if the subcontractor who takes a subcontract from a principal contractor would not also be protected in the matter as against the contractor but not the Government, in the matter of a lien against the contractor for whatever materials he may furnish.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Exactly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me make this statement. This is not a very major problem and I hope that this conference report and this amendment may be finally acted upon here so this does not have to go back to conference again, which means the bill will not become law until next week.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. The gentleman said, in answer to an inquiry a few moments ago, that the subcontractors would be protected by a lien. Of course, you cannot have a lien against Government property. If I recall correctly, there was considerable trouble in the last emergency about this very thing in connection with cost-plus contracts. In the absence of a bond, it seems to me, as suggested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], there is no real protection for the subcontractor.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course, on a negotiated contract, or a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract there is very little to bond, because there is no time element in it. The big thing to protect in a bond, so far as the Government is concerned, is that you will complete the job in the time you say you will do it.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. And also that the subcontractors will be paid.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is true. The Navy Department has operated for a year without any trouble about the matter.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Is this the McKellar amendment put on in the Senate?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I believe that is what it is supposed to be.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Did the conference committee agree to the McKellar amendment, or did you amend it?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The language of the amendment is changed. We put in the 6 percent limitation. We were not clear that the 6 percent limitation on the amount of fee would apply, and we added that to the McKellar amendment.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Referring to this list of contractors, suppose a job was started in some place far away, they certainly would not take this list of contractors and figure that someone, we will say in Washington, had to go out into Idaho to do the contract work, when in Idaho they might have good contractors who could qualify and be placed on that list. They certainly would give consideration to other well-qualified contractors for that kind of work.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Both the Army, the Navy, and the National Defense Council have literally thousands of contractors all over the United States who have filed statements, who have filed credentials, whom they have investigated, and whom they know to be dependable people.

Mr. THOMASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. Let me suppose a case. Sometimes contractors go broke because they are engaged in a hazardous business. Assuming that one of these approved contractors should go into bankruptcy, would the materialmen, the laboring men, on a cantonment, for instance, have the slightest protection without a bond?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know that they would.

Mr. THOMASON. In other words, the lumbermen in the town where a cantonment is built, and the carpenters and the plumbers and others, if the contractor went broke without a bond, would not get 1 cent, would they?

Mr. O'NEAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. The testimony before our committee was that the Federal Government, having the money and not having a bond, would follow the contract through, which the contractor had and the subcontractor had, and see that those men were paid. Certainly the Federal Government would not for one minute pay money to a general contractor without knowing that the labor and other bills were paid. He is going to be followed just as the bonding company would follow him. It is just economy in time and money, and the Federal Government is dealing with the highest class of men and, having control of the money and not having to pay the contractor until he has paid all of his bills, I do not think anyone is in danger of not getting his money.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter. First, you will observe that this amendment comes in that section of the bill that deals with military posts. Second, you will note from a reading of the amendment that it provides that the Secretary of War may, with respect to contracts for public works for the Military Establishment, waive this requirement of performance and payment bond. Now, what are public works? Barracks, hospitals, installation of utilities. In fact, an amendment was adopted a moment ago which provides $201,000,000 for this very section of the bill. Consequently, you are dealing with some portion, perhaps a very substantial portion, of more than $200,000,000, that may be affected by the provisions of the language written in by the Senate, where we will waive the requirement of performance and payment bonds, under the Miller Act, if this amendment is approved. I agree that the Navy may have had a very successful operation heretofore, but in the last year they have not been under undue pressure. But let us assume that the pressure for cantonments, for buildings, for equipment, and everything else assumes that degree of intensity that we had in the World War, then you know, of course, costs will go up and fees will go up, and it becomes very material as to whether or not the contractor performs the contract in time for one thing, and whether it makes adequate provision for the material men and subcontractors for another. That is why I believe this matter is of more than passing importance. It might be well to send this back for a little further discussion.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Does the gentleman think the matter is of sufficient importance, in view of the recommendations of the Department and the Budget, to send this bill back to conference, which will probably mean that it will not pass for another week?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not if we can fashion some language in the bill here before it is completed, but $200,000,000, after all, is more than pocket money.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SNYDER. What language would you insert?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I had to do it, I would strike out all of the Senate language in the amendment numbered 6 and leave the bill stand as is, so that we recur to the provisions of the Miller Act.

Mr. SNYDER. I would say that if the gentleman had heard all of the evidence introduced by the Army and the Navy and the Budget and everybody else, I do not think he would want to strike it out.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We might save a little money, and there might be some difficulties about performance, but I do believe the House should be thoroughly advised on the situation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 8: Page 6, after line 21, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

"Funds appropriated for Organized Reserves for the fiscal year 1941 shall be available for the pay and allowances of members of the Officers' Reserve Corps who may have been or may hereafter be detailed for duty in connection with the Reserve Officers' Training Corps."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 8 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 9: Page 8, after line 14, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 101. The first sentence of the seventh paragraph of section 127a, National Defense Act, as amended by section 20 of the act of June 15, 1933 (48 Stat. 161), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'In time of war or national emergency determined by the President any officer of the Regular Army may be appointed to higher temporary grade without vacating his permanent appointment.'"

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur, and yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this amendment in the ordinary course of events naturally would go to the Committee on Military Affairs for legislative action.

General Marshall, Chief of Staff, came before the House conferees after this amendment was placed on the bill in the Senate and made what I think all of us considered a very impressive statement. I do not believe there is any difference of opinion among the House managers on it. I shall read from a memorandum which was left with the committee, because it states the matter more clearly than I could:

There has already been a considerable expansion of the Regular Army and if the situation continues to become more menacing there must naturally follow further expansion of the components of the Army of the United States, which will be developed through a period of intensive training to meet whatever may confront it. The proper development of that Army to fulfill its role depends on three important and far-reaching policies—some form of selective compulsory military service, a question now before the Congress; the authority to order the National Guard of the United States and reserve components into the service of the United States, on which action has been requested of the Congress; and, thirdly, a uniform system of temporary promotion to meet the exacting requirements of an emergency.

Legislation now exists by which temporary promotions can be made in peace or war, under the conditions contemplated in the proposed amendment by administrative action of the President, for Reserve officers, including officers of the National Guard of the United States, ordered to active duty. Paragraph 7, section 127a of the National Defense Act, amended by section 20 of the act of June 15, 1933 (48 Stat. 161), authorized the granting of temporary rank to officers of the Regular Army in time of war. To make the system uniform authority should be extended to include the Regular Army in order that all three categories may be subject to the same treatment. The legislation herewith presented will extend to an emergency period of preparation the authority granted in wartime by paragraph 7, section 127a, of the National Defense Act, as amended.

The expansion of the Regular Army is being carried out without the necessity of increasing the strength of the permanent commissioned personnel. Under the enlisted strengths for which provision has already been made, the Regular Army is short about 2,200 cap-

tains for duty with tactical organizations and 57 general officers for important tactical command and staff assignments. These requirements for temporary promotions exist at this time. Sound military organization and procedure require that these temporary promotions be made at once in order that those exercising increased responsibilities of command and staff may hold grades commensurate therewith.

We must be able properly to organize and train our armed forces as they are expanded; we must be able to procure and maintain in important positions of command and staff, officers with the knowledge, initiative, drive, and leadership which will assure maximum success in a crisis; the Army prepared in peace must be able to pass to graver responsibilities without possible danger of dislocation incident to necessary reorganization.

To effect those temporary promotions indicated above will cost not in excess of $57,200 for the fiscal year 1941. While it is impracticable at this time to estimate the total additional cost of this proposed legislation, the small cost of those temporary promotions that represent an immediate need, indicates that the additional cost will be nominal.

This is not a new proposition. Such a system prevailed during the World War.

It is now urged simply because the large expansion of personnel in the Army makes it necessary to move men temporarily to a higher grade during the emergency. At the end of the emergency those officers who are advanced will revert to their former rank.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is not a man in this House who appreciates more than I the need for movements connected with perfecting our national defense, but I call to the attention of the House that here is another legislative matter which has never been presented to the committee which has jurisdiction over the subject. I believe this provision is necessary, but at the same time I submit to the judgment of the House that it should have been put through the Committee on Military Affairs in the proper manner.

We have three components in our Army: the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Officers' Reserve Corps. We have had no hearings on this matter, we know nothing about how it will affect the other components of the Army. We have no intimation of how it will affect the future status of even the officers in the Regular Army. I call the attention of the House to the fact that several times in the past 5 or 6 years it has been necessary for the Committee on Military Affairs to bring legislation to the floor of this House in order to correct unjust conditions that crept in during the World War. We have no knowledge but that this will produce like conditions.

I submit to the House that this motion to recede and concur should be voted down, and the Committee on Military Affairs be given an opportunity to hold hearings on this matter and determine just how it will affect the future status of officers of the Regular Army, and just how it will affect the other two components of the Army.

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

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Did General Marshall make any request to be heard by the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. FADDIS. I believe he did. The Committee on Military Affairs has been so occupied with the so-called conscription bill they have had no time for any other hearings. We are still in session, however, and we can still take up matters of this kind.

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

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. I have such great confidence in General Marshall that I am for this amendment because I feel it is a necessity. But I want the gentleman to understand that I concur heartily in his statement that there is not much use of having legislative committees if we let matters of this kind be handled by the Appropriations Committee without even the courtesy and consideration of a brief hearing before the legislative committee. We have spent several months on a bill to put us on the spot in connection with the draft, but when it comes to promotion of officers in the Army the committee does not have 10 minutes of hearings. We have exclusive jurisdiction in matters of this kind. If this is to become a permanent practice, the Committee on Military Affairs may just as well adjourn sine die.

Mr. FADDIS. I agree with the gentleman, and I also have every faith in the world in General Marshall, but just the same my memory carries me back to the days of the World War when the matter of promotion was not such an urgent affair. As far as promoting officers is concerned, I have seen captains, and even lieutenants commanding battalions. I know such conditions are undesirable and should be corrected, but at the same time such methods as this are highly irregular and exceedingly dangerous. I see no reason for any rush of this kind at the present time, and I hope the House will vote down the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia and will insist on its disagreement with the Senate in this matter.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. I am in sympathy with most of what the gentleman says. This matter should have come before the Committee on Military Affairs and should have been considered by that committee as the legislative committee. But does not the gentleman feel that the emergency is such, and it has been presented by General Marshall in such a light, that we should go forward in this instance by reason of this emergency and vote for the amendment?

Mr. FADDIS. I do not feel that way at all. I do not believe the matter is urgent enough to warrant such disregard of the accepted rules of the House or the rights of one of the committees of the House. This should come back and go through the regular legislative committee of the House. It should be given hearings in order to determine just what may happen.

Mr. THOMASON. As I said, I am not opposing this amendment due to the emergency. I am backing up General Marshall to the limit in this crisis. I know, too, that the gentleman whom I am now addressing was a distinguished colonel during the World War and knows about promotions, when I know nothing. But is it not a fact this amendment does not carry one penny of appropriation? It is 100-percent legislative and is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Military Affairs, which has had no hearings about and did not anticipate it would come up this way.

Mr. FADDIS. That is absolutely true and unless it goes through the Committee on Military Affairs we have no knowledge of what the ultimate effect is going to be on either the Regular service, the National Guard, or the Reserve Corps.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. I am in accord with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but has he discussed this with his colleague, the military expert, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. FADDIS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has had no time to discuss it with anybody. General Marshall only called me a few minutes before 11 o'clock. I hope the House will vote down the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. For what purpose?

Mr. MICHENER. For the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman says this changes the situation, but that in due time and when the emergency is over, then the matter will naturally readjust itself. Now on whose determination or when will this readjustment take place? Will the Congress declare that the emergency is over? When these officers assume the new grades and this new rank, they are going to continue until the emergency is over. Who is going to terminate this emergency?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Either the Chief Executive or the Congress. The gentleman knows we have passed much legislation which contained a time limit stating, "During the existence of the emergency." Sometime when declared by the proper forum, whether it be the Chief Executive or the Congress, when the period of the emergency has ceased to exist, this will also cease to be operative.

Mr. MICHENER. The officers affected by this amendment will continue in the rank and grade given them by this proposed legislation indefinitely and for all time unless the Congress or the then Chief Executive takes affirmative action changing the status created by this legislation?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. During the World War there was such provision. General Marshall stated one of the most important things he had to contend with was his inability to reach out and get key men, men of outstanding, distinctive ability, and move them into positions which they were entitled to hold; that he found himself stalemated time and time again by the rule of seniority in the Army. He named instance after instance which I do not think would be proper to designate here. General Marshall made the statement before the conferees, and I am sure there is not a member of the committee of conference who was not impressed by his statement that this was important in the set-up of the Army.

Mr. MICHENER. The point I am trying to make is that this amendment changes the whole situation. In other words, it gives the Chief of Staff the right to go in and rerank the officers of the Army. Now, that may be advisable in some cases, but after he has done that he has vitiated and nullified all the statutes which the Congress has placed upon the statute books concerning seniority rights. This is a very important matter.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It gives him the right to make temporary promotions.

Mr. MICHENER. Those temporary promotions, according to the gentleman, will be permanent promotions unless some legislation is enacted some time changing the situation.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is a temporary promotion during the existing emergency. I do not believe there is a gentleman here who would not be willing to trust General Marshall to do that. I would, so far as I am concerned, and I believe everybody else would who knows him.

Mr. FADDIS. These will be temporary promotions, yes, but it is also true no consideration has been given as to how this will affect the other components of the service. There are three components of the service, and they are all part of the Army, and they are all entitled to justice and consideration. The only way they will receive that is to have a thorough, complete hearing before the Committee on Military Affairs, which is the committee set up by this House to handle matters of that kind, and the committee which has jurisdiction over such matters. As long as you allow departments to go around by the back door there is no limit to the extent to which any of them will go.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt the House divided, and there were—ayes 117, noes 73.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: On page 8, after line 23, insert the following:

"SEC. 102. The Secretary of War may allocate to the Corps of Engineers any of the construction works in their usual line required to carry out the national-defense program and may transfer to that agency the funds necessary for the execution of the works so allocated."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 10 with an amendment as follows:

"In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"'SEC. 102. The Secretary of War may, until June 30, 1942, allocate to the Corps of Engineers any of the construction works required to carry out the national-defense program and may transfer to that agency the funds necessary for the execution of the works so allocated.'"

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it has been urged that this amendment is not advisable in the light of our experience during the last World War. It has been urged that at that time the construction work was under the Quartermaster General of the War Department, and that a splendid record was made by securing the cooperation of engineers and other experts in private industry throughout the Nation. The fear has been expressed that this amendment, if adopted, will preclude the possibility of securing similar cooperation and result in a divided responsibility insofar as the construction work of the Department is concerned.

I did not hear the testimony of the Chief of Staff on this point before the conferees. I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] two questions: First, whether this provision was in fact approved by General Marshall, and, second, what statement he made, if any, in respect to the effect of the adoption of this amendment on the possibility of utilizing the services of engineers and experts in private industry throughout the country.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out before categorically answering the inquiry of the gentleman that the amendment we offer changes in two particulars the amendment inserted by the Senate. In the first place, we put a limitation in there on the time in which this authority may exist, putting a limitation of June 30, 1942. In the second place, we strike out language put in by the Senate, "in their usual line," which would have prevented the Army engineers from doing anything, perhaps, in the defense program except the usual flood control and that type of work.

Answering categorically the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts, General Marshall very emphatically endorsed this provision. He pointed out the fact that it in no way was an effort to tread upon the prerogatives of the Quartermaster General, that the Quartermaster General of the Army customarily was geared up to do a construction total of about $10,000,000 a year, that under the defense program that figure had been skyrocketed to something like half a billion dollars, and that he did not have the set-up to do this work, whereas they had in many places over the country district engineers of the Army all set up and ready to go, especially qualified to do this work, and they could go right into the program immediately. He also said that it was very urgent, and that it did seem to him that having this facility for this construction work, with the capacity to perform it expeditiously, he ought to be permitted to use that facility. That is what he wanted to do. He very emphatically endorsed it, and stated that it would not in any way affect the regular routine work of the Quartermaster General's office.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: On page 9, after line 2, insert the following:

"SEC. 103. Section 1 (c) of the act of July 2, 1940 (Public, No. 703, 76th Cong.), is amended by deleting therefrom the words 'for supplies or construction', and the words 'of such supplies or construction.'"

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 11 and concur in the same with the following amendment: "In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

" 'SEC. 103. Section 1 (c) of the act of July 2, 1940 (Public, No. 703, 76th Cong.) is amended by deleting therefrom the words "for supplies or construction for," inserting in lieu thereof the word "with," and deleting the words "of such supplies or construction." ' "

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the effect of the amendment would be to make it possible to advance this 30 percent on all types of contracts. If the amendment as recommended by the conferees is adopted, the law will read as follows:

Whenever, prior to July 1, 1942, the Secretary of War deems it necessary in the interest of the national defense, he is authorized, from appropriations available therefor, to advance payments to contractors with the War Department in amounts not exceeding 30 percent of the contract price. Such advances shall be made upon such terms and conditions and with such adequate security as the Secretary of War shall prescribe.

Heretofore it just applied to construction or supplies. Now it may be applied to everything.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Will this apply, then, to contracts for the building of civilian training schools for Army pilots?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is the purpose of it, as I understand, to enable them to make advances of that sort.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. The amendment which has been agreed upon and which has just been read would permit of advances for that purpose?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: On page 10, line 1, insert the following: ": *Provided*, That the first proviso under the appropriation 'Miscellaneous expenses, Office of the Secretary,' contained in title I of the act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year 1941 is hereby repealed."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: On page 10, after line 13, insert the following:

"The paragraph under the subheading 'Naval Reserve' of title I of the Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1941 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided further*, That nothing in the immediately preceding proviso shall be deemed to prevent the use of any such appropriation for the purpose of paying the pay, allowances, travel, or other expenses of any such officer or enlisted man of the Naval or Marine Corps Reserve who may surrender such pension disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay for the period of his active duty in the Navy or Marine Corps.' "

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: On page 11, in line 13, insert the following: "and, in addition, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, prior to July 1, 1941, to enter into contracts to an amount not in excess of $15,000,000 for the purposes for which this appropriation is available."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 22: On page 11 after line 22, insert:

"MAINTENANCE, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

"For maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, including the purchase of 12 motor busses at a cost not to exceed $4,500 each, $2,000,000: *Provided*, That the limitation fixed in the Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1941, approved June 11, 1940, for expenditures for the maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, etc., is increased during the fiscal year 1941 from $100,000 to $110,000."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 39: On page 28, after line 14, insert:

"The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to continue the employment, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, of such employees now carried on the rolls as will be required for the preparation of plans and specifications and administrative work in connection with the public-works and public-utilities projects mentioned in this act."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 45: On page 32, beginning in line 1, insert:

"There may be detailed to the Bureau of Navigation not to exceed at any one time 25 enlisted men of the Navy in lieu of the 7 enlisted men as authorized by the Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1941, and to the Bureau of Operations not to exceed at any one time 12 enlisted men of the Navy in addition to those detailed to Naval Communications and the Office of Naval Intelligence."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 46: On page 32, after line 7, strike out lines 8, 9, and 10.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment and yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this is the part of the appropriation bill that was an amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] to repeal "the first proviso in section 8 (b) of the act approved June 28, 1940—Public, No. 671"; and that proviso is—

That the Secretary of the Navy is further authorized under the general direction of the President, whenever he deems any existing manufacturing plant or facility necessary for national defense and when he is unable to arrive at an agreement with the owner of any such plant for its use or operation, to take over and operate such plant or facility either by Government personnel or by contract with private firms.

This means the confiscation of property in violation of the Constitution.

Now, unless this is repealed, if either the Smith amendment to the draft bill or the Vinson substitute is adopted, the language will stand there absolutely ridiculous and absolutely unconstitutional, and I do not think the House ought to yield on this item.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I respectfully invite the attention of the House to the fact that this is a very important matter, because it has relation to two bills now under consideration, the conscription bill and this money bill now under consideration, and whatever we do here we do not want

to be contradictory. The amendment that I offered to the second supplemental national-defense appropriation bill repealed the provision referred to by the gentleman from New York. The Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations concurred in that action, but when the amendment offered to the conscription bill by Senator RUSSELL was adopted it also repealed the provision to which the gentleman from New York referred. That is the parliamentary situation now confronting us, and therefore it looks to me like the proper way to clear it up is for the House conferees to agree with the Senate in not repealing this language, because the Russell amendment or the Smith amendment will do that very thing. If you do it in the way suggested by the gentleman from New York, then you will have the Russell amendment or the Smith amendment amending something that has already been repealed. The House is going to repeal this language in one way or the other, and the only way to repeal it is to go along in the orderly way set out by the conferees and agree to the Senate amendment, concurring in their refusal to repeal it, for the reason that the Russell amendment to the conscription bill is an amendment which already strikes out that language. I think, if the gentleman will permit, we should go along and adopt the Smith amendment or the Vinson substitute which would automatically repeal this language. The Russell amendment has already provided for the repeal of that section.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York permit me to answer the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Is it not true that if we undertake to send this bill back to conference on account of this amendment, it unquestionably will have to wait in conference until the House finally has passed on the conscription bill before the conferees would know what to agree to, whereas, if the House takes the action recommended by the conferees, the whole matter then will be disposed of?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; and you will have only one statute dealing with it; otherwise you are liable to have two statutes, one in the appropriation bill and one in the conscription bill; and the House is in thorough accord with repealing it and modifying it along the lines suggested either in the Smith amendment or the substitute that I have been talking about offering. The parliamentary procedure is such that the conferees should accede to the Senate striking out this repeal owing entirely to the fact that the Russell amendment or the Smith amendment or my substitute will repeal this section.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield to me, so that I may query the gentleman?

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

Mr. CHURCH. I want the membership of this House to be consistent and our worthy chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee to be consistent. First, on page 11376 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 3, our chairman said—and we have a right to rely on it:

> There is nothing radical about the amendment I propose.

And that is your amendment.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. CHURCH. That is your amendment and you admit there are four propositions here to draft these plants, and that yours is the safest one. The one the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is speaking against is the worst and most drastic one. The gentleman from Georgia said the other day, September 3, further quoting from page 11376 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> I would like to see this amendment placed in H. R. 10263.

That is the present bill. The members of the Naval Affairs Committee and the House voted unanimously July 31 to repeal the provision in Public, No. 671, and have a right to rely on that statement made by the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House on September 3.

Further quoting him there:

> I would like to see this amendment placed in H. R. 10263 by the House conferees in lieu of the House amendment that was stricken out by the Senate, and I would like to see it substituted for the Russell amendment in the conscription bill.

On June 22, when many of the Members of this House were absent because of the convention at Philadelphia the next week, even our chairman and the ranking member of the minority on the Naval Affairs Committee did not know the effect of that language that was passed on that day conscripting these plants, and that has been admitted. We took that up in the House Naval Affairs Committee in executive session. We have a right to rely on the statement of our good chairman in the RECORD of September 3. He should offer today, in lieu of this motion, his amendment, which is the least harmful of all of these amendments. Are you going to put this House on record today as undoing everything it did by unanimous vote on July 31?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the result of this whole thing is this: It is going to be a very easy matter for anyone who is going to offer an amendment to the draft bill to bring it in as an amendment to paragraph (b) of section 8, while if none of these things happen you would still have section 8, subdivision (b) with the first proviso on the statute books. Why not have this bill repeal the whole proviso that is so bad and get rid of it when we have it before us, instead of throwing it out of this bill and taking a chance that something will be done to correct it later on? It does not seem to me that is the way to do the job. It seems to me that we ought to clean it up and get rid of it.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Apparently we are all in agreement that the provision in the act of June 1940 should be repealed. It seems to me to be orderly procedure to repeal it and then to reenact either the Russell proposal or the Smith proposal or the Vinson proposal. It is not necessary for continuance on the statute books of this provision of the act of June 1940, for the enactment of either the Russell, Smith, or Vinson proposal.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. This is a very important matter.

Mr. TABER. I hope the gentleman will not insist upon that. I think we can take care of it and get the Members here to vote if we need them.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, if we can get some time here—I indicated to the gentleman from Virginia a while ago that I wanted a little time to discuss this. I would just as soon have the gentleman from New York or the gentleman from Georgia discuss it. The House Members, every one of them then present, voted against this on July 31. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is now asking the House to reverse itself. What respect will the people of the United States have for the Congress if it does that sort of thing?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think the gentleman is getting a little excited about the matter.

Mr. CHURCH. I am not excited. I am surprised, though, because the gentleman from Virginia does not insist on the action taken by this House by unanimous vote on July 31; nor are we to follow what the chairman of our committee said the other day—September 3—in the RECORD, that the substitute amendment which he has prepared and which he recommends should be offered.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman from Illinois took most of the time I yielded to the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order that a quorum is not present?

Mr. KEAN. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Would the gentleman permit me to make a statement first? Will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. KEAN. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I hope the gentleman will not take 25 minutes time for a roll call. The passage of this defense measure is of vital importance. It has been delayed time and time again—not in this body but in the other body—and I hope the gentleman will permit us to go ahead.

Mr. KEAN. If the gentleman will give plenty of time to discuss the matter, I will withdraw my point of order.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have not cut off anybody. I have yielded to everybody who has asked for time.

Mr. CHURCH. You just criticized the time the gentleman from New York yielded to me.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. KEAN. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me we are making a great mistake if we throw this out of the bill and do not now repeal that language which everyone seems to recognize should be wiped out. If we try to tie in amendments to that bad language and the amendments slip up, or anything of that kind should happen, the language would still be on the statute books. I think that should be wiped out of the bill. I think that is all I have to say on the subject.

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

Mr. TABER. I believe it would be better for the gentleman from Illinois to take some time himself.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs if the statement I have made is not true; namely, in his statement on September 3 he expressed the hope that his amendment that he prepared and put in the RECORD on that day would be accepted by the conferees. Certainly we cannot get it accepted unless he presses it, unless he offers it here today. I believe he is willing to do it if we get the time. I have no reason to believe but that he will offer it, and if he offers it I shall not need to take time now. I would like to ask our chairman if he will not offer that amendment.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman from Virginia said he would yield me some time, and I will answer the gentleman at that time.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, then, while I am on the floor let me emphasize what I stated a while ago that the House on July 31 unanimously voted to repeal that provision. When it got to the Senate, hearings were held. They have been referred to. The only mention in the hearings of the Senate committee were these words on page 213:

Second supplemental national defense appropriation bill 1941, on H. R. 10263:

Senator RUSSELL. Does the Navy Department make any recommendation as to the Vinson amendment repealing the commandeering power?

I want the attention, Mr. Speaker, of the House and of my chairman.

I repeat:

Does the Navy Department make any recommendation as to the Vinson amendment repealing the commandeering power?

Admiral MOREELL. I do not believe the Navy Department has made any statement on that, one way or the other.

Captain ALLEN. The Secretary of the Navy would like this bill to stand as it comes from the House with that repeal in it.

Senator RUSSELL. He is a great advocate of conscripting manpower, though.

Senator BYRNES. Do you have anything else, Admiral?

Admiral MOREELL. That is all I have.

Those are the only words in the Senate committee hearings that have anything to do with this.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, when the House amendment was repealed in the other body there were less than 10 Senators on the floor. When the other body came to this last amendment it was referred to casually, and at least half a dozen Senators were asking: "What page? What page? What page?" And the RECORD shows that when they came to this amendment some Senator asked, "What page?" And the amendment was adopted striking this out without a Senator, except the author of the amendment to strike it out, realizing its import.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has been criticized the Nation over because of its action on the 22d of June. This Congress, on July 31, unanimously undid what it did on June 22. I do not want this Congress to approve the gentleman's motion. I want the Congress to vote down the motion. Vote "No." Otherwise this Congress on one day votes unanimously to take out this provision and then another day, today, votes in just the opposite way.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] that there is nothing to get excited about. We all have the same objective in mind and are trying to accomplish the same thing. The only difference is that of the method by which it shall be done.

Let me say at the very outset that I am just as much in favor of the repeal of the section in the so-called speed-up act of June 28, as is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], or anyone else. The parliamentary situation is such that the only question here is the proper way to proceed to accomplish the purpose desired.

When this bill was before the House some weeks ago, I offered an amendment to section 8 (b) of the act of June 28. It was adopted unanimously. We all wanted that section repealed, and it should have been repealed, because, as I stated then, it delegated powers far beyond what should have been given to the Secretaries of War and Navy or to the President in time of limited emergency. When that bill reached the Senate it naturally was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. That committee went one step further and also repealed the second proviso, while my amendment repealed only the first proviso in section 8 (b).

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman would look at No. 4, he has repealed the first proviso and the Senate has repealed the first and second.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right. The second proviso is meaningless without the first proviso.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman does not mean to leave any other impression but that both provisos should be repealed, does he? It was just an inadvertence that the gentleman's amendment did not include the two provisos appearing in my statement on page 9754 of the RECORD of July 31. These two provisos are the two provisos repealed by my bill that our committee unanimously agreed should be passed, and it was intended that day on the floor that both provisos above referred to by me should be repealed. My chairman, I believe, is confused about that.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. When I offered my amendment I distinctly limited it to these particular words:

The first proviso in section 8 (b) of the act approved June 28, 1940 (Public, No. 671), is hereby repealed.

That amendment was adopted and that is what we did when the appropriation bill was here originally. When the bill got to the Senate, the Senate Committee on Appropriations, by an amendment to my amendment, repealed both

the first and second provisos. In other words, my amendment, as amended by the Senate committee, had the effect of nullifying the following language:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy is further authorized, under the general direction of the President, whenever he deems any existing manufacturing plant or facility necessary for the national defense, and whenever he is unable to arrive at an agreement with the owner of any such plant or facility for its use or operation, to take over and operate such plant or facility either by Government personnel or by contract with private firms: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to fix the compensation to the owner of such plant or facility.

So the sum and substance of what the Senate committee did was to repeal all of that which I have just read.

The bill was reported to the Senate. In the meantime the conscription bill came on the floor of the Senate and during the debate on the conscription bill Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, offered an amendment in which he expressly provided for the repeal of the language which I have just read to the House and which we partly repealed when we had this pending bill up in the House before. Then the Senate passed the conscription bill with the Russell amendment written into it.

When this bill was in the Senate, and I refer to this appropriation bill, Senator MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, moved to disagree to the committee's report repealing the two provisos of section 8 (b), owing to the fact that the Senate had struck out such provisos in the Russell amendment to the conscription bill.

I think everyone in the House can now understand the situation. If there were not pending the Russell amendment, if there were not pending the Smith amendment, if there were not pending the Vinson substitute, I would be advocating with every faculty that I possess that this language which I read be repealed and wiped out of the law.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COLE of New York. Where would we be then if neither the Russell proposal, the Smith proposal, or the gentleman's proposal is adopted by the Congress?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. You would be right under this law, there is no two ways about that. That would be the only law on the statute books dealing with the matter.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, all I am seeking to do is to have the matter adjusted in one measure. It would be in order to offer right here an amendment to concur with an amendment and put in the Smith amendment or the substitute that I propose to offer to the Smith amendment. But what would be the result of that? The result of that would be that the conferees would be tied up waiting to see what will happen with reference to an amendment along the same line in the conscription bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not only would they be tied up all that time, but they would be tied up until the conference report was finally agreed to on the conscription bill; is that not true?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes. The only sensible thing to do is to agree to the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia to concur in the action of the Senate striking out this repeal proposal, for the reason that the House has to pass one way or the other upon the Russell amendment or the Smith amendment. When that is done, that will be the only law on the statute books relating to the commandeering of property. That is the proper way to proceed. I have no desire to keep this on the statute books and I am just as earnest in my effort to wipe it off the statute books and to have an intelligent, comprehensive, constitutional provision in the law. For the reasons set forth above I am supporting the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CHURCH. In the RECORD of September 3, in the language I have quoted, the gentleman indicated that he would offer his amendment. Does he not think we have a right to rely on that?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right, but to offer my amendment at this point only "gums up the cards." The amendment will be offered, and it is in the RECORD here, to the Smith amendment and by offering that amendment to the Smith amendment, assuming its adoption, it not only will repeal the Russell amendment or nullify the Russell amendment, but will absolutely wipe out the first and second provisos of section 8 (b) of the act of June 28.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman, knowing all those things, as late as September 3, just the other day, stated what I have said, and he has just now stated that he wants this thing repealed. Why not do it here.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Well, there are two ways to do it.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I hope we are not to be placed in the position of reversing our unanimous action of the other day. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will vote down the gentleman's motion to recede and concur.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CHURCH) there were—ayes 143, noes 75.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 48: On page 32, after line 20, insert the following:

"SEC. 201. To the President for allocation to the War Department and the Navy Department for projects for temporary dwellings to be constructed and operated under the direction of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps for housing persons engaged in national-defense activities under their direction, and for allocation to such other agencies of the United States as the President may determine upon the recommendation of the Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy for the construction of housing projects for persons engaged in national-defense activities or for loans (at such interest rates as the President may fix) for the construction of such projects, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, in localities where the President determines, upon the recommendation of the War or Navy Department, that there is an acute shortage of housing which impedes the national-defense program and that the necessary housing would not otherwise be provided when needed, $100,000,000, to be immediately and continuously available."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 48, and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 201. To the President for allocation to the War Department and the Navy Department for the acquisition of necessary land and the construction of housing units, including necessary utilities, roads, walks, and accessories, at locations on or near Military or Naval Establishments, now in existence or to be built, or near privately owned industrial plants engaged in military or naval activities, which, for the purposes of this act, shall be construed to include activities of the Maritime Commission, where the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Chairman of the Maritime Commission shall certify that such housing is important for purposes under their respective jurisdiction and necessary to the national-defense program, $100,000,000: *Provided*, That the average unit cost of such housing projects, including acquisitions of land and the installation of necessary utilities, roads, walks, accessories, and collateral expenses, shall not be in excess of $3,500: *Provided further*, That in carrying out the purposes of this section the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may utilize such other agencies of the United States as they may determine upon: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, at their discretion, are hereby authorized to rent such housing units, upon completion, to enlisted men of the Army, Navy,

Marine Corps with families, to field employees of the Military and Naval Establishments with families, and to workers with families who are engaged, or to be engaged, in industries essential to the military and naval national-defense programs, including work on ships under the control of the Maritime Commission. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are further authorized to use such rentals as may be collected from each housing project for the management and maintenance of the housing units therein, including utilities, roads, walks, and accessories, and to set up special reserve accounts for the amortization of the cost of the project: *Provided further*, That the authority of existing law for the negotiation of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts shall be applicable to housing projects for which funds may be made available to the War and Navy Departments or the Maritime Commission."

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I hope this will not put the War Department and the Navy Department in the real-estate business, renting and subletting these housing projects, knowing as I do that they have enough other worries and troubles.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It puts them in to the extent that the language states. It permits them when they build these facilities to rent them to the people, if you call that putting them into the real-estate business. I do not believe it does, however. These are for furnishing facilities. Of course, the only renting that will be done is where houses are built for industries connected with the defense, and they rent the houses to the people who live in them.

Mr. SABATH. I understand that another committee of the House has had before it and has reported a bill to do the same thing as is provided here.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not believe there is any conflict between the two, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. I should like to know from the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds whether this will in any way conflict with his bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am going to yield to the gentleman in just a moment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives has had before it for several days a bill for national-defense housing, authorizing an appropriation. The bill is sponsored by the Council of National Defense, by the War Department, and by the Navy Department. The bill has to do primarily with the housing of civilian workers at the various plants which will be established under appropriations heretofore made and which are already in existence. The need for such housing seems to be very acute. The statement has been made by those in authority that even the amount included in the amendment to this bill plus the amount included in the bill today reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will not be sufficient to meet the need.

There is a necessity for speed in providing this defense housing, in view of the fact that the winter is coming on, and we wish to obviate insofar as possible the likelihood of an epidemic of flu or other disease that may arise by reason of improper housing for our established defense forces and for workers. Many of these plants will be in isolated places, necessarily, where there is at present no provision for housing, and this housing will have to be quickly constructed and in many, if not in most instances, it will be of a temporary character.

The bill that has been reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has in it restrictions with reference to the various features of this national-defense housing.

With reference to the amendment that is pending before us, I understand that it was designed primarily to permit the Army and the Navy to do construction that is immediately necessary in the carrying out of their own work at their various posts and their various plants. I believe the construction provided herein should be restricted as much as possible to that purpose, and that the funds should not be diverted except insofar as is absolutely necessary, to the housing of civilian workers at these various posts, and only in those plants which are adjacent to the posts of the departments that are recited herein, because I believe the Army and the Navy need for themselves the amount of money here provided, inasmuch as we are increasing the forces of the Army and the Navy and those additional forces must be housed.

I hope that the great bulk of the housing for civilian workers will be carried on under the bill that has been reported today from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, because it contains restrictions with reference to the various features of this construction and announces very definite policies.

May I say that I believe it is more or less urgent for this amendment to go through, as suggested by the gentleman from Virginia, for the reason that some of this construction must be begun at once, and the money that is made available here will naturally, in view of the fact that this is an appropriation bill, become available for that purpose more speedily than under the bill today reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, inasmuch as the latter bill will have to pass through legislative consideration in the two Chambers.

Let me repeat that I believe the funds that are provided should be restricted insofar as possible to carrying out the necessary housing for these departments themselves, and that no more of it should be diverted than necessary to the purposes that will be accomplished by the bill today reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I believe that what is so diverted should be for those plants which are adjacent to or in relative proximity to the Army and Navy posts and establishments of the Maritime Commission.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

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

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

Mr. SABATH. So the gentleman is satisfied there will be no duplication between the work that is to be done under this appropriation and the work that is to be done under the gentleman's bill?

Mr. LANHAM. From the information before the committee there will be no duplication whatever. I am hoping, therefore, that the appropriation that is made here will be restricted principally to the Army and the Navy and the Maritime Commission and the Marine Corps, and their particular housing needs in view of our expanded program, and that as little of it as possible may be diverted to the purposes contained in the bill reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and that such as should be necessarily diverted will be with reference to plants that are so adjacent to the various posts of the Army and the Navy that they could with dispatch carry on that work.

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

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

Mr. HOLMES. I want to ask the gentleman if we are not dealing with two entirely different problems here.

Mr. LANHAM. Absolutely so.

Mr. HOLMES. As I understand the situation, and I have been on the committee with the chairman and have listened to the testimony on this other authorization bill for several days in connection with building houses for the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, they will be more or less of a permanent nature, while the bill that is before our committee deals more with temporary buildings for housing civilian employees in connection with our defense program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. And, in addition to what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES] has said, our bill not only provides for definite policies and restrictions in such construction, but that we may recoup much of that money by the disposition of the property after the time of emergency that makes it necessary has passed.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a further observation?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes; and I may say that the gentleman from Massachusetts is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HOLMES. I want to say to the chairman of the committee that I approve the proviso the gentleman has inserted in this amendment, because when the Army and the Navy came before our committee urging the adoption of the bill which we have already reported, they assured us that none of their activities would in any shape or manner conflict with the authority which was sought in the other bill, and as I understand it the proviso put in by the conferees is that the Army and the Navy, when it comes to the matter of building homes for civilian employees connected with naval establishments or industrial plants, under this amendment can turn over to the Department of Public Works and let them handle that type of work along with the authorization under our bill.

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

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER. Not to bring another factor into this matter, but last week the U. S. H. A. released $4,000,000 in the city of Hartford for housing of employees of two industrial plants, Colts and Aircraft, but not built under the U. S. H. A. I mean by that no subsidy whatever for housing facilities. Is there going to be a conflict there? The thought I have in mind is that they have these local authorities, and we will not go into that now, that have a good deal of valuable information and experience and I am wondering if the gentleman's committee has given consideration to making use of existing local authorities.

Mr. LANHAM. I will say to the gentleman from Connecticut that our committee has given very attentive consideration to that very matter and to all housing agencies that may be helpful, and I think he will see from our bill as amended that it will meet the situation exactly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute that he may yield to our colleague from Illinois.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. As I understood the gentleman's interesting statement of his bill, I was fearful that the measure confined whatever expenditure might be involved only to those places to house civilian employees that were adjacent to existing Naval or Army Establishments.

Mr. LANHAM. Oh, no; the bill reported by the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee provides for them throughout our domain, and inasmuch as it does so I was hopeful that the bulk of the $100,000,000 provided by this amendment would be used by the Army and the Navy for their own housing purposes, for their expanding forces, and that as little of it as possible would be diverted to purposes that are provided for otherwise.

Mr. McKEOUGH. There is no restrictive requirement in the event of the establishment of a new industry where housing facilities for civilians are absent. Under the provisions of your measure, I presume there is sufficient discretion left with the Army and the Navy and the Defense Commission to spend some of that money in that direction.

Mr. LANHAM. The Army, the Navy, the Council of Defense, and many others appeared before our committee and there is complete understanding and no duplication with reference to the functions of these two measures.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. DARDEN of Virginia. Can the War Department and the Navy Department transfer this money to any other department for its utilization or are they restricted to spending it themselves in the interest of housing?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They cannot transfer the funds as such; that is, they cannot allocate them. They can only get the Public Works Agency or any other existing agency to do the job for them, if they wish to do so, but they cannot allocate the funds.

Mr. DARDEN of Virginia. But they can spend the money through those agencies?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the amendment carries the language "that in carrying out the purposes of this section the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may utilize such other agencies of the United States as they may determine upon." This means that the United States Housing Authority or any other incompetent outfit can be hauled into this operation. I cannot go along with the amendment with that language in it, and the parliamentary situation is such that I cannot offer an amendment to the amendment. Therefore I am placed in the position of being obliged to oppose it. If we are going to have that racketeering outfit in the construction of these buildings, we are just going to be in a mess. At the present time Admiral Moreell told the committee that they are building these outfits and taking care of these people with outfits that cost about $2,400 a unit, including the utilities. That is a unit for a family. This raises it to $3,500. If the housing racket gets into this, they will run it up to $3,500 and keep it there. I cannot see why we should let that outfit get their fingers on anything, and I cannot vote for anything that will let them in.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. I wish to say to the gentleman that in the bill reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds we limited it to $3,000 for continental United States, $4,000 outside of continental United States, and we also placed a ceiling of $3,950 beyond which they could not build a home for anybody in the United States, and $4,750 for anyone outside of the United States.

Mr. TABER. Did you not also turn the job over to the public buildings branch of the public-works outfit?

Mr. HOLMES. That is right.

Mr. TABER. Rather than this other outfit?

Mr. HOLMES. And authorized them to use any other unit in connection with the carrying out of the program.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I was interested in the gentleman's observation about the housing racket and his reference to the United States Housing Authority. I do not understand from a casual reading of the amendment that it necessarily follows at all that the United States Housing Authority will have anything to do with the administration of this, and I would like to have the gentleman's further statement about that.

Mr. TABER. Well, it says this:

> That in carrying out the purposes of this section the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may utilize such other agencies of the United States as they may determine upon.

That means that they may determine upon and turn over the construction of these buildings to the United States Housing Authority or any other outfit that is doing building in the different departments of the Government.

Mr. COLMER. There are a number of agencies in addition to the United States Housing Authority?

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes; but they can use this Housing Authority. I do not believe in letting them get a crack at it. I believe that a great deal of this will be turned over to them if we pass the bill with this language in it. I cannot support it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. From all the testimony before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds we feel that the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Public

Works Agency are not going to turn the building of these projects over to the United States Housing Authority on the same terms and conditions as they have been building homes. They will only be of a temporary nature and there will not be the eligibility rules nor any of the other matters which made the United States Housing Authority projects so expensive, such as community facilities and different matters of that sort. It will be more a matter of temporary necessary housing projects under the direct supervision of Mr. Carmody, of the P. W. A.

Mr. TABER. It would be a good deal better if this job was done by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy with their own outfits and not monkey with these people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask the gentleman a question in this way, to find out from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES] if his committee is now establishing the precedent of building family units in Puerto Rico and Hawaii, for instance, that run $1,200 to $1,750 above the cost of family units in the continental United States. Is that what I understood the gentleman to say?

Mr. HOLMES. No. We are placing a limit of $4,000 above which no family unit can be built, outside of continental United States. We placed that limit there because when you come to build units in Alaska you will find it is more expensive than building them in Florida or even in Hawaii. But the evidence produced before our committee was that the average would be around $2,000 or less.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But all of the testimony we have had before the Insular Affairs Committee and the Banking and Currency Committee indicates that the cost of building family units on the islands would run much less than in the United States. Are we establishing a precedent that you can go into those islands and put up family units at a greater cost?

Mr. HOLMES. Not at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It sounds that way.

Mr. HOLMES. Certainly not.

Mr. IZAC. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. Surely there is nothing in this provision that would prevent the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Navy Department putting up these homes in the vicinity of the navy yards?

Mr. TABER. Nothing to prevent them doing it, no. I am not going to object to their doing it themselves, but I do object to their turning it over to this United States Housing Authority. I am going to oppose the proposition for that reason.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have questioned the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, as to whether there will be any complications should this appropriation as well as the bill reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be passed. They assured me that there would not be any such complications.

Mr. Speaker, there might have been some justice in the criticism of the program and policies pursued prior to the establishment of the United States Housing Authority and before the appointment of the present Administrator, Mr. Straus. Today, thanks to the tireless efforts and energy of Mr. Straus, construction costs of dwellings for workers are as low as they have ever been and are constantly being reduced, and therefore I consider the repeated attacks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] as entirely uncalled for, unwarranted, and unjustified. I can attribute his remarks to no other cause but a deep-rooted prejudice against the policy of the Government taking people out of the slums and housing them in decent, sanitary, and healthy surroundings at a cost as low or lower than the rents previously paid by them.

I challenge the gentleman from New York to show waste, mismanagement, or graft under the administration of Mr. Straus. The record is clear and unimpeachable.

In this connection I want, first, to point out and clearly emphasize that the U. S. H. A. is not engaged in actual construction of low-cost housing projects. Each of the projects are built under direct control and supervision of local authorities, the members of which are high public-spirited citizens interested in social welfare. They are acquainted with the needs of the locality and the most effective and expeditious way in which to achieve those objectives. The members of the local boards are appointed by the mayor in each locality, and every member of the local authority serves without compensation. The U. S. H. A. is the financial agency engaged in loaning money to the local authorities to carry on the work. All of the moneys so loaned are amply secured, and every cent loaned is being paid back, and will be paid back with interest.

It is also to be remembered that the U. S. H. A. is a pioneer in the field of housing without benefit of precedence or experience of others. As with all experimentation, necessary in carrying out a program successfully, the Authority has set remarkable standards and has established staggering and most impressive records in low-cost housing and low-cost rentals. These are all matters of record and suggest that my colleague from New York acquaint himself with some of the facts and not base his conclusions on gossip and hearsay. I am sure that U. S. H. A. would be only too happy to furnish him with any information he desires.

Now, what are the facts about the present U. S. H. A. program under Administrator Straus? Here they are:

LOW RENTS

Average shelter rents range from a low of $6.32 per dwelling per month to a high of $17.86, with a Nation-wide average of $12.92.

ACTUALLY SERVES LOWEST INCOME FAMILIES

The average income of tenants ranging from a low of $442 to a high of $1,110 in a project in the largest city with the highest levels of income and costs of living, with a Nation-wide average annual income of $782.

REHOUSES SLUM DWELLERS

Only families actually living in slums and substandard dwellings are accepted for occupancy. Rents are well within means of present slum dwellers.

PROGRESS OF PROGRAM

U. S. H. A. has made contracts with local authorities for 424 projects with a total of 145,126 dwelling units. These projects are located in 193 localities in 35 States and Territories.

Construction is under way on 244 projects with 90,436 dwelling units. There are 64 projects now ready for occupancy with a total of 22,807 dwelling units.

LOW CONSTRUCTION COSTS

The net construction cost of U. S. H. A. houses—including plumbing, heating, and electrical installation—ranges down to $2,000, with an average of $2,734 per house, or more than 20 percent below the cost of private construction in the same localities. Over-all cost of new housing—including land, site improvements, architectural fees, and all overheads—ranges down to $3,000 with a Nation-wide average of $4,359 for durable, decent, modern housing built under prevailing wages and with a life expectancy of 60 years.

SLUMS BEING CLEARED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LAW

Every contract requires that slum dwellings must be eliminated equal in number to the new dwellings to be built. Up

to date 32,000 old slum dwellings have actually been eliminated. A total of 160,000 will be eliminated as part of the present program.

NET COST OF PROGRAM TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The loans made by U. S. H. A. are repaid in full with interest and will involve absolutely no cost to the Federal Government.

The only cost to the Government—aside from U. S. H. A. administrative overhead—is represented by annual contributions. The maximum contracts now authorized provide for only $28,000,000 per year. Due to operating economies the subsidy has been reduced from a maximum of 3.5 percent to 2.8 percent. Moreover, the U. S. H. A. is borrowing money at a lower rate than that at which it loans to the local authorities; and this interest spread further reduces the net cost to only $13,400,000 per year.

NET COST PER FAMILY

The net cost per family will average $6 per month or only $1.50 per person. This is an extremely low figure in relation to the social benefits of the program.

NO COMPETITION WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

The only families admitted to U. S. H. A.-aided projects are those who have been forced to live in the slums because they cannot afford decent housing. Public-housing projects are never approved by the U. S. H. A. unless the proposed rents are far below the lowest rents at which decent privately owned homes are available.

STIMULATES BUSINESS

Public housing projects are carried out by private industry. Land and materials are bought through normal channels, all contracts are let to private architects, engineers, and contractors, and labor is employed through usual channels of the building industry. Public housing affords needed employment for idle capital and labor.

It is regrettable that in carrying on so noble a work the housing officials are being charged with lobbying activities. As chairman of the Rules Committee I am well acquainted with lobbying activities, but not once have I or do I know of any other Member who has been approached concerning U. S. H. A. legislation by officials of the Authority. I am, however, approached day after day by numerous civic organizations, social and welfare boards, labor organizations, and many other public bodies interested in such high social purposes. These groups are vitally interested in the program and are constantly calling my attention to the needs in the localities all over the country. That U. S. H. A. officials are engaged in such practices is wholly untrue and only a figment of my colleague's imagination, highly exaggerated, in his effort to blast and destroy that which has been so difficult to build and create.

It is the easiest thing in the world to make charges and accusations, but I defy the gentleman from New York or any other man to substantiate any such reckless charge as he has made. Mr. Speaker, I cannot conclude without resenting what, to my mind, are cheap insinuations reflecting on the personnel of the United States Housing Authority, and for that reason I am inserting the names of the outstanding officials to whom credit is due in bringing that agency to such a high point of efficiency that persons living in the communities where such projects are located point with pride to their achievements.

The Honorable John M. Carmody, Chief of the Federal Works Agency, is in general charge of the Authority. He is a man whose record of ability, honesty, and integrity cannot be questioned.

Mr. Straus, as Administrator, needs no introduction. He has been a businessman of long standing, and comes from an outstanding family distinguished for its activities in the field of public welfare. I know Mr. Straus personally and have the highest regard for his ability in administering a project of this character. He is doing an admirable job, and is highly respected by all who come in contact with him.

Mr. Leon H. Keyserling, Deputy Administrator and Acting General Counsel, is also personally known to me. He is very likable, courteous, and considerate. He has, for many years, been a student of housing problems. He is a keen observer, is extremely conscientious, and certainly well qualified for the position he occupies.

Although I am not personally acquainted with the other officials of the Authority I know that each of them are of high caliber. Each of them has had years of experience in problems of public housing and each is outstanding in his or her respective profession.

Leon H. Keyserling, Deputy Administrator and Acting General Counsel.

William T. Seaver, Assistant Administrator.

Warren Jay Vinton, Chief Economist and Planning Officer.

Thomas M. Hall, Executive Officer.

Regional Directors:

Region No. 1, Sumner Wiley.

Region No. 2, John T. Egan.

Region No. 3, Oliver Winston.

Region No. 4, James P. Broome.

Region No. 5, William K. Divers.

Region No. 6, Marshall W. Amis.

Region No. 7, Winters Haydock.

H. Lyle Campbell, Director of Construction Review Division.

S. J. Elson, Director of Finance and Accounts Division.

Charles E. V. Prins, Director of Informational Service Division.

Walter V. Price, Director of Labor Relations Division.

H. Tudor Morsell, Director of Land Review Division.

David L. Krooth, Director of Legal Division.

Russel Cook, Director of Personnel Division.

Romer Shawhan, Director of Projects Division.

Frank T. Horne, Acting Director of Racial Relations.

James W. Routh, Director of Research and Statistics Division.

Rudolph Nedved, Coordinator for Rural Housing.

Albert C. Shire, Director of Technical Division.

T. J. Carolan, Director of Office Service Division.

Lee F. Johnson, Tyrrell Krum (press relations), Special Assistants to the Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, so much for the regular program of the Authority. I will now take but a moment on the part of the Authority in the program of national defense. In recognition of the acute need for housing as part of the defense program, Congress passed a law which conferred powers upon the War and Navy Departments and the U. S. H. A. to undertake or assist in national-defense housing projects. This law, Public, No. 671, was approved by the President on June 28 of this year. It did not make any new moneys available, but some projects have been started with a small amount of funds which the U. S. H. A. has been able to make available. Under Public Law No. 671, the President has called upon the War and Navy Departments to undertake some of the defense housing projects. However, in most cases the War and Navy Departments recommended that the projects be undertaken by local public housing authorities with loans from the U. S. H. A. To date national defense housing projects have been approved in 17 localities. Of these, 13 are being constructed by local housing authorities. The housing experience of these local authorities has made it possible for them to achieve speed and efficiency on the defense housing projects which they have undertaken. The usual time schedule of a local housing authority on the defense housing project has been cut to 120 days from ground breaking to occupancy. As a result, the number of the defense housing projects approved on June 25, 1940, are scheduled for occupancy before the end of this year.

The President has already approved projects to provide 7,475 homes for the families of persons in defense activities.

and additional projects are now being prepared for submission to the President which will bring this total to 10,338 homes. These homes will be occupied by the families of married enlisted men, civilian workers of the War and Navy Departments, and industrial workers in plants producing defense materials, but only to the extent that private industry cannot furnish the necessary housing for them.

In view of the fact that the U. S. H. A. and the local housing authorities have made such a splendid record, not only in the regular slum-clearance program, but also in the defense housing program, I am particularly pleased to find that the conferees have included a provision in section 201 which would permit the use of this effective existing machinery. Section 201 provides that in carrying out its purposes, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may utilize such other agencies of the United States as they determine upon.

In the past, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy have recommended to the President the use of the U. S. H. A. and local housing authorities in the undertaking of most of the defense housing projects now under way. I am glad to see that the conferees have recognized the importance of continuing the use of these facilities under the plan provided in Public Law No. 671 approved by the President in June of this year, which provides for loans by the U. S. H. A. to local housing authorities for the construction of projects for persons engaged in national-defense activities. I hope that the War and Navy Departments will make funds available to the U. S. H. A. for loans to local housing authorities, so that we may get the best possible defense housing program by utilizing the facilities of local authorities which are run by local citizens, who are naturally most familiar with the local housing problems of their own communities and the best way to meet those problems.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 102, noes 47.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 50. Page 34, line 4, insert the following:

"SEC. 302. Nothing in titles I and II hereof shall be deemed to render inapplicable the provisions of the act of March 3, 1931, as amended by the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1011; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 276 (a)), or the provisions of the act of June 30, 1936 (49 Stat. 2036; U. S. C., title 41, secs. 35–45), to any contract or contracts to which the provisions of either or both of such acts would otherwise apply."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 51. Page 34, line 12, insert the following:

"SEC. 303. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the wages of every laborer and mechanic employed by any contractor or subcontractor engaged in the performance of any contract of the character specified in the act of June 19, 1912 (37 Stat. 138; U. S. C., title 40, secs. 324, 325), shall be computed on a basic day rate of 8 hours per day and work in excess of 8 hours per day shall be permitted upon compensation for all hours worked in excess of 8 hours per day at not less than one and one-half times the basic rate of pay."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if this motion is agreed to, it will complete action on this bill insofar as the House of Representatives is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report and the several motions were agreed to was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will briefly recognize Members to submit unanimous consent requests.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from a St. Petersburg, Fla., paper.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the President's Labor Day message.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. SABATH, and Mr. CHURCH asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein excerpts from the speech of Governor Hoey, of North Carolina, on the occasion of the dedication of the Great Smokies National Park.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NAVY AIRPLANE ORDERS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs I present a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 584

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to transmit to the House of Representatives forthwith detailed information showing the number and types of airplanes for which contracts have been made for the use of the Navy, the dates such contracts were entered into, since June 1, 1940, and the names of the firms, companies, or corporations contracting to furnish such airplanes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of the Navy be read.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This is a privileged report.

Mr. FISH. I just wanted to say that I am very happy that it will be read, that this information will be given to the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, September 4, 1940.

The CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to the request of the Naval Affairs Committee for the views and recommendations of the Navy Department on House Resolution 584, directing the Secretary of the Navy to transmit to the House of Representatives detailed information showing the number and types of airplanes, for which contracts have been made since June 1, 1940.

There is tabulated below the data desired in House Resolution 584. Attention is invited to the fact that publication of detailed figures on the procurement program of the United States results in the release of valuable military information in an authoritative and convenient form:

Contracts for naval airplanes since June 1, 1940

Type	Number of planes	Date of contract	Contractor
Utility-transport	5	June 12, 1940	Beech Aircraft Corporation.
Primary trainers	500	do	Naval Aircraft Factory.
Advanced trainers	25	June 21, 1940	North American Aviation.
Primary trainers	600	July 1, 1940	Stearman Aircraft Division, Boeing Airplane Co.
Do	201	July 10, 1940	Spartan Aircraft Co.
Do	100	Aug. 19, 1940	Ryan Aeronautical Corporation.
Fighting	243	Aug. 5, 1940	Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corporation.
Utility-transport	10	Aug. 3, 1940	Do.
Patrol-bomber (experiment).	1	June 29, 1940	Boeing Airplane Co.
Transport	1	Aug. 27, 1940	Lockheed Aircraft Corporation.
	1,686		

One hundred of these planes on option on this contract, option being exercised, but formal acknowledgment not yet received.

The Navy Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL,
Under Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the letter just read contains all the information called for in the resolution showing that some 1,600 planes have been ordered since June 6, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the motion will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. 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. 10132) to protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his motion a moment to permit me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAY. Certainly.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include some excerpts from the Democratic platform and an address I made before the Democratic platform committee in Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an extract from various Democratic national platforms.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short article on Senator McNARY.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion 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. 10132.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I insist upon my motion, and I do not yield.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky 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. 10132.

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. 10132, with Mr. WARREN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Congress hereby declares that it is imperative to increase and train the personnel of the armed forces of the United States.

(b) The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of miltary training and service should be shared generally in accordance with a fair and just system of selective compulsory military training and service.

(c) The Congress further declares, in accordance with our traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard, as an integral part of the first-line defenses of this Nation, be at all times maintained and assured. To this end, it is the intent of the Congress that whenever the Congress shall determine that troops are needed for the national security in excess of those of the Regular Army and those in active training under the provisions of this act, the National Guard of the United States, or such part thereof as may be necessary, shall be ordered to active Federal service and continued therein so long as such necessity exists.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. For 10 minutes only?

Mr. COLLINS. For 10 minutes in addition to the 5 to which I am entitled.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman will not insist on that. We have just started now after 2 long days of general debate.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman for some time in general debate on this bill and he told me there was none left.

Mr. MAY. I have no recollection of that.

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I do.

Mr. MAY. I do not think you did.

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I did, in spite of what the gentleman says.

Mr. MAY. Do you want me to object?

Mr. COLLINS. That is immaterial to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have been one of those who tried very hard to get time but could not get any. I recognize the gentleman is far more worthy than I, or perhaps any man in the House, to have time and I shall not object; but if this continues, I shall object because I would like to have 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

Mr. ANDREWS. What is the request, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. That the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I offered the gentleman from Massachusetts all the time he wanted, and I think he was offered some time at the end of the session. I shall object to more than 10 minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am surprised. When did you do that?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that a Member of Congress cannot fully discuss the conscription bill, now before the House, from all of its various angles. With no time, however, available to me under general debate and with the little time at my disposal under the 5-minute rule I have elected to use it in discussing only one phase of compulsory military service, and that pertains to its lack of merit in the modern military way. The present war has thoroughly proven that the German successes have been the result of three things—modern air and land weapons, soldiers highly trained to use them, and commanders of imagination and with wide experience in the problems that confront officers in commanding a highly mechanized and industrialized army—and all three of these fully coordinated. Added to these is the total elimination of men too old, too weary, and too outmoded to pursue and comprehend warfare of the 1940 type.

I do not intend to convey the thought that modern infantry and field-artillery training should be neglected, but let it be remembered that old-fashioned infantry in the modern set-up has been abandoned. It is a noteworthy fact that mechanized divisions in the German Army are organized on the basis of about one to four or five of its modern infantry. Its successes on the continent have been the direct result of the use of airplanes as artillery followed by ground forces in large, medium, and small tanks—even the flanks of these fingers of steel have been protected from flank assaults by airplanes cooperating with these mechanized troops.

According to an editorial in the New York Sun of June 20 of this year, referring to a dispatch that came through the French censorship at Bordeaux, it put at 150,000 the strength of the German units that blasted their way through the Ardennes, broke the French line at Sedan, pushed fingers of steel to the sea, cut off the French and British and Belgian forces in Flanders, and ruptured the Meuse and Somme defense lines. The German casualty lists, both for the Polish campaign and the Flanders campaign have seemed fantastically small in the light of what was accomplished. If those casualty lists are correct, they are fantastic only because they reveal an entirely new economy of war in which the machine is made to substitute for flesh and blood.

The casualty lists were small because the soldiers operating these machines were protected by armor and because their adversaries clung to the military technique of the past and put their reliance upon manpower.

Col. William Donovan, appointed by Hon. Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, to go to London on an important military mission, met there the veteran foreign correspondent, Edgar Mowrer. These two men, on behalf of the United States, made surveys and studies of the methods used by the totalitarian powers and recently wrote a series of articles with a commendatory foreword by Secretary Knox. From an article by them in the Washington Times-Herald of August 20, 1940, I quote the following:

> Adolf Hitler's "blitz" conquests of Norway, Belgium, Holland, Luxemburg, and France are military masterpieces. In all secrecy and with incredible speed the Nazi leader built up a unique military machine beside which all other armies in the world were obsolete. Basing his organization upon experience acquired in Spain during the civil war, Hitler placed at the head of his mobilized masses a modern "airplane plus tank" spearhead. The German masses were not particularly impressive. They did not need to be. It was the spearhead of 50,000 men that beat France.

Hanson W. Baldwin, military critic for the New York Times, has written a very able article which was published in Harper's Magazine for August, in which he discusses at considerable length a plan of defense for the Western Hemisphere. I suggest its reading by the membership of this House. In discussing the Army, he says:

> It must provide a field force, highly trained, fully equipped, instantly ready for transportation as an expeditionary force anywhere within the Western Hemisphere—to quell, with the help of the Navy and air force, alien-inspired revolutions, to seize an advanced base, to repel an attack or hold an area until larger forces are transported, if necessary, to assist it. Such a force certainly need be no larger than 150,000 men—perhaps half that number—about the number with which Germany, only 100 miles away, seized Norway. Adding to this the numbers required for the Army's other functions, the Regular Army, even to fulfill its broadened responsibilities, need be no larger than 400,000 men, if that large.

In the same article he urges that the National Guard be reorganized and that its duties be enlarged to provide coast and antiaircraft defense for the country, and then points out:

> This reorganized and strengthened army needs, above all, to be a balanced army, with the proper number of antiaircraft units, the proper number of mechanized divisions, etc. Despite the graphic lessons of the war, there is as yet no indication that our future plans have been altered to fit those lessons; there is as yet no evidence that the importance of the gasoline engine in war has been fully realized.

The editorial from the Sun, the quoted section from Colonel Donovan's and Edgar Mowrer's article, and the quoted excerpt from the Hanson Baldwin article are merely illustrative of what every one of us reads day after day in the newspapers as the German Army made its advance through continental Europe, and we are all too familiar with the fact that it was a comparatively small force operating airplanes and tanks that laid Europe prostrate. The other German troops merely followed. There was little left for the so-called infantryman with the rifle to do except police duty. The airplane held the ground that the infantry occupied by making it untenable for the adversary in their feeble attempts to occupy it.

Notwithstanding these facts it is now proposed to draft millions of men, place them on old fields, and give them a type of military training that we have recently seen is an utter failure. This cannot be justified on a basis of hemisphere defense, for no such mass of men, if conscripted, can be used effectively to combat the weapons that would be used by an enemy in an attack against this hemisphere.

Likewise these men cannot be used in offensive warfare for the man with a rifle is utterly and pitifully helpless in battle against the tank and the airplane. Only airplanes and tanks, carrying officers and men highly trained to use them, can successfully combat these same instruments in the hands of an intelligent adversary. A 1940 army that has not a large portion of its strength tied to the motor and protected by armor is an outmoded military organization. The training given a man to handle these engines of destruction must be that of a football player, trained through the years to handle them. The soldiering that will be given to draftees will not be of this type and such is not contemplated. If we pin our hopes upon men thus trained and equipped, this country, like the fallen countries of Europe, will pay for it in blood when the next war comes.

Through the years I have preached the use of the airplane and armored ground vehicles in large numbers, for I have sincerely believed that by so doing we can secure the maximum of fire power through the use of a minimum number of men and because of the armor that is on these vehicles we can give to the men operating them the chance to survive. The boy in the street will be called upon to die when war comes—we as legislators should give him a chance to live, and unless armor protection is given him in battle this chance is negligible.

In the face of the successes by the Germans in the use of the airplane and mechanized weapons, I cannot see the sense of returning to the theory of mere numbers, and that is the reason I shall not vote to put into the field an army of two or three million men with khaki as their armor protection, and equipped, as they are bound to be, with weapons that will be useless in combat against an industrialized army.

The War Department, if the information that I have is correct, and it has come to me from the newspapers and from other sources, is not now planning to use but two divisions for mechanized ground force—18,000 men. Aside from those in the Air Corps, about 47,804 out of a total authorization

of 94,443, the rest of them will belong to the other branches, largely to the infantry, and if millions of men are to be drafted, they, too, in the main, will be infantrymen.

And so we go preparing not for the next war but for past ones. I stand ready, as in the past, to equip the men we have with modern weapons—it matters not what the cost—because that is the thing to do. If and when our National Guard of 250,000 men and the Regular Army of 400,000 are so equipped, it is then felt necessary to raise more men and to equip them in the same modern way, I will be the first to propose it, but to draft these youngsters now and put them in the field prepared to fight as of a hundred years ago has no appeal to me, and, frankly, I do not believe it is going to frighten Hitler, for I am afraid he knows too well that all of the nations of Europe which he has so ruthlessly conquered have had for years this same type of universal military training.

I have high regard for the judgment of the membership of this committee, and regret that I cannot go along with them on this bill. I have voted for all bills to implement and strengthen our military and naval forces, both legislative and appropriation. I know too well, however, that this bill ties us to the age-old reliance upon mere numbers—a doctrine that is as obsolete as the slingshot of old. I feel that I would be derelict in what I regard as my duty if I followed the excitement of the moment and gave approval to ways in warfare which will mean our ruin if we are forced to fight an industrial nation that has industrialized its army. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairmain, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISH: On page 14, after line 21, insert the following:

"(d) The President is authorized to issue a call as soon as possible after the date of enactment of this act, and another call at any time after January 1, 1941, for qualified men between the ages of 18 and 35 to volunteer for training and service for 12 months in the land and naval forces of the United States under this act. Each such call shall be for not more than 400,000 men. The President is authorized to induct into such forces for such training and service so many of the men who volunteer pursuant to such call as are not in excess of the number of men for whom the call was issued. If, upon the expiration of 60 days after the issuance of either of such calls, the President finds that the number of qualified men who have volunteed pursuant to such call is less than the number for whom the call was issued, he is authorized to select and induct into such forces such number of qualified men selected in accordance with section 3 (a) as, when added to the number who have volunteered pursuant to such call, will equal the number for whom he issued such call. Until the expiration of 60 days after the date of issuance by the President of the second call authorized by this subsection, no man shall be inducted into the land and naval forces of the United States under any provisions of this act other than this subsection. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require or postpone, during either of such 60-day periods, the registration, classification, or selection of persons to be adopted for training and service under this act."

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

Mr. FISH. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. BARRY. Is this the amendment for which Senators WAGNER and MEAD, of our State, voted?

Mr. FISH. This is the Hayden amendment, for which both Senators from our State voted. The gentleman is correct.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. The 60-day provision applies to both the first and the second calls?

Mr. FISH. It does.

This is the so-called Hayden amendment that was discussed and voted upon in the other body but failed to pass by a vote of 43 to 41. The sole object and the sole purpose of this amendment is to permit, encourage, and give further opportunity to the youth of America to volunteer under our American volunteer system. I believe this amendment interprets very largely the public point of view and that of many leaders of important organizations in America. Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, speaking on Labor Day, enunciated this very proposal and asked that the Congress give the people of America an opportunity to enlist before resorting finally to conscription in peacetime.

If this amendment is adopted, the President will call for 400,000 volunteers immediately after the adoption or as soon as possible after the adoption of the bill. If the 400,000 volunteers are not forthcoming within the 60-day period, then, under the draft which will be put into effect at the same time, the balance to make up the total of 400,000 will be inducted into the Federal service.

For example, if we can raise only 200,000 by the volunteer system, the balance of 200,000 will be raised by the draft. I venture to say that if you put this amendment in the bill it will not delay by 1 day, by 1 hour, or by 1 minute calling into service the number of men asked for by the War Department for national defense. This in no way hinders, hampers, or delays the national-defense program. It merely encourages and gives further opportunity to those Americans who want to volunteer according to the old traditions and ideals of our country in time of a great emergency.

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

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. If this amendment were to be adopted, would that delay the setting up of the draft machinery as contemplated by the bill under consideration?

Mr. FISH. Let me read the last part of the amendment:

Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require or postpone during either of such 60-day periods the registration, classification, or selection of persons to be adopted for training and service under this act.

Therefore it does not in any way postpone the operation of the draft.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In other words, the machinery would be set up just the same as if the amendment had not been adopted.

Mr. FISH. It goes into effect the same way; yes.

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

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

Mr. COLE of Maryland. As I understand from the debate, it is pretty generally conceded that, under the bill before us, without the gentleman's amendment, it is difficult for anyone to assume that the first man would be called before the expiration of 60 days.

Mr. FISH. In answer to the gentleman, let me quote the sponsor of the bill in the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who stated yesterday upon the floor that in his belief no person would be inducted into the service before November 8 or 10. That is beyond the 60 days.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I recall that statement.

Mr. FISH. Therefore, this amendment in no way hampers the drafting of those men.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman.

Mr. FISH. Both the members of the gentleman's delegation in the other body felt the same way the gentleman does on this amendment.

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

Mr. FISH. I should like to ask the gentleman, if I yield, if I may have 5 additional minutes to discuss the amendment. This is a very important amendment and should be very carefully discussed. As the sponsor of it I should like to have 5 additional minutes to discuss it.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is for the members of the Committee to decide.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I ask the gentleman to refer to section 3 (a), page 15, line 10, reading as follows:

That any person, regardless of race or color, between the ages of 18 and 35 years, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer to be inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States.

They can volunteer to go into the service now. That is already in the bill. Suppose 100,000 men do volunteer, it just means that that number will be subtracted from the total draft, so that in fact it is the same thing.

Mr. FISH. No; it does not apply in quite the same way. This calls for a proclamation by the President or a call or an invitation by the President to the youth of America to volunteer before they are drafted, and it specifies that it shall be done on 2 different occasions, before the first 400,000 are inducted into the service and again before the second 400,000 are inducted into the service. It is an entirely different proposition.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. As I understand it, the purpose of the selective-draft law is not to raise a huge standing Army, but it is to enable us to get a rotating reserve of trained manpower to be called upon if necessary during the emergency of the war. Simply getting volunteers is not sufficient. We want this rotation of men taken from occupations generally and from agriculture to be able to serve in the Army when necessary.

Mr. FISH. Let me say to the gentleman that the volunteers serve for exactly the same time as the draftees, 1 year, and they are paid the same amount. Hitherto, with the enlistment for 3 years and $21 pay, we have obtained 40,000 volunteers last month. There is no difference between the pay of the draftee and the volunteer under the provisions of this bill, but we are giving an opportunity to Americans to volunteer if they want to, beginning at the age of 18 and extending up to 35.

Mr. CELLER. It would be easier to get a volunteer army. There is no difficulty about that with ballyhoo and advertising, but that is not the purpose of the proposed law.

Mr. FISH. I am not so sure you can get 400,000 volunteers in 60 days. I hope we can. I have a good deal of faith in the patriotism of the young Americans of today. I believe they are just as patriotic and loyal as they ever were, and I believe now that with 1 year's service and $30 pay we will get hundreds of thousands of them in 60 days. I do not guarantee, however, that we will get the entire 400,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question at that point?

Mr. FISH. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Suppose we get the required number of volunteers within the 60 days. That, of itself, operates to suspend the operation of the draft provisions of this bill, as I understand it.

Mr. FISH. That suspends the drafting of the first 400,000 that were supposed to be inducted into the service by the 1st of January. Then, later on the President again calls for 400,000 more volunteers. But, for example, if we only raised 200,000 volunteers in the 60 days, then the other 200,000 are inducted as draftees.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In other words, nothing can be lost by the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. FISH. Not one moment of time or any personnel can be lost.

Mr. GAVAGAN, Mr. BENDER, and Mr. GEARHART rose.

Mr. FISH. If I can have 5 minutes more, I shall be glad to yield.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to proceed for 5 additional minutes so I may yield to the gentlemen.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GAVAGAN. Under the provisions of the gentleman's amendment, in the event 800,000 men are procured by the volunteer system, the provisions of this bill will thereafter be suspended.

Mr. FISH. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. BENDER. Will the distinguished gentleman make it clear to us that these volunteers volunteer for 1 year of service rather than for 3 years of service?

Mr. FISH. I have already tried to do so. To my mind it takes a pretty patriotic man to go into the Army for 3 years, but under that system we got 40,000 volunteers last month. I know that if I had a son 18 years of age I would not encourage him to join the Army for 3 years, but I would want him to go in for 1 year.

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

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

Mr. GEARHART. In view of the fact that under the proposed legislation a person has an option to enlist for 1 year or 3 years, does the gentleman's amendment add anything to what appears on page 15, line 21?

Mr. FISH. Oh, yes.

Mr. GEARHART. Let me read that language:

That voluntary enlistments in the land and naval forces of the United States, including the reserve components thereof, shall continue as now provided by law.

Mr. FISH. As I tried to explain to another gentleman, this amendment of mine calls for a proclamation by the President inviting every American who wants to do so to join the armed forces as a volunteer up to 400,000. I think if that is done and some of us in Congress and outside the Congress, who are interested in the volunteer system, go on the radio and explain the provisions of this amendment, we will possibly have 400,000 volunteers in 60 days.

Mr. GEARHART. Does not the law itself invite them to join?

Mr. FISH. No; it does not. My amendment establishes a specific and orderly procedure.

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

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

Mr. NICHOLS. I just want to ask the gentleman if his amendment provides for the volunteers and the draft after the failure of the volunteer plan on a quota system allocated to the States.

Mr. FISH. There is nothing in my amendment about the quota system at all but I believe that is taken care of in another section of the bill.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Does the gentleman believe that a proclamation of the President would make much difference to the average man?

Mr. FISH. I believe that a call or proclamation by the President, carrying out the provisions of an act of Congress, would make a great difference. If the President is authorized to call for volunteers in this emergency, I think there will be tremendous response by both Republicans and Democrats alike from all sections of the country.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman discussed this with the War Department?

Mr. FISH. No; I have not discussed the amendment with anyone whatsoever. I rather imagine the War Department has already stated its views that it is for the draft and this bill. This is an amendment to the draft bill, designed merely to encourage voluntary enlistments and give the American youth a further opportunity to volunteer before the draft goes into effect in peacetime.

Now, let me add this point. I am very fearful if this bill goes through in its present form, with great civic organizations and patriotic organizations in America against it—honestly, sincerely, and openly against it—there will be a great deal of resentment in the hearts and minds of many people

and of many American women who believe that their sons are being railroaded into the Army through a peacetime conscription bill. But, if this amendment is put into effect and the youth of the country are given an opportunity to enlist by a proclamation or call of the President in an emergency, upon the request of Congress, I believe that will help create good will and better understanding. It will also tend to do away with discord and resentment, and substitute cooperation and national unity which is most desirable in America at the present time.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. BARNES. In the event your amendment should be adopted and a person served 1 year of enlistment, would he be in the Reserves following that period of enlistment?

Mr. FISH. I believe that provision is carried in the bill. It is not in my amendment, but I understand it is in the bill, that anyone who enlists, whether a volunteer or a draftee, goes into the Reserves thereafter.

Mr. LEAVY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. Under your amendment a volunteer would be in for 1 year, but the provision would still remain in the bill, beginning in line 21, page 15, where he could volunteer for 3 years, if he so desired?

Mr. FISH. If he so desired. It in no way interferes with that.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Does not the gentleman think that the amendment should be perfected to provide that if under the President's call the State of New York, for instance, should offer its full quota of volunteers, then the draft provision should not apply to the State of New York?

Mr. FISH. I think that might be pretty hard to operate, but I have no objection to such an amendment myself, because I understand the justice of it and I understand what the gentleman is driving at.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. Perhaps in reply to the question put to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], I assume if his amendment is adopted and these men volunteer, under another provision of the bill they will be credited in the several districts in the Nation against the quotas assigned to those districts?

Mr. FISH. That is what I assume.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I want to ask another question, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. FISH. Gladly.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The amendment reads that each such call shall be for not more than 400,000 men.

Mr. FISH. That refers to the first two calls.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Well, does it?

Mr. FISH. Yes, and that is in accordance with the program announced by the War Department.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The amendment reads "and another call at any time after January 1, 1941."

Mr. FISH. That is right. I think that is very specific and carries out the program of the General Staff of the Army. Some of us may not believe they need so many and some may believe otherwise, but that is the announced program of the General Staff.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Even though there is some question of doubt, as suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], might it not be well to include this amendment and then if there is any doubt, and if the amendment is in the bill, it can be perfected in conference?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute additional.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. In answer to that question, none of these amendments are perfect. We all realize that. My amendment can be amended further if necessary. It can be changed in conference or amended in the Senate when it gets back to that body, but my proposal carries out the purpose that we want to give the volunteer system a chance.

Mr. MICHENER. And this only lost in the Senate by two votes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. Chairman, I have just received a telegram from the American Labor Party of my State which I think is worth while reading to the membership:

> Every real American congratulated our great President for the epochal action in exchanging 50 over-age destroyers for British air and naval bases. These destroyers are not indispensable to the United States, but such important bases are indispensable not only for the defense of our country but also of the Western Hemisphere. The opponents criticize the President by saying that wide and long discussion was necessary before taking action. They are the same people who have been blaming him for too much talk and no action. Most of them are "fifth columnists," cheap politicians, or plain lunatics. Some of them are open agents of nazi-ism, fascism, or bolshevism.

I am sure all loyal Americans and sincere followers of democracy approve and enthusiastically greet his action because it gives material and moral support to European democracy and stronger security for peace and integrity of our beloved United States. The truth is that their rage proves he is the greatest living champion of democracy in the world. Humanity salutes the President and all Members of Congress who support him in his ideals and undertakings.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman is out of order. He is not talking to the pending amendment. He is clearly out of order under the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. CELLER. I read this telegram particularly because of the lunatic fringe——

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is out of order and is violating the rules of the House. He is not talking on the pending amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman wait?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will proceed in order.

Mr. CELLER. This telegram is from Luigi Antonini, New York State chairman of the American Labor Party.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from New York is out of order. Under the rules of the House the gentleman is not entitled to read anything in the Well of the House except by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has heard the point of order made by the gentleman from Wisconsin. The gentleman from New York will proceed in order so that the Chair may determine later if he is out of order. If he is the Chair will stop him.

Mr. CELLER. I am simply trying first to read the telegram. It is a splendid telegram from a worthy patriotic gentleman, representing a worthy group. Secondly I read the wire in contrast to the unpatriotic groups that have come down principally from New York City to propagandize in a wretched fashion against this bill.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from New York is out of order. Under the rules of the House the gentleman is precluded from reading any telegram or letter except by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. The gentleman from New York will proceed.

Mr. CELLER. This man, signatory to the telegram, is the first vice president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union. The same union supports the administration and the pending bill and is, I am sure, opposed to the pending amendment, because the purpose of the amendment is to defeat the bill. Surely the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] will vote against the bill even if his amendment carries.

I call attention to this telegram particularly in contrast to and because of the so-called lunatic fringe whose members beseeched my office yesterday and tried to intimidate me, tried to coerce me by threats of all sorts to vote against this bill. They assembled about me repeatedly and in unruly, boisterous manner actually demanded that I vote against the pending bill. Unfortunately, I say, that a number of those were of the race of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, from whence I spring; and I repudiate them. I am no part of them and they are no part of me. I spew them out, I castigate them. They are pariahs, unfortunately, and some of them are in this very gallery. They deserve condign criticism. They are the first to invoke the liberties of the Bill of Rights which they seek to destroy. I refer them to Lenin, Stalin and company. They would overturn our Government which they would refuse to defend.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the pending amendment does not refer to the race of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. I ask that the gentleman be required to discuss the pending amendment, as required under the rules of the House. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman from Wisconsin would read and delve into the prophets of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, he would be a little more temporate in his remarks. He would, as I do, reproach those who use threats and intimidations to Members of the legislature. [Applause.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I asperse them not because they oppose the bill—that is their right—but because of their infamous manner of coercion.

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

Mr. CELLER. It is within the province of some people, unfortunately, to bring indictments against a race because of the sins of the few; but they are not of my race, and I again repudiate them. Please do not judge my people by these renegades.

Mr. THORKELSON. The gentleman, then, is anti-Semitic in his statement.

Mr. CELLER. That statement is part and parcel of the gentleman from Montana's usually unfortunate, insulting remarks.

As for these unruly, rowdy groups that seek to crowd me and to hound me, I want naught of them. Further, I do not want their votes. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky, chairman of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I am not seeking recognition for the moment for debate on the amendment. I just wondered in view of the apparent excitement that seems to be starting, if we might not get calm and quiet and possibly agree to a reasonable time for the discussion of this amendment?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman from Kentucky that this is a very important amendment. Many gentlemen are interested who have not had any time at all to speak on the bill. I suggest that the gentleman let debate run on for a while before he attempts to limit it.

Mr. MAY. I will agree to the gentleman's suggestion, but I hope debate may proceed calmly and dispassionately.

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

Mr. Chairman, like all Members, I have given this bill my serious consideration, realizing as I do, the importance of the bill, realizing world conditions, and realizing the gravity of the situation that confronts us as a Nation. I realize also that this bill is a departure from an American tradition of 150 years standing.

If I felt the danger was imminent I would have no hesitancy in voting for the bill as reported by the committee. While I recognize that a grave world condition exists, I do not consider the danger so imminent to ourselves that it is necessary at this time to provide an immediate outright conscription law. [Applause.] I feel, however, that it is necessary to have available the machinery to give to the youth of this country the opportunity of enlistment. It is because of these reasons that I feel constrained to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, or any amendment of a similar nature. [Applause.]

Let us look at this from a practical angle. I made a speech in favor of repeal of the embargo when I received 10,000 telegrams and letters to vote to the contrary. I have not received 200 letters on this question. I speak and vote on this bill, as on all bills, as my conscience dictates, as all Members should and as all Members undoubtedly do.

It is admitted that it will be at least 60 days before they will be able to draft our young men into the service. Why not give the youth of our country the opportunity of voluntary enlistment, after the call has been made by the President for 400,000 volunteers as provided in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York? It is only a few weeks since one of the generals informed the American people that the Army would not be prepared until around January 1 to take 400,000 young men into the service, that the Army did not have the equipment, did not have the barracks, did not have the facilities.

It seems to me the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York meets every purpose the committee seeks to obtain in the bill as reported. The amendment is not inconsistent with the objectives sought by the bill reported. It is an amendment that strengthens the bill, an amendment which preserves the bill, and which is not hostile to it.

It is an amendment which preserves and strengthens a bill calling for conscription that we all realize must come unless we obtain voluntary enlistments, and at the same time it states that for a period of 60 days the machinery of conscription shall be held in abeyance to see whether or not the young men in the United States up to the required number voluntarily enlist.

This procedure preserves the traditions of our country, if the young men enlist and, at the same time, if they do not, it meets in a practical and realistic manner this great problem of necessary manpower that confronts us by putting into immediate operation this machinery. This is not an amendment which says the machinery shall be considered later by legislative act, but states that the machinery shall automatically go into operation if the number of voluntary enlistments are not obtained. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], in his speech of yesterday, practically admitted that the Army would not be ready to do any drafting before the 8th or 10th of November. Responsible Army officers have stated that they are not prepared at the present time and that they will not be prepared until around the 1st of January. This amendment is a perfecting amendment of a strengthening nature which meets the objection that exists in the minds of so many of our people and in no way impairs the efficiency of conscription legislation, if it is necessary to resort to its use, legal machinery that automatically operates in the immediate future if voluntary enlistments fail. If this amendment is adopted and enacted into law, and if voluntary enlistments are insufficient then no real American

can or will object. This amendment provides the machinery for immediate operation, and giving the opportunity of voluntary enlistments for a period of 1 year, before conscription becomes operative, meets the honest objections of millions of fine American citizens. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. Chairman, a good deal can be said in favor of the proposal offered by the gentleman from New York and so ably sponsored by the gentleman from Massachusetts, but I should like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts what he has to say with reference to this phase of the proposal: Figures have been placed in the RECORD by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] which show that from January 1 there have been more than four men volunteered their services in Texas and a few other States for every one man in certain other States, based on the same population. In this connection I recall that in the States of Texas, North and South Carolina, Kentucky, and a few other States, almost three men were volunteering to serve their country for every one man from the gentleman's State of New York and two and one-half to one from the State of Massachusetts.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that in a matter of so grave importance every section of the country, yes, every social, economic, and racial group in the country, should be required to contribute its just share of this responsibility. Under any system of voluntary enlistment, and, in fact, under this very amendment, that will not be the case. Some way must be found to compel the States, whose young men are rushing to the marriage bureaus to escape military service, or crowding the galleries of the House of Representatives, as they have been doing since debate on this measure began, to furnish their just quota. Mr. Chairman, the young men from the State and from the district which I have the honor to represent are volunteering to serve their country in this time of emergency. They should not be required, or even permitted, to furnish more than their just share of the men needed. [Applause.]

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

Mr. SOUTH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think the objection which the gentleman raises is good. This bill as written provides that not only shall it apply equally and fairly to everybody alike, but also provides, as I understand, that each State shall be charged with its own quota and that there shall be a fair, equitable division among all the States as to the number of men enlisted.

Mr. SOUTH. I thank the gentleman. I may say to you gentlemen who come from the States that have furnished more than their quotas, you should consult the tables which you will find in the RECORD of August 28, page 11119, and again in yesterday's RECORD, September 4, in the speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], at page 11426 where you will find what your State has contributed. I know of no justification for the fact that Texas furnishes 4 volunteers out of every 1,000 adults above 21 while several States are furnishing less than 1. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that you cannot represent your State and your district honestly and fairly and condone any proposition that will permit the young men from your State to offer their services and, indeed, their lives if need be, while young fellows from other sections are taking advantage of higher wages and getting better jobs as a result of this emergency. The amendment ought to be voted down.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that under the other provisions of this proposed bill the States will be given credit against various quotas for their enlistments as against any possibility of draft?

Mr. SOUTH. I do not think the provisions to which the gentleman refers can accomplish this purpose under any and all eventualities.

Mr. KEEFE. Is that not in the law?

Mr. SOUTH. The law may attempt to do that, but I am not sure that it will work that way. This amendment is simply an attempt to circumscribe and hamper the law, if it is passed, as much as possible.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman vote for this amendment if the amendment he now proposes is adopted?

Mr. SOUTH. I have not proposed an amendment. I am opposing the gentleman's amendment. Having referred to the tables relating to the various States, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the same be printed in the RECORD.

The following table shows enlistments for the months of January through June 1940 by State or residence, as tabulated from enlistment records received through August 3, 1940:

	Number of enlistments	Male population 21 years and over, census 1930	Ratio, percent
Alabama	2,168	666,742	0.00325
Arizona	314	134,401	.00203
Arkansas	1,071	494,948	.00216
California	2,847	2,025,774	.0014
Colorado	978	323,224	.003
Connecticut	636	489,250	.0013
Delaware	108	76,058	.00142
District of Columbia	184	160,809	.00114
Florida	1,129	438,847	.00257
Georgia	2,823	731,490	.00386
Idaho	338	136,212	.00248
Illinois	2,784	2,469,993	.00112
Indiana	1,470	1,016,313	.00144
Iowa	726	765,863	.00094
Kansas	1,022	580,455	.00176
Kentucky	3,053	718,286	.00422
Louisiana	1,086	566,908	.00191
Maine	582	244,320	.00238
Maryland	704	500,549	.0014
Massachusetts	1,974	1,287,970	.00153
Michigan	1,254	1,558,021	.00080
Minnesota	671	797,960	.00084
Mississippi	1,157	516,082	.00224
Missouri	1,266	1,137,503	.00110
Montana	294	181,494	.00163
Nebraska	680	419,139	.00162
Nevada	45	37,588	.00119
New Hampshire	255	145,551	.0017
New Jersey	1,434	1,261,298	.0011
New Mexico	301	115,667	.0026
New York	5,471	4,078,340	.0013
North Carolina	3,442	758,445	.0045
North Dakota	215	196,028	.0011
Ohio	1,956	2,095,788	.00093
Oklahoma	2,261	673,398	.0033
Oregon	801	331,805	.0024
Pennsylvania	7,411	2,849,895	.0026
Rhode Island	351	202,029	.0017
South Carolina	1,763	395,234	.0042
South Dakota	313	207,413	.0015
Tennessee	2,620	701,194	.0037
Texas	6,648	1,656,675	.0040
Utah	254	136,960	.0018
Vermont	240	112,374	.0021
Virginia	2,169	650,357	.0033
Washington	1,034	545,410	.0019
West Virginia	1,618	471,779	.0034
Wisconsin	1,169	917,712	.0013
Wyoming	256	77,205	.0033
Hawaii	74		
Panama, C. Z.	22		
Philippines	29		
Puerto Rico	188		
U. S. Army posts	898		
Alaska	22		
Total	74,579		

Percentage of enlistments, by States, for the months of January to June 1940, calculated on the basis of the male population over 21 years of age (1930 census)

State	Percent	Men per 1,000
North Carolina	0.0045	4 5/10
Kentucky	.00422	4 2/10
South Carolina	.0042	4 2/10
Texas	.004	4
Georgia	.00386	3 8/10
Tennessee	.0037	3 7/10
West Virginia	.0034	3 3/10
Wyoming	.0033	3 3/10
Virginia	.0033	3 3/10
Oklahoma	.0033	3 3/10
Alabama	.00325	3 2/10
Colorado	.003	3
Pennsylvania	.0026	2 6/10
New Mexico	.0026	2 6/10
Florida	.00257	2 5/10
Idaho	.00248	2 4/10
Oregon	.0024	2 4/10
Maine	.00238	2 3/10
Mississippi	.00224	2 2/10
Arkansas	.00216	2 1/10
Vermont	.0021	2 1/10
Arizona	.00203	2
Louisiana	.00191	1 9/10
Washington	.0019	1 9/10
Utah	.0018	1 8/10
Kansas	.00176	1 7/10
Rhode Island	.0017	1 7/10
New Hampshire	.0017	1 7/10
Montana	.00163	1 6/10
Nebraska	.00162	1 6/10
Massachusetts	.00153	1 5/10
South Dakota	.0015	1 5/10
Indiana	.00144	1 4/10
Delaware	.00142	1 4/10
California	.0014	1 4/10
Maryland	.0014	1 4/10
Wisconsin	.0013	1 3/10
Connecticut	.0013	1 3/10
New York	.0013	1 3/10
District of Columbia	.00114	1 1/10
Illinois	.0012	1 2/10
Nevada	.00119	1 1/10
Missouri	.0011	1 1/10
North Dakota	.0011	1 1/10
New Jersey	.0011	1 1/10
Iowa	.00094	9/10
Ohio	.00093	9/10
Minnesota	.00084	8/10
Michigan	.0008	8/10

NOTE.—The fractions indicate the number of men enlisted per thousand men.

[The Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service]

Enlistments, State of residence as tabulated from enlistment papers, fiscal year 1940

State	Number of enlistments	Number of enlistments per 100,000 population (census, 1930)
Alabama	4,545	172
Arizona	642	149
Arkansas	2,532	137
California	5,695	100
Colorado	1,892	183
Connecticut	1,376	86
Delaware	205	89
District of Columbia	413	81
Florida	2,085	142
Georgia	5,906	203
Idaho	723	187
Illinois	6,794	89
Indiana	3,189	98
Iowa	1,994	80
Kansas	2,304	122
Kentucky	7,326	280
Louisiana	2,519	119
Maine	1,268	160
Maryland	1,501	92
Massachusetts	4,268	100
Michigan	3,310	69
Minnesota	1,762	68
Mississippi	2,338	116
Missouri	3,149	87
Montana	664	125
Nebraska	1,633	118
Nevada	236	[1] 262
New Hampshire	497	108
New Jersey	3,007	74
New Mexico	553	131
New York	11,092	88
North Carolina	6,220	196
North Dakota	585	86
Ohio	4,326	65
Oklahoma	5,512	230
Oregon	1,574	165
Pennsylvania	14,586	153

[1] Estimate given on basis of 100,000 population; in this case below that figure.

Enlistments, State of residence as tabulated from enlistment papers, fiscal year 1940—Continued

State	Number of enlistments	Number of enlistments per 100,000 population (census, 1930)
Rhode Island	745	109
South Carolina	3,121	180
South Dakota	724	100
Tennessee	4,502	153
Texas	14,670	252
Utah	536	105
Vermont	427	122
Virginia	4,280	176
Washington	2,183	139
West Virginia	3,598	209
Wisconsin	2,973	101
Wyoming	451	205
Hawaii	122	34
Panama Canal Zone	25	[1] 83
Philippines	57	4.7
Puerto Rico	382	241
United States Army posts	2,353	
Alaska	33	[1] 66
Total enlistments	159,403	
Average per 100,000		133

[1] Estimate given on basis of 100,000 population; in this case below that figure.

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census; Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1933.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to discuss with the membership of the House the question of voluntary enlistments.

The real issue before us is to decide whether we must have conscription of the youth of America or whether we should proceed in a democratic manner in giving voluntary enlistments a thorough and, above all, a fair trial.

We are told that the needs of our Army require approximately 1,000,000 men by the end of next January. According to the War Department, we have a standing Army as of September 3 of 295,000 enlisted men and 14,000 officers, or a total of 309,000 men in the Regular Army.

The National Guard as of June 30 had an enrollment of 236,768 subject to call to duty under the authority given the President. The Chief Executive is empowered to mobilize an additional 104,500 Reserve officers as well as 35,000 enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve.

In other words, by the process of simple arithmetic, with the Chief Executive exercising the authority granted him by Congress, he can have overnight a total of 685,268 men in the Army of the United States.

Contrary to the opinion of those advocating conscription, the volunteer system has not failed. As late as September 3 the War Department was kind enough to furnish me information regarding recruiting efforts on 3-year enlistments at $21 monthly as base pay.

On June 19 the strength of the Regular Army was increased to 280,000, the maximum authorized by law. Before this strength could be recruited Congress further increased the strength to 375,000. Immediately the recruiting service of the Army intensified its efforts, with the result that as of June 30, 1940, the strength of the Army was 246,949, and on July 31, 1940, a total of 270,183 was reached. As stated previously, on September 3 the strength by actual enlistments totaled 309,000 men.

The following table shows the monthly enlistments in the Army from January 1, 1939, through July 31, 1940:

January 1939	3,872
February 1939	6,108
March 1939	7,328
April 1939	5,442
May 1939	6,736
June 1939	6,946
July 1939	7,162
August 1939	9,259
September 1939	14,765
October 1939	19,815
November 1939	17,286
December 1939	16,530
January 1940	17,820
February 1940	9,151
March 1940	8,374

April 1940	6,274
May 1940	9,492
June 1940	23,444
July 1940	31,958

During June 1940 the Army enlisted on a volunteer basis 23,444 men. During the month of July the number increased, when 31,958 were enrolled. With the aid of a Nation-wide advertising campaign, the United States Army recruiting service enlisted as of September 4, 37,425 men during August, with reports not available for the last 10 days of August. When the final figures are received for August the number of recruits may reach fifty-five or sixty thousand men.

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Has the gentleman any report as to the number of discharges?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I am talking about new enlistments.

Mr. WADSWORTH. What is the net gain?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I am sorry, I do not have that information.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is the important matter.

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Is the gentleman talking about the Regular Army enlistments or the National Guard?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The Regular Army enlistments.

Mr. FISH. There have been very few men that have gone out of the Regular Army, so the net gain should be something like the same number, approximately 40,000. It is the National Guard that has been losing men.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. If the men enlist at the rate of 50,000 a month, in 6 months' time we will have a sufficient number of men in Uncle Sam's Army to give the Chief of Staff 1,000,000 men, including the National Guard and the Organized Reserves.

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

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

Mr. MICHENER. Existing law provides that the War Department shall enlist men for 1 year. The War Department has refused to do that. If this amendment is enacted, then the War Department will be compelled to enlist men for 1 year. There is no comparison between the number of men you can get—as referred to by the gentleman from New York—for a period of 3 years and the men who will go in case of an emergency enlistment for a period of 1 year, as this amendment provides.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct. May I add that every one of the enlistments to date are for a 3-year period at a base pay of $21 a month.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman vote for the bill if the amendment is agreed to?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I reserve the right to decide my vote when this bill has been perfected. No Member can foretell the number of amendments that may be adopted, and likely to change the whole complexion of the legislation. To give a blanket endorsement at this time would be ill-advised.

It must be kept in mind that the advertising campaign of the United States Army Recruiting Service has started in earnest only the past few weeks, and at the rate the recruits are responding, there is every indication that the monthly total should average 60,000 men monthly.

Keep in mind these men represent voluntary enlistments for 3 years at a base pay of $21 monthly. Plain arithmetic will disclose that in a period of 6 months 360,000 young men will have joined the United States Army on their own accord.

It is easily seen that the objective of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army to have 1,000,000 men will have been reached by February 1941.

Let me remind you again that the men now enlisting are being enrolled for a 3-year period. I say to you, what would happen were a 1-year enlistment offered at a base pay of $30 monthly? It is a foregone conclusion that the Army could double the present recruiting figures under such a modified enlistment on the voluntary basis.

Diverting our attention for a moment from increased enlistments on a voluntary basis, or the mass enrollment under the Burke-Wadsworth bill, we are faced with the pressing problem of accommodating the present strength of the Army and at the same time provide adequately for those inducted into service.

According to the War Department, right now the Army can accommodate in permanent and temporary buildings, 230,000 men with construction under way to accommodate a total of 375,000 men, or an additional 145,000 men.

In a few weeks the National Guard will be streaming into camp. To accommodate the guardsmen, permanent tent camps with concrete floor, wooden frame walls, and a tent roof are being built in southern cantonments with temporary buildings in the northern cantonments.

Some of these tent camps and temporary buildings are under construction while others are not yet started, awaiting the necessary appropriations. Those guardsmen who cannot be accommodated in permanent or temporary buildings will have to be housed in tents. According to the War Department, young men conscripted under the Burke-Wadsworth bill will be known as selectees and will be assigned to the Regular Army or National Guard units and given the facilities of the parent unit.

What will become of the Regulars which will then include the National Guard? No doubt they will be based in the republics south of the Rio Grande.

Many of you are veterans of the World War and recall the frenzied efforts to accommodate draftees as they swarmed into the various camps throughout the United States. Let us not forget we were actually at war with Germany at that time.

You remember the epidemics of influenza, spinal meningitis, measles, typhoid fever, dysentery, and other scourges that greeted the youth of 1917–18. From April 1917 to December 1919 there were 734,397 cases of influenza, 93,629 cases of measles, 221,060 cases of mumps in the United States Army alone. The interesting point is that out of every 1,000 soldiers, 199 of them had the influenza. As a result, 75,460 deaths were recorded, which should be a lesson for us to heed in this plan for peacetime mobilization.

There is another important matter that should have our attention. It is the problem of clothing and equipage. My study of facts and figures convinces me that it will be months before there will be sufficient clothing and equipage on hand for the mass enrollment under the Burke-Wadsworth bill, let alone the voluntary enlistments now reaching an all-time record.

In connection with equipping 1,000,000 men with rifles, machine guns, and so forth, I am willing to concede that there may be a sufficient supply of this kind of equipment on hand, but I am inclined to be doubtful, since already we have sent 500,000 .30 caliber rifles and 70,000 .30 caliber machine guns to England.

In the training of a soldier, machine guns and rifles are not alone necessary but additional critical equipment is needed, such as scout cars, tanks, antiaircraft and artillery guns, and other military supplies of a kindred nature.

In passing, let us analyze the following inventory as of May 1, 1940, furnished me by Gen. George Marshall, Chief of Staff, United States Army.

Item	Total on hand or on order to include fiscal year 1941	Actually on hand May 1, 1940	Actually on hand Aug. 1, 1940	Balance on order Aug. 1, 1940
Antiaircraft:				
3-inch antiaircraft guns	588	448	471	117
90-mm. antiaircraft guns	503	0	0	503
Directors	400	168	184	216
Height finders	382	142	153	229
Sound locators	1,179	194	297	882
37-mm. antiaircraft guns	1,689	15	59	1,630
.50 caliber antiaircraft machine guns	2,568	1,014	1,411	1,157
Small arms:				
Semiautomatic rifles	240,559	38,000	49,124	191,435
37-mm. antitank guns	1,862	228	228	1,634
60-mm. mortars	3,831	3	3	3,828
81-mm. mortars	905	183	223	682
Machine guns caliber .50 (both infantry and pack)	1,874	83	330	1,544
Field Artillery material:				
75-mm. gun, modernized	1,471	141	241	1,230
75-mm. howitzer (field and pack)	392	90	90	302
105-mm. howitzer	240	0	0	240
155-mm. gun, long range	96	4	4	92
8-inch howitzer	48	0	0	48
Combat vehicles:				
Scout cars	2,412	485	525	1,887
Combat cars	[1] 148	114	114	34
Tanks, light, M2A4	1,582	10	67	1,515
Tanks, medium, M2	1,308	18	18	1,290
Tractors and special ordnance vehicles:				
Tractors, light	150	93	108	42
Tractors, medium	550	261	298	252
Tractors, heavy	780	65	140	640
Trucks, small arms repair	146	79	85	61
Trucks, instrument repair	53	0	0	53
Railway artillery: 8-inch railway gun and carriage	24	0	0	24

[1] Funds for 60 combat cars (difference between 148 shown above and 208 shown on p. 4362 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 1940) used for procurement of light tanks, M2A4.

While time does not permit me to dwell on this topic at length, I do want to call your attention to the fact that the situation in critical equipment is no better than on May 1, 1940, and will show no great improvement until June or July 1941 at the earliest date.

From the standpoint of health, ample military equipment and accommodations of those serving in the Army of the United States, the amendment before us for consideration will make possible the achievement of the objective desired of 1,000,000 men in an orderly and democratic way through the process of voluntary enlistments which have been greatly increased as a result of the Army's present recruiting campaign.

Given a thorough trial or modified to permit voluntary 1-year enlistments at a base pay of $30 will produce gratifying results and maintain the morale of the youth of America who are eager to serve their country without being conscripted in European fashion.

In closing, let me add that the average military officer will tell you there is a whale of a difference between a man who volunteers for service and one who is forced to do such military duty. [Applause.]

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just preceded me once enjoyed the honor and distinction of being the head of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. I regret that he does not entertain the same views concerning this bill as does his successor, the present occupant of that high place. A reference to the hearings on this bill, on page 486, will disclose the testimony of Mr. Millard W. Rice, national legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in which he says in part—and I quote from page 490:

> Our commander in chief, Otis N. Brown, personally has indicated his conviction that the Nation should immediately adopt the principle of selective conscription of manpower for training and service in our armed forces. Various other national officers have indicated their concurrence with that principle.

I can understand why the gentleman from Pennsylvania did not answer the question of the gentleman from New York when he asked him if he would vote for this bill if this amendment were adopted. The gentleman declined to answer. I make the prediction that the gentleman and even the author of the amendment, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], will not support this bill even if the amendment is adopted, and if I am wrong in that prediction I yield for him to answer.

Of course, if you are opposed to this bill, this is one of the best means I know to scuttle it. Selective service is either right or it is wrong in principle. There is a crisis existing this minute in the affairs of the world and of this country or there is not. If there is not a crisis, we ought to defeat all national-defense legislation right now and move on to other business. If there is danger ahead, we must have full and complete defense, which includes trained men and many of them.

If you have read the headlines in the papers today you saw where the Parliament in London had to recess until after the bombers passed by, and if you read Hitler's speech yesterday you must know the world is on fire and the fire spreading this way. I am not given to hysteria. I am not a militarist. I have always opposed a large standing Army. But I am a realist. I want us to face facts. Our neighbor's house is on fire and if we fail to put some water on our own, it may also be in flames.

Now, I undertake to say that the selective service system is not only fair, but it is democratic, and I would like to call your attention to this fact. General Marshall, the Chief of Staff, has testified, and his testimony appears in the RECORD, that he cannot obtain the necessary voluntary enlistments within the time he feels necessary to provide defense for this country.

I now want to call this to your attention. You hear much said here along the line that 40,000 have enlisted during this past month, but you will also find from the records in the War Department that approximately 12,000 serve out their enlistments each month, and there have not been replacements to cover those 12,000. So there has not been a net increase of 40,000 during the last month.

If this amendment should be adopted, that means we must raise 400,000 men within the next 60 days or 200,000 per month, when thus far we have not been able to raise even 50,000 per month. But here is the main trouble as I see it. This is going to disrupt the whole organization of the War Department and draw a line of distinction, between the volunteer and the drafted man. Assuming that this amendment should be adopted, you will see one of the biggest ballyhoos and pep campaigns the country ever witnessed where the orators get on the stump and before the radio, the bands play and big advertisements appear in the newspapers and the boys are urged and touted to sign up. Every sensible man on this floor knows you cannot get 400,000 in 60 days. We would then start in on the draftees. We would have dissatisfaction and lack of unity the very first day. The volunteers would consider themselves more patriotic and the draft boys would be classed and stigmatized as slackers. The psychology would be bad. Let us start out right. We should treat everybody alike.

Now, much has been said, even by my good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], about some statement the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] made about it being the early part of November before the War Department could get under way.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes because I want to ask him a question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. I ask you to look at yesterday's RECORD on page 11426, at a statement I inserted from the War Department, showing the official action taken in the War Department and giving a schedule of how long it would take them to get these 400,000 men. I shall not take time to read all of it, but it shows that the whole job will be done in 40 days. The first day is reporting day, the second day is registration day, the next 5 days set up local boards and serially number cards, and so on.

The 21st to 25th days: For lottery and distribution of order number.

The 24th to 29th days: Local board assign order number and mail questionnaire.

The 29th to 34th days: Return of questionnaires.

The 34th to 36th days: Run through questionnaires and sort out probable class I-A.

The 36th to 40th days: Physically examine and induct class I-A.

The whole job is done in 40 days. It is evident what the purpose of this amendment is. One is to kill or cripple the bill if you are against it and the other one is to tide it over past the election, but somehow or other there is something about this situation that to me far transcends any political consideration. If the election were not on or if it were over, there would not be 50 votes against this bill. We have appropriated or authorized $15,000,000,000 for war equipment. It is almost worthless without trained men to handle it. The best in blood and brains may volunteer, but the ones who need it most are the ones who do not. We need a composite Army, with every man assigned to the thing he is best fitted for. The people back home are expecting us to act, and act now. This postpones the evil day for 60 days longer. Hitler took France in 60 days. This is no time to practice appeasement or carry umbrellas. We need strong men who know how to use guns. We must meet force with force. Talk about national unity and democracy; talk about equality of obligation; there just cannot be any fairer way in the world if we must have an Army than to do it along the plan suggested. It must not be forgotten that General Marshall, Chief of Staff, testified that clothing, housing, guns, and equipment would be ready for all men just as fast as they are inducted into the service.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman took upon himself to make a decision for me.

Mr. THOMASON. No; I made a prediction.

Mr. FISH. I want to say to the gentleman and the House that I am very much inclined to support this bill if my amendment is adopted.

Mr. THOMASON. I notice my friend from New York hedges quite successfully, as usual, by saying, "I am inclined." He knows he is doing all he can to kill this bill.

Mr. FISH. I am inclined. I want to know all the perfecting amendments. Now, the gentleman said 50,000 volunteers were obtained last month.

Mr. THOMASON. Forty thousand.

Mr. FISH. Forty thousand. That was under the 3-year enlistment. This will be under the 1-year enlistment.

Mr. THOMASON. Well, even so, you have to enlist 400,000 men in 60 days, and everybody, including General Marshall, says it cannot be done. In other words, you have to quadruple what you are doing now, and I believe you, or any other thinking man, knows it is impossible. Then when you have done that, and you have a lot of boys who have gone in voluntarily, you come in with the remaining 200,000 or 300,000 as draftees, and the volunteers will poke the finger in scorn at them. That is not the way to raise a great Army in a short time and in a democratic way. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDMISTON to the amendment offered by Mr. FISH. Add the following: "*Provided further*, That should induction under this amendment become necessary, full credit shall be given in fixing such quotas for residents of such subdivisions of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia as may have volunteered in the land and naval forces of the United States at the time of such call."

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is that not already provided for? The language on page 20, where there is voluntary induction, that is to be credited on the quota for that State or subdivision.

Mr. EDMISTON. The gentleman feels that this additional language to the language offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] would be included in the bill, even though his amendment were adopted?

Mr. FISH. If the gentleman thinks this is more clarifying and helpful, of course I am in favor of the amendment and will accept it.

Mr. EDMISTON. I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] that was my opinion—I think this language should go in here at this place in the bill with the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] because neither you nor myself can tell what might happen to this future language in the bill when we continue amending it. So I would like to have this provision here, right now, with the Fish amendment.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. May I proceed a few minutes in explanation of my amendment, and then I will yield if I have any time remaining.

I think this provision for the quotas is nothing but fair to credit the States with existing and future quotas. We have had a recitation here numerous times of the percentages per thousand male inhabitants that have volunteered their services in the land and naval forces of this country, so I will not repeat those, but you all know there is a vast difference between Kentucky on the top and Michigan on the bottom of that list.

Mr. COOLEY. The record shows that North Carolina is on top.

Mr. EDMISTON. All right; North Carolina on top. I know Michigan is on the bottom. North Carolina and Kentucky are very close and West Virginia is seventh on the list. We will not argue about that. Those men who have enlisted should be credited to their communities if and when it becomes necessary to draft. With that amendment I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] to postpone it for 60 days, because personally I do not believe the Army will be ready to take care of these men before 60 days.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield.

Mr. MAY. May I call attention to subsection (b) on page 20 of the bill, which provides that the quota to be furnished for such training and service shall be determined from each State, Territory, and the District of Columbia and for subdivisions thereof. Is that not practically it?

Mr. EDMISTON. All right, but I want that amendment on the Fish amendment if the Fish amendment is adopted. We do not know what may be done to this bill by future amendments. If this amendment to the amendment goes on and then his amendment should be adopted, there is no question about the intent of Congress that the quotas should be given to the several States for their enlistments.

Mr. SOUTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield.

Mr. SOUTH. Is it not entirely possible that your volunteers will be so great that it will be impossible to equalize with what draftees are left and certain States will be furnishing far above their quota?

Mr. EDMISTON. No. You mean the volunteers would exceed the quota in that State?

Mr. SOUTH. It does not have to exceed it, but suppose it almost equals it. You do not have enough left to equalize, as I understand the amendment.

Mr. EDMISTON. If the volunteers did equal the quota you would have no draft in that State.

Mr. SOUTH. There is a maximum number that may volunteer from any State under the Fish amendment.

Mr. EDMISTON. But the 400,000 quota as provided by the Fish amendment is divided among the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia.

Mr. SOUTH. Is there a definite maximum for each State?

Mr. EDMISTON. No; not for each State, but it is rated by their male population between the ages specified in the Fish amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. Chairman, I merely call the attention of the committee to the following language in the bill: Page 15, section 3 (a), line 10:

Provided, That any person, regardless of race or color, between the ages of 18 and 35 years shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer to be inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States for training and service described in subsection (b), if he is acceptable to the land or naval forces for such training and service.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], it is true, does change the situation somewhat, but, as far as I can see, it merely sugar-coats the proposition a little for the benefit of some of the folks back home who may be opposed to this bill. But the amendment suggested would not be the sure way of doing this thing, it does not afford a sure way of building up our Reserve forces. It is only temporizing with something that we all know ought to be done the other way. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FADDIS and Mr. RANKIN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must first recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], a member of the committee.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of this amendment in all fairness I ask the members of this committee to remember those who are really informed about the equipment of the Army, about the facilities for taking care of those whom it is contemplated to take into the service, about the equipment to be given them, and all of that, are the members of our General Staff—I ask that you take into consideration the word of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army and those under him who know the facts. I submit in all fairness that their opinion is worth a great deal more than the opinion of those who, in general, are out to scuttle the bill at any rate. In this connection I ask each one of you to get a copy of yesterday's RECORD and on page 11490 read a letter from General Marshall to Senator SHEPPARD, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. There read in his own words where he assures Senator SHEPPARD that he has on hand equipment enough to take care of those who are going to be inducted into the service.

Mr. Chairman, within the last few minutes statements were made by Members on the floor that we had almost no equipment. I ask you to turn to page 11491 of yesterday's RECORD and read there the statement put in by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] regarding the equipment in the Army. It is more or less itemized. That is a statement given out by General Marshall himself. It comes from responsible parties. It comes from the parties who know exactly what they have on hand every day from the morning report.

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

Mr. FADDIS. Not now.

It shows exactly what they have. Those who state we have almost nothing should get yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and read the figures therein set forth.

This amendment is really offered by a man who is not for this legislation, who has been against it from the start and whom we have every reason to believe will continue to be against it. Suppose this amendment should prevail; suppose that for 60 days we should delay the acquisition of the men the General Staff of the United States Army has assured the Committee on Military Affairs of both Houses of Congress are necessary to provide for the security of this Nation. Suppose the volunteer system should succeed to the extent the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] would like to see it succeed; what have we accomplished then? Have we eradicated any of the defects or any of the objectionable features of the draft system? Have we by the volunteer system transferred the burden of military service from the rural sections in the South and West to the more populous and industrial sections of the United States? Indeed, we have not done any such thing. The men who will serve in the armed forces will have come from those sections of the United States which because of various conditions have furnished the most of the volunteers for the Army. We shall not have succeeded in taking into the Army a cross section of the population. We will still have the burden of military service falling upon those who are the most patriotic and the most public spirited.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] spoke in considerable detail about the diseases which attacked those who had been drafted into the Army in 1917 and 1918. Does he mean to imply that measles, mumps, whooping cough, and such diseases attack only those who have been drafted into the Army? I will ask any man of medical experience in the House whether a man susceptible to those diseases would not catch them when exposed to them even though he were a volunteer? This argument, therefore, amounts to nothing whatsoever.

As to the plan to bring these men in purely by the system of volunteering, if we are going to discredit the system of the selective draft, let us make up our minds to do it. If we are going once more to trust the safety and security of the United States to the same old system that throughout 150 years has proven to be ineffective, that over and over again has been an embarrassment to those who have been attempting to raise forces to provide for the security of this Nation, then let us in all fairness and frankness say to the country that that is exactly what we are doing.

Let us not attempt to hide under any cloak of this kind. If we are not ready to vote for a system of selective service, let us be frank with the country, let us be frank with the world as a whole and say that here in a time of emergency, when the very security of this Nation is in jeopardy, we, the Representatives of the people of the United States, are not courageous enough to go down the line for what has been conclusively proven to be the only practical means of raising an army. Let us say to the young men of this Nation, "We are willing to send you raw into battle as we pick you raw from the streets. We are not willing that we sacrifice a little, we are not willing to require you to sacrifice a little in advance in order that if it is necessary for you to go into battle you may go in there hardened and trained for the hardest game in the world." If the young men of this Nation go forth to battle, God only knows that we as the Congress of the United States owe them every protection we can give them. We owe them all of the training we can give them beforehand in order that they may be prepared to do their utmost for the Nation and to do their utmost for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal is only another attempt to delay this matter of preparedness. It is another attempt to set this Nation on the same road which France followed—and where is France today? It is a move to accept the council of those in favor of delay, and look to the plight of England to see the results of delay. My God! Has it come to the point in this Nation where, with the lessons of a policy of delay in Poland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, France, and England fresh in our minds, we must also be so lacking in courage or foresight to expose our Nation to a similar fate? What will be required to awaken this Congress? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the advocates of the Fish amendment meet themselves coming back on this proposition. They come here and tell us that we do not have the equipment to take care of 400,000 draftees, yet they turn around and say they are willing to put the draft into operation conditioned upon our failure to get 400,000 volunteers. They profess to believe that we will get 400,000 volunteers within 60 days. If we are not able to take care of 400,000 draftees, how are we going to take care of 400,000 volunteers?

Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that in the Civil War when the question of conscription came up in the Congress, this same kind of an amendment was offered to the bill then pending. The law as enacted was actually based upon failure of the volunteer system with a similar time limitation. As a matter of fact, all of you know the dismal failure that confronted the Union forces under the volunteer system which caused the draft system eventually to be put into effect. Even though the law as passed was conditioned upon getting a sufficient number of volunteers, the Union forces were unable to get these volunteers and conscription went into effect. Of course, it may be said that was in wartime and that this is in a time of peace. I wish we could all get clearly in our minds today that war is no longer made as it was made during the years gone by. A force of 1,200,000 men, which is deemed sufficient as an initial protective force in this country, is not deemed sufficient to protect us over a long period of time. It is not sufficient to protect us while we draft or voluntarily obtain and train a sufficient army to give us the ultimate defense to which we are entitled. Today we do not have time for that. In the World War we had 12 to 18 months in which to draft an army and in which we hoped we might equip it, although we were unable to do so, and in which we might train our Army and get it ready. I believe, and all of us must honestly admit, that never again, if we are confronted with war, will such opportunity be given to us. We must have a trained force ready to go into the field very quickly after hostilities open and remember that today war is often started without even the formality of a declaration of war.

Mr. Chairman, just another word on this matter of equipment. It is such a simple matter for any Member who may be sufficiently interested to ask the War Department for a showing as to the equipment that we actually have on hand. Ask them for the number of pieces of equipment necessary to equip this army.

There is just one item I happen to have in mind at this time, for instance, the number of antiaircraft guns that we possess. There are 500 antiaircraft guns in the hands of the Army today. Twelve guns make a regiment. That is sufficient for forty-odd regiments of antiaircraft alone. The same thing is true in various other branches of the service. A release was issued by the War Department on May 18 which shows the various pieces of equipment it had. I will be very glad to give my copy to any interested person and I am sure any Member who is sufficiently interested to inquire can get a similar copy from the War Department brought up to date. If you inquire with reference to the amount of equipment necessary for the different units, I believe it will convince every reasonably fair-minded man who wants to be convinced that we do have the equipment necessary to give the basic training to these men over a period of 12 months.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ALEXANDER. How far does the gentleman feel those 500 antiaircraft would go toward defending our farflung coast line and cities when they have that many antiaircraft guns defending the city of London alone?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, that is a question that can be brought up, but any person who has studied this matter of defense will soon reach the decision that never can we hope to give complete protection to every city, village, and hamlet in this country. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was offered in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and that body came within two votes of adopting it. I have discussed it several times with its author, and he feels that if the House approves it the Senate will accept it.

I shall support this amendment because I believe that we should first give these men an opportunity to volunteer. I was amused at the statement made by one gentleman to the effect that if we took in a great many volunteers they would sneer at the drafted men when they came in. But that was not the experience in the World War. You may ask any World War veteran, no matter which side of this question he takes, and he will tell you that none of them experienced any such feeling between the volunteers and the drafted men.

Another thing—they tell you that it was the drafted men from the South who won the battles in the Civil War. I do not want to raise the Stars and Bars in this House, but I call attention to the fact that the most glorious victory won by the Confederate Army was at the first Battle of Bull Run, where those volunteers from the South went up against the Regular Army of the Union forces.

I am for this amendment for many reasons. In the first place, I am a little afraid of universal compulsory military service in times of peace. I am afraid of militarism in this country. Of what does militarism consist? It consists of universal compulsory military service in times of peace, with the armaments that go with it. I should like to have a time limit on the act, in order that it might expire when the emergency has passed, that we may not fasten upon this country a policy of compulsory military training that may destroy our representative government, our democratic institutions, or our Christian way of life in the years to come.

This amendment will also—and I take issue with the gentlemen who have discussed this measure from that standpoint—bring into the service rapidly a class of men who are qualified for the service we are going to need them for. What we need are trained men, skilled men—aviators, mechanics, electricians. By giving them an opportunity to volunteer, with this provision raising the base pay, I do not believe it will be necessary to put the draft into effect at all.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] talks about his Jewish brethren quarreling about this issue. None of them have disturbed me. I have had no raids on my office. I believe I speak the sentiment of the majority of the people I represent when I say, Give us this amendment and let us try this voluntary system first.

I have heard the statement here that the majority of the volunteers are now coming from the Southern States. If you take into consideration the fact that we have almost, or quite, 1,000,000 colored people in our State and that the volunteers are coming almost exclusively from the whites, then we are far ahead of even the average State and far ahead, probably, of even the average Southern State in our quota of white volunteers. But, if this bill passes, we will get credit for those volunteers, if and when the draft goes into effect.

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SOUTH. The gentleman says he believes that if this amendment is adopted it will not be necessary to resort to the draft.

Mr. RANKIN. I doubt if it will.

Mr. SOUTH. Then what good will credits do?

Mr. RANKIN. If the young men of this country want to join the Army, no matter where they come from, let them join.

Mr. SOUTH. Does not the gentleman feel, however, that the sections of the country that are not furnishing their just share should do so? I may say to the gentleman that it goes deeper than sections. The gentleman knows there are certain social, economic, and racial groups that are shirking their responsibility, whereas the farm, ranch, and small-town boys are volunteering.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; but let me say to my distinguished friend the gentleman from Texas, for whom I have a profound admiration, that I do not share in any of this silly argument that there is any man in this House who is disloyal or unpatriotic. I do not care where he is from. If war were to come, and if it were necessary for the Members of this Congress to go to the front, I believe that every man within the sound of my voice would respond at once. [Applause.]

I am questioning no man's patriotism. But I say to the gentleman from Texas that if we are going to raise an army we need an army of technicians, we need an army of engineers, we need an army of mechanics, we need an army of aviators, we need men who are skilled. We will get a far larger percentage of them through the voluntary system than we would through the draft system, to begin with.

Besides, you have raised the base pay considerably for those skilled men, and that will induce them to come in from other sections of the country as well as from the South.

I admit that economic conditions have a great deal to do with it, but I believe if this amendment is adopted as it was advocated in the Senate, not by an enemy of this bill but by one of its strongest supporters, the distinguished Senator from Arizona I believe, we will get all the men we need.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and several others have a habit of getting up and asking Members, "If you adopt this amendment will you vote for the bill?" If you want to know what I will do, my answer is "Yes." If you adopt this amendment, of course I will support the bill.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. It is very unfortunate that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] made an anti-Semitic speech on the floor of the House today. Let it be remembered that many thousands of men of Jewish extraction volunteered and faithfully served our common country during all of our Nation's wars.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] wants to stir up a row between the American Jews and the international Jews, that is his business. We have refrained from bringing that issue up, and I prefer not to discuss it here.

I hope this amendment is adopted.

For fear that I may not get another opportunity to speak again, I hope you will also adopt the provision that was adopted by the Senate—to draft munitions establishments, if necessary—in order that we may not have a sit-down strike on the part of them and the Wall Street financiers who finance them, who might want to browbeat Congress into giving them concessions in taxes, perhaps, in order to get them to keep these manufacturing establishments going.

I hope these two amendments are both adopted. I shall support both of them, and, if they are adopted, I shall support the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this bill has taken a queer change and a queer turn. Anybody that supports this bill holds himself out to be a great American, and anyone that is against this conscription bill is not an American, he is a "fifth columnist" according to some supporters of this legislation.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. I am sorry, but I have no time to yield. This amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] was offered by a good American who served in France with distinction, and the substitute amendment is offered by another very good soldier, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON] who served in France with distinction, and although I have never mentioned it, I will put my war record against any man on this floor, and that is the first time I ever have mentioned it and I hope the last, in public life.

I hope the fact I am fighting this does not make me a "fifth columnist" or the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] a "fifth columnist," or the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON] a "fifth columnist." I think we are as good Americans as anybody on this floor. [Applause.] You take the records of the men who are supporting this amendment and where were they in 1917 and 1918 and 1919? Those who howl loudest for this bill have no sons or were not in the last war. I was in it and the veterans on this floor who are fighting this bill were in it.

By passing this bill you send out to the youth of America the challenge that he is yellow, that he will not fight for his country, you brand on the forehead of every young American boy that he has not the courage to defend the Stars and Stripes. I say you do not need this draft. If they will let the rules down and modify the stiff examinations they have to get into the Army, then you will have plenty of volunteers. What they have done is to make the examinations so stiff that even a West Point or an Annapolis man would have a hard time passing the physical examination. I say give these boys a chance, give them 60 days, and I do not care who puts the amendment in, Republican or Democrat. Above all, we are Americans and the youth of this country are Americans and will volunteer if given a chance to volunteer. I do not care about politics in this issue. Many a man is voting for this for politics or to perpetuate himself in office. Thank God, my Americanism is above my politics, and I hope this House will vote the passage of this amendment [Applause].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I do not know when I have been so disappointed and so saddened as I am at this very moment over the remarks of my long-time and devoted friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. It is difficult for me to believe that his remarks represent the goodness of his heart and the loyalty of his nature.

Mr. Chairman, this Fish amendment simply provides a way out for those who, for different reasons, hesitate to meet the pending issue. To accept it would let down this House in the confidence and in the affection of the people of this country as nothing else could do. The people of this country believe that an emergency exists, the membership of this great body knows that an emergency exists. The people of this country believe that there is an actual need for the strengthening of the national defense, the membership of this body knows that such need exists; and the purpose of the pending bill, Mr. Chairman, is to strengthen the national defense. The purpose of the draft is to lay the hand of compulsion upon those who receive all of the benefits that government can bestow, but who decline to render any sort of service in time of its need.

Mr. Chairman, to accept this amendment would be tragic. To accept it would convince the people of this country that the membership of this House is only an aggregation of self-serving politicians.

Mr. Chairman, the time is at hand when men and women who love their country should stand up and be counted. Let us accept this amendment and rip from the wall the flag of the Republic that hangs above the Chairman's head and send it to the dictators of Europe as a testimonial of our esteem. Accept this amendment, Mr. Chairman, and let us confess to our inability or our unwillingness to meet and deal with a great issue. Accept it and let us close the doors of this Chamber and go home and stay there. [Applause.]

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative from the State of Michigan, I resent the remarks which have been made here this afternoon casting reflection upon the patriotism of my State, just because the quota of men who have volunteered may not be quite as large as it has been from some other section of this Nation. The services of the people of Michigan, in every conflict in which this Nation has

been engaged denies the implication of any such remark as that. [Applause.]

While an equal number of young men may not thus far have volunteered for the Army up to the present hour, let me call attention to the fact that the great industries of my State, with hundreds of thousands of men engaged in them, including many young men, are making the materials of war that this Nation requires for its national defense. [Applause.]

I was somewhat surprised at my able and genial friend from the State of Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] when he made the remark that the volunteer system has never worked in the United States. Let me call attention to the fact that the very system that we are asked to adopt in the United States under this bill is the system now practiced by every arrogant dictator in Europe. If we adopt this policy of conscription we shall make the same mistake and fall into the same error. The compulsory military training system has saved none of the conquered countries of Europe, but the volunteer system has saved and preserved the United States Government for 150 years. [Applause.]

My good friend from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has made some remarks with reference to the voluntary system during the Civil War and stated that it failed. I took it upon myself to obtain from the legislative service of the Congressional Library the figures pertaining to voluntary enlistment and draft for every war in which this Nation has been engaged, and I want to give to the House the figures as far as they relate to the Civil War, particularly the number of volunteer enlistments. I want you to listen to these figures as furnished to me.

The total number of Union troops enrolled in the Civil War was 2,128,948, of which 75,215 were Regulars and 1,933,779 were Volunteers. [Applause.] Only 119,954 were drafted, and of that number only 46,347 actually served, the remainder having served as substitutes in some other form.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Why, then, did Lincoln ask for a conscript army?

Mr. DONDERO. Lincoln invoked the draft some time in 1863, but the record shows that the draft had nothing to do with the patriotism of the men of this Nation, and for one good reason, and that is: They were called to serve on their native soil when the preservation of the Union was the issue. [Applause.] They were not asked to serve in some capacity on other soil, or even face the possibility of serving on foreign soil across the sea. That was the difference.

May I say for the benefit of those who come from the South that the patriotism of the men of the South equalled the patriotism of the men of the North when they volunteered in the Confederate Army for the same reason, namely: To defend their homes and the cause they believed right as referred to by my friend from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. Such were the men who met each other at the first battle of Bull Run.

Mr. SOUTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. SOUTH. I have a very high regard for the gentleman speaking and certainly would not say anything to embarrass or offend him. I should like to remind him that no one has cast any reflection upon the gentleman's State. The most that has been done is to quote the record, and the record shows that the gentleman's State has furnished 69 men as against 280 men from the State of Kentucky. The record speaks for itself. It is no reflection on those men. We are trying to adopt a policy that will force every section of the country to furnish its just pro rata of men for this emergency.

Mr. DONDERO. The patriotism of American manhood is not dead. The people do not accept this war hysteria that an emergency exists or that it is necessary to adopt national militarism to provide national defense. [Applause.]

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment which I offered to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], because we have worked out a better amendment, in my opinion, which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] will offer.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NICHOLS to the amendment offered by Mr. FISH: At the end of the amendment offered by Mr. FISH insert:

"(e) Quotas of men to be furnished for such training and service shall be determined for each State, Territory, and the District of Columbia, and for subdivisions thereof, on the basis of the actual number of men in the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, and the subdivisions thereof, who are liable for such training and service but who are not deferred after classification; credits shall be given in fixing such quotas for residents of such subdivisions who are in the land and naval forces of the United States on the date fixed for determining such quotas, and those who volunteer during the 60-day volunteer period; and until the actual numbers necessary for determining the quotas are known the quotas may be based on estimates and subsequent adjustments therein made when such actual numbers are known; all in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe."

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, before I start to discuss the amendment let me lay down one or two predicates. In the first place, I yield to no man in the United States in my patriotism or my love for this country, and I charge no other man with a lack of patriotism or lack of affection for his country by reason of his views on this pending legislation. And in order that I may not be charged with offering this amendment for political reasons, I wish to make this statement: I shall support this bill whether or not this amendment is adopted. If the amendment which I have offered to the Fish amendment is not adopted I shall vote against the Fish amendment. Now, if I am not still hiding behind some log I would like to discuss my amendment.

In the first place, if the Fish amendment has in it a provision that quotas shall be given to States upon the basis of population and that then those States shall be given credit for those men who volunteer in the land and the naval forces, I think the Fish amendment with that amendment is a good and equitable one. And the above is exactly what my amendment would do. The only difference between my amendment and the language of the bill is that my amendment provides that States shall be given credit for those men who volunteer, including those men who volunteer during the 60-day volunteer period provided for in the Fish amendment. Under the language of the bill as it now stands they would get credit only for those men who had volunteered before the beginning of the 60-day volunteer period. Under the Fish amendment they would not get credit for those who volunteered during the 60-day volunteer period. My amendment simply takes the language out of the bill and adds to it the proposition that they shall have credit for those who volunteer during the 60-day period.

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

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. FISH. I understand that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], and yourself have agreed on the gentleman's amendment. So far as I understand the amendment, I have no objection to it and am in favor of it.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of my getting some information?

Mr. NICHOLS. Please let me continue. I will try to yield later.

As to the provisions of the bill, Mr. Chairman, let no one be misled into thinking that the Fish amendment will delay the operation of the bill by 60 days. My distinguished and learned friend—and a great guy—the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] on yesterday inserted in the RECORD, on

page 11427, certain tables, and at the bottom of the table on that page he placed information in the RECORD which will show anyone who wants to peruse it that under the 60-day volunteer period there could not possibly be lost more than 20 days over the draft plan as proposed in this bill. I quote now from the information the gentleman from Texas put in the RECORD yesterday:

From nothing up to 14 days, in other words the first 14 days after the passage of this act, they will be engaged in registration preparation. The fifteenth day will be consumed in registration. The sixteenth to the twenty-first day they will set up local boards and serially number cards. From the twenty-first to the twenty-fifth day there will be the lottery and the distribution; twenty-fifth to twenty-ninth, local board assign order number and mail questionnaire; twenty-ninth to thirty-fourth, return of questionnaire; thirty-fourth to thirty-sixth, run through questionnaires and sort out class 1-A; thirty-sixth to fortieth, physically examine and induct class 1-A. (Consider zero day the day of passage of the act.)

It is going to take 40 days to get the draft machinery in operation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. If this amendment is adopted, the very day this bill becomes law with the signature of the President, the Chief Executive can issue his call for volunteers as provided in this amendment. If he does it on that day and sufficient men are not secured under the volunteer system within 60 days in any State this bill goes right into operation. Why, the War Department, Mr. Chairman, does not have to slow one cog of the machinery it takes to put into effect this conscription bill. With the signing of the bill the President can issue his call, and at the worst they can only be slowed up for 20 days.

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

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes; briefly.

Mr. EDMISTON. The gentleman has quoted the War Department's own time table and all of us know that the War Department is a lot slower than their estimated speed.

Mr. NICHOLS. The gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. NICHOLS. I am sorry, I cannot for the moment.

The reason I cannot support the Fish amendment without my amendment which provides for this quota to States is because I do not think any section of the United States, be it South, East, North, or West, should be compelled or even by reason of its patriotism permitted to furnish all of the soldiers for the United States. If certain sections of the United States furnish more volunteers than other sections then I think it is nothing but fair, just, and equitable that the section which furnishes the most men by volunteers be given credit against their conscripted quota and that those sections of the United States which have failed to come up under the volunteer system be compelled to make up their quota by conscription.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I regret I did not avail myself of the opportunity, but I did not know that I could possibly be allowed time on yesterday. So I will lay aside the remarks I would have made and now devote myself to congratulating Texas. In the first instance, you have the military spirit, if you lead in volunteers. A Boston paper of this morning contains an article stating that the First Corps of Cadets of Massachusetts are delighted that they will be sent to Texas for training. Wonderful Texas. [Applause.] And most of the boys in the flying squadrons are sent to the flying fields of Texas. Wonderful Texas. [Laughter.] The spirit is there, the Army spirit, of course, is there. Why should you not lead in volunteers? You ought to. If Michiganders do not want to go to Texas, it is passing strange. They are just as patriotic, no doubt, but the war spirit is there in Texas. We understand it. With our military cantonments so largely there, of course, these Texas boys get imbued with militarism. I favor this amendment. During the World War we did not have it; and no matter how many men volunteered from a section, when conscription came along, they received no credit for those having already volunteered. Now you are to give us such credit. I only wonder in a large town what a subdivision means. I hope it means voting precincts, so that one large voting precinct will have to send its share. The boys have enlisted in my community in sufficient numbers to release the other boys. The remainder will not have to hasten marriage. They will not hasten to be divinity students. They can look for a job, and employers will be willing to hire them. They will be relieved by the volunteers. They will relieve the situation. Some of you claim that the volunteer system is discredited. I do not think so.

I want to talk a little about the selective draft. In our democracy we try to get away from the word "select." We have civil service, lest officials select and show favoritism. Under the civil service they have to pass all kinds of examinations to determine their full and complete fitness. In this matter they determine height and poundage. Does that determine a good soldier? Far from it. Only the brave make good soldiers. Many boys are fearful, no matter how big or strong they are; the sound of a gun frightens them, and they will not make good soldiers. But you will select such. A board in my home town will pick a boy because of his poundage, his height, his eyes, his teeth, and such points, as to make a good animal. They will ask if he has dependents and will grant many exemptions. They will not consider important deficiencies of a state of mind for such service.

They will send the names here to Washington and somebody here will put his hand in a hat and draw out a name. That is a wonderful method of selective service. Did you read the book Four Feathers? If you have not, read it. It will do you a lot of good. You will learn how difficult it is to determine whether the sound of cannon will make a brave man or a coward. I do not exactly know how the selective service can work out as a purely democratic system. We should not boast about it. We pick jurors by pulling their names out of a hat. Yes, but if you have a case in court how carefully your lawyer looks over those names that you pull out of the hat. I think you see my point.

It is going to be very difficult for this selective service to work satisfactorily. I hope it does. I am voting for some sort of a selective service bill because I know we ought to have training as fast as we can give it. But I am voting for it as a defense measure, while some of you are voting for it as a war measure. There is a vast difference between the two. I fear that England may be overcome. God knows, I hope she will not be. But I firmly believe she is our first line of defense. I firmly believe that if she is defeated she will transfer her government and fleet to Canada, then we are in the war. Recall the recent pledge of the President to that Dominion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we might reach an agreement as to time on this amendment? According to my tally of the time we have spent on this amendment exactly two and a quarter hours. Apparently we cannot give that much time to all amendments or we will never get through. In view of the fact that we had 2 long days of debate and stayed here until 11 o'clock last night, I think there ought to be some agreement as to time. I wonder if we can agree on an hour's time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour. Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour and 30 minutes.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it has been very difficult to secure time. This is a very

vital matter. It has been the practice heretofore that when time has been rationed out those who come at the tail end find they have a minute or 2 minutes only, which would be exceedingly unfair in this case. If this can be disposed of by permitting all those standing to get 5 minutes, and this is probably the only time I shall have on the bill, I have no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Would not the gentleman be willing for those standing to get an equal division of the 90 minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If that resulted in only 2 minutes, it would be just the same as no time at all. Can you not make it 2 hours?

Mr. MAY. As I have just stated, we have had 2 hours and a quarter already. That would make 4 hours and a quarter debate on one amendment, which to me seems unreasonable.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will not the gentleman give 5 minutes to those standing? After all, we are preparing not for now but for years to come, and I think everyone is entitled to be heard who wishes to be heard.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that we continue debate until 5:30, with the understanding that following debate on this amendment tonight the Committee will rise. Of course, I mean following a vote on the amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close not later than 5:30 this evening.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, has a count been made of those who were on their feet?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is unable to answer that question. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is perhaps in its implications the most vital amendment that can be offered to this bill. Its adoption will sadden the hearts and chill the spirits of all American citizens who are deeply and vitally concerned with the grave menace our country faces in this critical hour. I do not for an instant question the patriotic motives of any gentlemen who advocate the amendment or who vote for it, but there are one or two things I should like to call to your attention.

First, every man on the floor of this House who is against this kind of legislation—if there is such a man—will vote for this amendment. Every citizen in this gallery and outside the dome of this Capitol who is against this legislation and who is against American preparedness will be for this amendment. If you could have a conclave this afternoon of Stalin, Hitler, and Mussolini, to go into session to see what they could do to prevent America's being prepared, the first thing they would say would be, "Do not raise an Army, do not raise your reserve forces. But if America is patriotic enough to raise its reserve forces, then the next best thing to do is to put it off as long as possible, delay it every day that you can delay it."

Why is Great Britain tonight with her back against the wall? Why do we have to send destroyers to help her? Because not for 20 days but for years Great Britain has listened to the siren voice that told her, "Put it off, put it off, put it off, delay it, delay it, just a little longer. There is still more time."

I have been sitting with the House Committee on Appropriations for a month listening to our accredited leaders. Every one of them has driven into our hearts the grave necessity of immediate preparedness for America. Every responsible leader we have today, to whom we must look in this crisis to lead us and protect us if America is threatened, from the President of the United States on down, tells you, "Do not delay even 1 day."

Oh, it is no argument to say "20 days, 20 days, just a measly 20 days." My friend says it will delay it only 20 days. My God, if you could go to Great Britain tonight and promise them that the invasion would be delayed 20 days there would be universal rejoicing over there.

I am going to vote for this bill; however the committee fashions it, whatever is in it, I am going to vote for it. But I beg of you not to send the message out to the United States and to the world that America is hesitating or equivocating. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, there are some things which I do hesitate to give up. I do hesitate to see our country adopt what seems to me a central portion of the dictatorial system. I am not talking about what happens in time of war; nor, according to their own statements, are those who want no changes in this bill talking about a draft of men for war. They tell us this draft bill is to prevent war. I should like to point out to all the gentlemen who have talked about the percentage of volunteers from the different States and about other matters that if this country ever becomes involved in war, when there is dying to be done the people from all over this country will be equally involved, and all of us will have our part in that sacrifice. War and peace are still two different things and the problem presented by this bill is one of its effect on this country in peacetime, for it is, after all, an Army draft bill and not a bill for general training of our citizens.

I believe it is healthy for the House of Representatives to consider for an hour or two the adoption of an amendment to see whether it is not possible that democracy by rising to the height of her traditional democratic effort may not be able to defend herself sufficiently and strongly and now, without the sacrifice of what seems to me to be an essential foundation stone of a free system. I am willing to see things sacrificed for the sake of my country's safety. I am willing to take chances for the sake of it. There is today no perfectly safe course. I know that. I said on the floor the other day that I was willing to vote for this bill as is if you made it a real emergency measure to last 1 year, until we had time to put into effect a real, honest-to-goodness training and national-service program which would apply to every group and class and would offer not only a chance for service, but also opportunity for development to everybody in the Nation and which would enable people to be fitted into the kind of training and service program for which they were best fitted.

I am for this amendment. I am for it because I want at least one chance to have America show that by means of the system she has always followed she can meet this situation. Maybe she can. Believe me, Mr. Chairman, if she did, it would be an answer 10 times as good as the conscription answer to Mr. Hitler, Mr. Stalin, Mr. Mussolini, and all the rest of them. [Applause.]

I know that a lot of people in America have said, "Let us try the volunteer system first, and if it does not work, then we are ready to see you do the other thing." I think it would make a lot of difference in the psychology of the people.

I should like to point out that this amendment, if adopted, will make your program with regard to men exactly four-square with the program with regard to industry, as proposed by the Committee on Military Affairs. They say in that amendment, for which I shall certainly vote, that if the volunteer system with regard to placing orders is not successful, then you shall have compulsion and shall be able to conscript the use of industrial plant in order to obtain necessary defense material. In this amendment, offered by the gentleman from New York, precisely that same principle is applied with regard to the obtaining of men.

I think it is important for us to have the maximum possible amount of unity about what we do. For that reason I do not want to vote against this bill for I feel quite certain it is going to pass. I am going to do so if I can. But

there are some principles and convictions which a man cannot easily set aside. This amendment is gonig to make a lot of difference to me, if it is adopted or if it is not adopted. I hope it is going to be adopted; and I want to say this much further.

Whatever the action of the House is today, and whatever position any Member of this House takes, after that majority decision is made, whatever that program may be, it is up to every Member of the House, including me and everybody else, to support that program wholeheartedly and to have no post mortems about it. [Applause.] If our decision is a decision that has got to be made, after it is made it should be, in effect, a unanimous decision, and we must go forward on that basis to work for the things in which we believe. So I appeal to the Members of the House, in view of the deep principles involved in this measure—and they are deep and this is a solemn hour—to vote for this amendment.

America has been here a long time. She has stood for principles of liberty and the essential cement of her social order has been the cement of the cooperative agreement of her citizens to support great institutions and to defend them. Her people will not fail now. Their leadership must not fail. It must not fail either to provide defense, nor in providing it, to guard as best it can the democratic system of free government for which our country stands.

The young men of America have not known for more than 2 or 3 weeks that it was important for them to join the armed forces. I speak to you as one who has raised 15 boys who are in them now. They are not by own boys, of course, but all grew up in a school I had and they are scattered all over the world in the armed forces of the United States. They volunteered in California. [Applause.]

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to exend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the selective-service bill, commonly called the draft bill. I have not and will not hesitate to support legislation that is necessary for the defense of this country. I believe that I am in as good position as any Member of this House to view all sides of the questions now presented. I have only two children, and both of them are sons of military age. My younger son is already a lieutenant in the Officers' Reserve Corps. Legislation which I have supported and expect to support will vitally and immediately affect both of these sons.

We often boast of our cherished liberty in this country, but we forget that this liberty was fought for and won by our forefathers. It did not come as a result of our own personal sacrifices. Many of our citizens made personal sacrifices in the World War in 1917. We ought to be willing now to make personal sacrifices to preserve that which has been handed down to us.

The stock argument that I have heard most against the selective-service bill is the charge that it is undemocratic. I do not view it that way. As the thing stands now, only the poor boys from the poorest homes, who cannot get jobs otherwise, usually join the Army. Our Southern boys always enlist up to quotas, but they do not do it in other sections. The burden of defending this country ought to rest upon the shoulders of everybody everywhere, not just the poor boys. What can be more democratic than to provide a national defense composed of all classes, rich and poor, high and low, small and great?

The next main objection that I have heard to the bill is the charge that it is not necessary. Hitler has subjugated nearly all of Europe. This is a world struggle between the nations that have and those that have not. America is the richest nation in the world. Does anybody think that Hitler will stand by and have no evil design if he crushes England? It is not like Hitler to do that. We are urged to wait until war is declared. There is no use to "lock the stable after the horse is stolen." It takes time to train an army. We will either need this army or we will not need it. If we are going to need it, we are going to need it badly, and we should start training that army now. To start training after war is declared may be too late. We do not have a situation parallel to 1917. Then we had England and France to hold them off while we could train an army, but France is gone now, and England may soon go. If our boys have to fight to defend this country, I want them to have the best training, the best guns, and the best of everything. I do not want them to be unprepared. If they do not have to go to war, this training that they will get will not harm them but will be beneficial to them. So, from either way you look at it, it appears to be a wise thing to enact this bill speedily. This does not mean that our boys are going to war, but it is our best insurance against war. It is well to bear in mind that we are living in very abnormal days, and we have to meet conditions as they are, not as we would like for them to be. We are all against war, but we propose to protect our country with everything that we possess. There is no question but what we must have an adequate Army and Navy, and the democratic way is to get that Army and Navy from all over the Nation and from all classes of people. That is what this bill will do, and I intend to support it.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, one of the supporters of this Stalin-Hitler type of compulsory peacetime military service, one of the members of the committee reporting the bill, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] quoted statistics a few moments ago indicating that equipment was available for training our men, including the conscripts provided in this bill. He stated that his statistics were as of the month of May, 1940.

I do not believe he should quote May statistics. I hold in my hand a page of the Milwaukee Journal for Saturday, August 24, 1940, some time later than the month of May, 1940, which contains actual photographs indicating that during the week of August 24, 1940, the Wisconsin and Michigan National Guard volunteers while called into Federal training were forced to use some strange and unusual equipment for their artillery practice. This paper states:

> For lack of sufficient real equipment, National Guard men at Camp McCoy, Wis., are using some singular makeshifts in the Second Army maneuvers. Above, two of Michigan's One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Infantry prepared to "shoot" an antitank gun made from a plank and a couple of iron wheels, while their comrades (below) use a log as a trench mortar.

Mr. Chairman, the photographs above reveal that the antitank gun is a large plank mounted on the wheels of an old manure spreader and that the trench mortar is an old wooden fence post. This as late as the 24th day of August, 1940.

I wonder if this strange and unusual equipment is listed in the May list of equipment which we were told was available for military training.

Mr. FADDIS. Does the gentleman expect the House to take a cartoon in a newspaper in opposition to a statement of the War Department?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, these are not cartoons. They are actual photographs which were made in the training camp in the week of August 24, 1940. Our New Deal brethren sold much of Uncle Sam's artillery to the British and therefore our own men must use large planks mounted on old, rusty manure-spreader wheels for artillery practice and training and wooden fence posts for trench-mortar practice and training.

Our New Deal brethren also sold millions of Uncle Sam's Army rifles to the British, and during the recent Federal training of our National Guard its members were forced to use many broomsticks and fish poles for rifle practice and training.

Our New Deal brethren have also sold many of Uncle Sam's warships and airships to the British.

I hold in my hand the first page of the Washington Times-Herald for Wednesday, September 4, 1940, which contains a September 3 United Press report from Ottawa, Canada, stating that Canada is negotiating for the purchase of over-age United States Government tanks, and that a Canadian officer is in the United States inspecting certain tanks which might

be useful for training purposes in Canada. I suppose that our Regular Army, our National Guard, and the additional troops provided in this bill will have to use old, decrepit, rusty automobiles and trucks for tank-training purposes.

Mr. Chairman, our New Deal brethren have stripped Uncle Sam's national defense and have sold so many essential portions of it to the British that I wonder just what they intend to do should Hitler attack us, as vociferously claimed by our New Deal brethren under the war hysteria propaganda which is used as a smoke screen to cover the third-term "blitzkrieg" of our ex-international banker, New Deal "fuehrer," Mr. Roosevelt.

If the New Deal, in the future as in the past, continues to strip our own national defense and sell essential portions of it to the British we will be in a pretty tight box should their claims of Hitler's attack come true. In order to defend our country and our countrymen we will practically have to meet a naval attack with rowboats, stop his 80-ton tanks with anti-tank artillery consisting of large planks mounted on manure spreader wheels, go over the top with infantry equipped with broomsticks and fish poles instead of rifles, use old rusty discarded automobiles and trucks for our tank offense, use wooden fence posts for trench mortar defense, and meet him in the air with the hot air and gas of New Deal politicians.

Mr. Chairman, because I will not have time to speak on the amendment which I am going to offer to the pending Fish amendment, I shall now read that amendment for the information of the Members. My amendment proposes to add after the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] the following proviso:

Provided further, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to receive and accept voluntary financial contributions and place them in a separate fund to be available for the purpose of helping to defray the cost of our national-defense program, including that portion provided in this act.

I shall offer this amendment in order that we might have a voluntary man-created dollar service in defense of our country as well as a voluntary God-created man service. In view of the almost bankrupt condition of our Federal Treasury my amendment should be adopted and incorporated in this bill, the title of which is, "To protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training and service." The pending Fish amendment provides for voluntary service of God-created men. My amendment to his amendment provides for voluntary service of man-created dollars.

In view of the almost bankrupt condition of our Federal Treasury, the incorporation of my amendment will certainly increase the effectiveness of our national defense and give our multi-millionaire war mongers and war interventionists an opportunity to voluntarily contribute much of their worldly wealth.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] who, unfortunately raised an anti-Semitic issue, the gentleman suggested that I read and delve into the prophets Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. I have perhaps read and studied the prophets Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob more than the gentleman has. I have great respect for them. However, I am more familiar with Matthew, Mark, Luke, Paul, and John. This is what I wanted to tell him when I asked the gentleman to yield after he suggested that I read and delve into the prophets Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. However, the gentleman would not yield, and I therefore answer him at this time.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to the amendment.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am, according to the ruling of the previous Chairman, when I made the same point of order when the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] was discussing the prophets.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman from Wisconsin will proceed in order.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, that is precisely what I am doing.

Mr. Chairman, I was certainly surprised at the denunciation by the gentleman from New York of our countrymen from New York who are now in Washington exercising their constitutional right to petition Congress in opposition to this Hitler-Stalin type of peacetime compulsory military service. We know that during the World War our countrymen of all racial extractions and religions——

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Including those from New York, enlisted in the service of our country and many made the supreme sacrifice.

Mr. FADDIS. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman is not speaking to the amendment.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking to the pending amendment. We do not want anyone in this emergency to foment racial or religious animosity and hatreds and deny any of our countrymen the privilege to exercise their constitutional right to come to Washington and impress their views upon their representatives in Congress. We Americans must all stick together, no matter what our racial extraction, religious beliefs or stations in life may be; no matter whether we live in the Nation's Capital, the States of Wisconsin, New York, Texas, Mississippi, or any other State of the Union. We must unitedly stand in defense of our common country under the Stars and Stripes. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] is recognized.

Mr. BARDEN of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to try to make as much noise as a couple speaking, together with the Chairman's gavel [laughter], but I do want to mention one or two things. I believe if there is any one thing uppermost in the minds of the American people today it is that they want action, and they want action without further faltering. I do not know how the rest of you feel about this. Far be it from me to question either the motives or the words of any Member who wants to express his opinion on this floor. I think it is a dangerous proposition to have the overwhelming percentage of our armed forces from one section of this country, and it is an admitted fact that not only is such the case but that area is the southern agricultural areas. You know and I know that we have warmongers in this country. You know and I know that we have men who are making a lot of money out of selling gunpowder, munitions, and airplane engines, and so forth. Both the men that own these plants and the employees that are drawing premium wages now are from an entirely different section from the one that is furnishing the volunteer soldiers. Do you not think it would be a safer proposition if we are honestly and sincerely preparing for peace and not war—and I am one of those who are preparing for peace, and I want no mistake about that—to have the Senator's son, the Congressman's son, the banker's son, the munition manufacturer's son, the Wall Street stockbroker's son, the airplane manufacturer's and the farmer's son, the industrial worker's son, the W. P. A. worker's son, all side by side in uniform and let all those men back home have some blood kin interest in what they may be planning? [Applause.] God forbid that we shall ever have another war. But if we should, we do not want it to be called a rich man's war and a poor man's fight.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I stated a question of the privilege of the House earlier this afternoon. I ask unanimous consent that at that point I may revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to get that permission in the House.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] is recognized.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the members of the committee to the situation we would be up against if this amendment should be adopted.

Congress has empowered and instructed the War Department to increase the Regular Army up to 375,000 men, and they have engaged in their recruiting campaign with that

objective in view. I do not have the last figures showing the strength as of today. I assume it is approaching 300,000. It should not be forgotten that the Department is recruiting men for the standing professional Army, quite distinct in its mission from a citizen's army. Although I do not want to start a controversy here, I think the War Department has been wise in adhering to its practice of recruiting men for 3 years in the standing professional Army. The 1-year period of enlistment was attempted in 1920 and 1921. The results were appallingly disappointing. The Army merely became a funnel through which men passed in rapid succession and it proved impossible to keep an effective Regular Army recruited on the 1-year enlistment basis. However, they still have 75,000 men to come. The testimony shows that they expect to reach the 375,000 figure some time in the month of December. That is their first duty. If we put upon them the job of finding 400,000 more men, their burden will be 475,000 men and 2 types of soldiers. Sixty days from the passage of this bill will bring us to about the middle of November. It is proposed to enlist 400,000 men by that time. If you do it and induct these volunteers into service, you simply cannot take care of them. It cannot be done. There will not be sufficient clothing or housing. There will not be cantonments. There will not be tentage.

It is impossible for the Department to handle any such number. It is far beyond the plans and hopes of the Department to take in 400,000 men in the next 60 days, plus the 75,000 which they have to take into the Regular Army. That they must go ahead with. That they have planned for. Under the plans of the Department, under this bill, as I tried to explain yesterday, it is planned somewhere near the middle of November, the 8th, 10th, 12th, or 14th, no one can state exactly, to bring not 400,000 men under the draft, but only 75,000. That is what they certainly can take care of at that time. Then a month later, we will say, 100,000. They are going to bring them in in driblets, spread the effort over 3 months' time, so that by approximately the first week or the second week in January they will be able to take care of between 350,000 and 400,000 men.

This amendment throws a monkey wrench into that whole machinery.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do.

Mr. FISH. I do not agree with the gentleman's statement that this throws a monkey wrench into the machinery. I cannot believe the gentleman really means that. The War Department does not have to take all of these 400,000 men within the 60-day period, the War Department could take them a month later or whenever they wanted to so long as they volunteered within that time; and by the 1st of January, of course, they say they will be able to take care of the first 400,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I regard the job handed the War Department recruiting service by the gentleman's amendment as impossible of fulfillment, absolutely impossible when you consider all the limitations. I am convinced that this amendment, although well intentioned by its introducer, would throw a monkey wrench into this whole business and result in delay. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time simply for the purpose of making the record clear as to the position of the American Labor Party with reference to conscription and the 50-battleship question.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] in speaking on the amendment now before us read into the RECORD a telegram in which the sender purported to present the position that the American Labor Party was in favor of conscription and that it endorsed the transfer of the 50 warships. I think I know something about my own party, a little bit more than the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]; and may I say that the sender of that telegram had no authority to speak for the party.

The American Labor Party is fighting this question out on the 17th of September in a democratic manner at the primaries. The issue before the enrolled voters of the American Labor Party is the issue of armaments, conscription, and war. Delegates will be elected to the convention of the American Labor Party on the 17th of September on that issue, and only the convention of the American Labor Party representing the enrolled voters of the American Labor Party can speak for the party, and not the sender of that telegram.

May I say further that when the sender of that telegram worded it in the manner in which he did, lacking authority to speak for the American Labor Party, he attempted deliberately to perpetrate a fraud on the Members of Congress by making a deliberate misrepresentation. The overwhelming majority of the American Labor Party voters are opposed to conscription, war, and everything that makes for war.

It is most unfortunate that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] signaled out the race and religion of some of the people who come here to Washington to petition Congress against this bill. From this Well he said he spewed them out. I think one of the reasons why we detest and despise Hitler and Hitlerism is because he commenced this spewing-out business back in the days of the beer-cellar Putsch. [Applause.] I just wonder, I just wonder who is imitating Hitler now! [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE] is recognized.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. This amendment is the so-called Hayden amendment which was defeated recently in the Senate by only two votes. I have resented the inference and innuendo contained in some of the speeches that have been delivered on the floor today that would question the patriotism of those who held contrary views. Mr. Chairman, we all have a common objective to provide for an adequate national defense. The honest differences of opinion arise over the question of the best means of accomplishing our common objective.

It should be remembered that what is proposed in this bill is conscription in peacetime. It is hard to legislate coolly in an atmosphere charged with war hysteria. I am not yet convinced that this Nation is threatened by invasion. This amendment offered by the gentleman from New York simply defers for 60 days the drafting of men and gives an opportunity to supply the needed personnel through the volunteer system. In the event the number called for by the President have not volunteered, the additional number needed would automatically be drafted. It will not delay the procurement of enlisted personnel for the reason that it will require approximately 60 days to secure the men by conscription.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], for whom I have great respect, has just indicated that under this amendment there might be more volunteers than the War Department could take care of between now and January 1. There is nothing mandatory in this amendment to require calling out the entire number authorized. If the War Department can take care of draftees as provided in the bill, I can see no reason why they cannot take care of volunteers.

In his speech yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] indicated that the first call to service is calculated to come about the 7th to 10th of November, at which time approximately 75,000 men would be drafted into the service. Why not give the volunteer system a chance to fill this quota and future quotas under the provisions of this amendment? With the 1-year enlistment period permitted and the increase of pay from $21 to $30 a month as provided under this bill, voluntary enlistments will be encouraged and increased enormously when the President issues his proclamation asking for volunteers. Should the volunteer system not prove adequate, conscription automatically goes into

effect, and no delay in the securing of personnel will be experienced.

Support this amendment and give the volunteer system a chance. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, first of all, may I say that I am perfectly willing to meet the issue squarely. I favor this amendment but even if this amendment be not adopted and perhaps one or two others that I should like to see agreed to, I still shall vote for the bill, because I feel that adequately prepared manpower is absolutely necessary for the defense of this country. I have always voted and fought for an adequate Army and Navy, air force, and all that go with them. No one knows who is going to win the present war across the seas. We all have our wishes and hopes, but no one knows. No one knows what form of government the victorious nation will have. Do we want to be a weak nation no matter what nation in the world is victorious? No. We do not want to fear any nation or combination of nations in the world. We must be strong in every way. Just think for a minute of our coast line. Just think of our vast boundaries. Think of our huge population with all the different elements it contains. Think of those within our gates who are hostile to us and our way of thinking and to our freedom of thought and action and of worship. We need great manpower to guard everything we have. Everything for which we stand. We cannot afford to take a chance. We must prepare fully and at once.

I shall support the Fish amendment because under its provisions I believe that instead of slowing up or preventing the objectives of this bill it in a very short time will increase very much the manpower of our country. If I did not believe so I would not support it. There already is provision in the bill for enlistment, but I believe the pending amendment will focus the Nation's attention on enlistment. I represent the historic towns of Concord, Lexington, Arlington, Acton, and all that great area made famous during the Revolutionary War. The men of the Sixth Regiment of Massachusetts were the first to enter the Civil War. Many, many from Lowell and other towns of my district volunteered and enlisted during the Spanish-American War and also during the World War. After all, enlistment was our original way of doing the thing in this country.

I believe in giving our young men the opportunity to enlist. I believe they should be encouraged to enlist if they want to. I wish that the pay in all branches of our service were equalized, that it were more adequate compensation for a man's monetary sacrifice in entering the Army.

Mr. Chairman, I want to bring up another point, because the mothers and fathers of America may have been alarmed by the speeches that were made on the floor yesterday. I refer to the conditions they were told that the men will likely face in the various cantonments and Army posts. I refer to the health of the soldiers in comparison with the health of the civil population, and I am going to insert in the RECORD a letter from Dr. Parran, Surgeon General of the United States, and some statistics from the Surgeon General of the Army, which show that the health of our men in the Army and Navy is infinitely superior and infinitely better protected than is the health of those in civilian occupations. [Applause.]

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, September 5, 1940.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: In response to your request for a statement concerning the general health of the civilian population as compared with that of troops in camp, I would say:

We cannot truthfully compare the general health of the civilian population with that of troops in camp, for the reason that soldiers are picked groups of physically fit young men, while the civilian population covers all ages, both sexes, and all degrees of physical fitness. However, the general health conditions under which enlisted men live compare favorably with those afforded the civilian population and are, in fact, better than those experienced by a large proportion of the general population. Enlisted men are immediately given preventive inoculations against smallpox and typhoid fever. Strict control of the venereal diseases among the troops is maintained. In addition, the nutrition, environmental sanitation, and the medical and hospital services provided for the troops are more comprehensive and better than that available to a large proportion of the civilian population.

Since your second question concerning the encampment of troops in tents during the winter months is a problem of the United States Army, I have referred your request to the office of the Surgeon General of the Army.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS PARRAN,
Surgeon General.

Colonel Meehan, of the Surgeon General's office in the War Department, advises:

Comparing the death-rate figures of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. (industrial department) with the death-rate figures in the United States Army, the following is shown:

Civilian males between the ages of 20 to 64 for the period 1911–35, the death rate was	13.54
Death rate in Army for same period (same ages)	6.66
Death rate for period 1931–35:	
Civilians	12.35
For the Army	4.80

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I am for the pending amendment and also for the amendment to the amendment. No gentleman in this Chamber has a higher place in my regard than the author of this bill, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who, of course, is opposed to the pending amendment. I recognize, too, that the author of the amendment, another gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], is a man well versed in military affairs, as well as those who offered amendments to the Fish amendment. I talked this same matter over with the junior Senator from Arizona, who offered the amendment in the other body. That amendment in the Senate lacked only two votes of carrying.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] as a man of great authority in regard to military affairs and a man who is not surpassed by anyone in his patriotism and in his desire to give us proper, timely, adequate defense for the country. It is largely because this is Senator HAYDEN's amendment, and I so respect his judgment, that I am taking the floor at this moment to support it. He made an admirable statement on this matter some days before it came before the Senate. This will be found in his statement of August 20, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 28, on page 11124.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the selective principle is the proper method to be followed in time of war. I also believe that in these modern days, when only hours separate peace and war, we have reached such an emergency as will justify use of the selective principle in peacetime as a basis for training, but I am also well aware of the great hold upon our people which the volunteer system has. As has already been expressed here, we ought by this amendment to make this concession to the volunteer idea which is in the minds of our people. For this reason I am for the pending amendment.

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

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. May I say to the gentleman that I have given a great deal of thought and study to this matter and am still open-minded on the bill. It is with great reluctance that I even think of voting for conscription in peacetime, but I recognize the existence of a great emergency. The amendment, with the amendment to the amendment added as a safeguard, it seems to me only strengthens the bill rather than weakens it. To me, it would be far easier to support this bill if it had this amendment added to it.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I believe that the gentleman is exactly right.

It is quite true that the voluntary system results in a heavier burden falling upon certain States and sections of our country than upon other States and sections. It is true that certain sections of our population, perhaps more patriotic than other sections, enlist in greater proportions, thus carrying the heavy end of the burden. But I think the people who thus carry

the heavier part of this burden take pride in doing so, and possibly resent the idea of a draft. I notice that Arizona ranks quite high in the matter of voluntary enlistments. I recall that the men of Arizona flocked to the standard of Theodore Roosevelt when they remembered the *Maine* and formed the Rough Rider contingent to fight in Cuba. Three companies of Rough Riders were organized in Arizona, and one of the dashing leaders was Bucky O'Neill, who lost his life in the charge up San Juan Hill. In that undertaking Arizona was far over her quota, if such a thing had been known then.

I think we ought to leave the way clear for enlistments, even along with conscription. I doubt whether enlistment has been given a fair trial, and although the dual system has been provided for in this measure, the bill without the amendment before us emphasizes conscription and minimizes the voluntary-enlistment door to our armed forces. If this bill becomes law without the pending amendment, the Army might not encourage voluntary enlistment and would make the act almost completely one of conscription.

It is complained that valuable time will be lost if this amendment should be adopted, and time is of the essence. I cannot see that time will be lost. We propose to register men between certain ages, and then we propose to select by lot the required number of men taken from the total number of men between certain ages. It will take about 60 days to do the work of registration and to get ready to draw numbers by lot, and if meanwhile we have only half, or 25 percent by voluntary enlistment, the numbers can be selected by lot at about the same time as they could be selected under this bill without the amendment. The difference would be that by this amendment we would have given the traditional American voluntary-enlistment plan a chance to work, and I believe that the psychological effect on our people would be good.

Some say that we must immediately draft, or at least prepare to draft, millions of men just to show European dictators that we have them. Well, the registration alone will do that. The actual number of men taken into service for training must necessarily be limited by the equipment which we have. Since we have to build up that equipment, we must not call the men until we have the right amount of equipment needed. Another point to note is that this is an authorization bill which authorizes the President to call these men at his discretion as the emergency warrants, merely placing an upper limit on the number called.

All of us stand for total adequate preparedness. We have voted astronomical sums of money to build war machines. I believe the engineering genius of America can outbuild the whole world, if we have to do so, both in quality and in quantity. When we voted those appropriations, we knew that men would be needed and must be trained. But the two programs must go along together, and I believe that in starting off this new and enlarged phase of national preparedness we do well to give voluntary enlistment its fair trial. Especially when we can do so without loss of time and without hazard. Therefore I shall vote for this amendment. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, as careful a study as I have been able to give to this bill—and that study has been careful and long and painstaking—has persuaded me that I must support the Burke-Wadsworth bill, because that study has convinced me beyond any question of doubt that the security of the United States requires it. Therefore, I intend to vote for the bill whether or not the Fish amendment is adopted. [Applause.]

I sincerely hope, however, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] may prevail. That amendment provides that immediately upon the enactment of the bill the President by proclamation shall call for 400,000 volunteers for an enlistment of 1 year. That is equivalent to the quota which this bill proposes to raise under the draft by January 1, 1941. The machinery of the draft is not suspended by this amendment. The registration, the classification, and the selection continues to go right along. The amendment simply provides that if within 60 days from the passage of the bill 400,000 volunteers have responded, then as to that quota the draft will not apply. If, on the other hand, the quota should be only partially filled by enlistment, then the draft shall apply as to the remainder of it. In the first place, I am convinced the amendment can do no possible harm to the bill and that it will not cause any delay whatever in securing the number of men we need. The amendment seems to me to be entirely fair and just and equitable. I am convinced, moreover, of a further and a more important thing, and that is that if this amendment is adopted it will remove entirely nearly all of the objection that has been offered to the Burke-Wadsworth bill.

It is conceded by all that no one wants conscription in peacetime unless conscription is necessary. The distinguished author of this bill in the House stated on the floor on yesterday that unless he had been satisfied that compulsory military training and service was necessary at this time for the defense of the Nation he would not have proposed it. In that I think all of us must concur. We support the bill because we think a sufficient Army cannot be recruited without it, and for no other reason.

Now, what is the objection to the bill on the part of those who oppose it? The objection or the opposition to it is the claim that it is not necessary. Why? Because, say the opponents of the bill, we are able by voluntary enlistment to raise an Army as large as the War Department has said we require in this emergency and therefore we do not need the draft.

Now, since that is the principal argument that has been made against the bill, let us meet it by presenting the bill to the country with this amendment attached to it and let us see whether within 60 days we can recruit by enlistment the same number which will be called for by this bill 60 days from the date of its passage. If within 60 days we cannot do it, then the machinery of the draft, which will be already in operation under this bill, notwithstanding the amendment, will proceed to reach out and get the men we require. That is a fair proposition. It will not delay the draft one single day, in event the quota is not reached through voluntary enlistment, because it is not contemplated by this bill to bring in the first quota under the draft until after the expiration of 60 days from the date of its passage. The amendment is not only good for the bill, it is good for the country also, because it will create a feeling of good will and cooperation that we cannot obtain in any other way. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GEYER].

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in rising at this time is not particularly to discuss the pending amendment but to inform the Members that at the proper time I expect to offer an amendment to this bill. My amendment will be a very simple one. Probably you have already guessed the nature of it. It will have to do with the voting rights of those people who come from States where the poll tax is a prerequisite to voting. As you know, there are eight such States. It seems to me that the least we can do for the boys who come from the South—and it seems to me that the South is proud of the fact, and well they may be, that they have so many men enlisting—is to give them a democracy for which they can fight. I will say more on that later.

We are going to have something said about the constitutionality of this proposal. Far be it from me to argue the constitutionality of it, not being a lawyer. However, we have in the hearings, which unfortunately have not yet been printed, very expert testimony as to its constitutionality. May I say right here—and I wish the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] and the chairman of the Committee of the Judiciary, that very able gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], would listen to these next statements—on the 17th day of May the hearings were completed on the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill, but up to the present time they have not been

ordered to be printed. They were ordered to be printed once, but on the next day, according to the Printing Office, they were recalled.

Mr. WALTER rose.

Mr. GEYER of California. I hope the gentleman will tell us why he has not ordered these hearings printed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, the statement has been made this afternoon on several occasions that what the people of the United States want is action. I agree with that statement. What they want is action, and they want preparedness, but as I pointed out in my remarks day before yesterday, they want action of a wise and a justified nature, and a preparedness program which will give us preparedness.

Let us do a little analyzing as we consider the particular point which is being debated at this time. Manifestly, if we are going to get action, and be prepared, it is for some particular eventuality. This eventuality, I assume, is the possibility of meeting an enemy at war, or of preventing one from taking advantage of us. Whether this enemy forces war on us in a military way or takes advantage of us in an economic way—and in either event it is war—I do not believe this particular conscription bill is aimed at preparing us for meeting that challenge, either in a military way or an economic way.

For instance, if the enemy which most of you are thinking about comes to our shores with their troops, with their navy such as they have, which is not much, and with their air force, which we have to admit is pretty good, how are we going to meet them and what are we going to meet them with? Are we not going to meet them first with our Navy, and next with an air force and with antiaircraft guns and with a mobile, fully mechanized, small but very active force of men? How under the sun is this conscription bill, bringing in millions of men, going to solve this problem which we are going to be faced with? Or if the enemy says, "We are going to meet you on the business field in an economic war," and we are told, "Well, that means that the price of rubber or the price of tin is going up, and we just cannot stand to pay more for our automobiles or our tin cans or what have you," then in answer to that I submit that we could pay a lot more for a lot of automobiles and a lot of tin cans and still be a lot better off than we would be to conscript an army of several millions and to go into a war which is being proposed by the proponents of this bill with all of the tremendous loss of not only dollars and materials but also of lives and health, and even of democracy itself. What would you rather do, pay for a war or pay more for rubber and tin?

Now, the charge has been made that a conclave composed of Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini would be in favor of the Fish amendment which proposes to postpone and limit the workings of this draft bill. Well, I do not know as to that, but I am mighty sure that they would vote unanimously in favor of this conscription bill for two reasons: First, because it is right up their alley and puts the world's last free people alongside them in the dictatorship class with a peacetime conscript army, thus admitting that their own program has been right; and secondly, this bill, if enacted into law, will give us everything else but preparedness of the right sort, and they know it, after viewing Poland and France. Sure, Hitler, Stalin, and company would chuckle in glee if we are weak-minded enough to pass any such bill as proposed, thus wasting our time, our resources, and our opportunity for real preparedness and the preparation of an up-to-date military force suitable for the needs of this year and those to come. [Applause.]

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I am voting for this bill as it is. I am voting against all amendments. [Applause.]

If we want to send an encouraging word across the water to a legislative body which adjourned a few hours ago on account of an air raid—men who speak our language, men of our religion, men who could understand us, people with whom we would be at home in their homes tonight—if we want to give them a word of encouragement, we will pass this bill without further delay and without amendment. [Applause.]

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

Mr. PIERCE. No.

It is wrong to attempt to kill this bill by this method. It is a crime to play politics with a matter so serious. If we actually are imperiled, let us act. If not, cancel the armaments. I am not a military man, but during the World War I served on the Appeals Board in Oregon, and during those months of hard work I passed on many appeals coming up from the local boards, and I classed and reclassified many men. I became acquainted with selective service and I became convinced that it was the only way to secure an army or to give all an equal chance either in peace or in wartime.

We cannot delay preparation until war comes because war comes out of the clouds suddenly and we might have no chance to prepare. Unpreparedness would be a hazard to every participant.

Very reluctantly, and with a heavy heart, I came to the conclusion some weeks ago that it would be my duty to vote for a bill providing for selective-service training. I arrived at this decision after careful consideration of all factors involved, fully realizing that this is the most important bill which has been before the Congress since I became a Member of it almost 8 years ago.

The menace of Hitlerism today and tomorrow; the uncertainties of our national welfare under unpreparedness; the general agreement that we shall spend billions for mechanized defense; the futility of acquiring such armament without trained men to operate it and others trained to service them—these considerations influenced my decision.

I took my stand in the firm belief that such preparation would be our best insurance against attack and against involvement in the European debacle. I cannot believe this means war; I can only hope it may mean peace for us—an armed neutrality, with confidence in our prowess and a stern warning to possible aggressors.

Now that the Senate has finished its prolonged debate and passed a bill embodying its ideas and best judgment and the Nation has spoken by letter and through the press, we in the House have before us for guidance all the facts and all the opinions which a legislative body in a democracy could desire. The House committee has improved upon the Senate bill by using wider spread age limits and lifting part of the burden from the shoulders of youth. All men in their prime who are physically fit and considered eligible for service without sacrifice of dependents and social welfare should be among those millions from which the small percentage will be chosen for service. The training will be valuable in developing the physical body as well as other capacities, and the time will not be lost.

SERVICE OF YOUTH SHOULD RECEIVE EDUCATIONAL CREDITS

I am well aware of the fact that many young men will find education interrupted by a year of service, as that happened in the World War. I was the author of the Oregon soldiers' education bill which provided that those who had served in the World War might have 4 years' training in educational institutions in the State of Oregon, and be paid $25 a month for 8 months of the year, or a total of $800 for each returning veteran. Oregon spent about $3,000,000 in educating and training its ex-service men. I have always taken great pride in the fact that this was the first such recognition of the services of the men who had gone into the World War, and I know it was of immense help to hundreds of boys who took advantage of it. I place high value on formal education, but realize that other things may be more important when our institutions are in jeopardy.

On the 7th of August, I wrote to the House Military Affairs Committee, as follows:

> I am convinced that we must take measures toward selective service training. I think, however, that it should be so arranged that those young men who are called upon to sacrifice a year of college life, during which they might prepare for professions, should be given college credits for work which may properly be accredited.
>
> After the World War, I prepared and got through the Oregon Legislature the soldiers' education bill which provided college educa-

tion for returned soldiers. This has always interested me, and I now write to ask that your committee investigate to see whether it will not be possible to work out some system of credits which would be accepted by colleges for certain types of work, especially for technical work which will be required in the service. All land-grant colleges, and some others, now allow credits for military training, so my proposal will be merely an extension of credits for technical training under Government auspices.

It is my understanding that we are preparing for compulsory military training, and not just for compulsory military service. I hope this will be made clear.

I also wrote to the American Council on Education, urging that they cooperate with the universities to bring about the granting of credits. I am assured by them that this plan is being worked out. It is my opinion that credit will be given to the young men for the year they spend in military training.

UNIVERSAL SERVICE OUR WATCHWORD

College students are among the privileged groups, and many young men are not there included because of pressure for self-support and earnings needed for parents and family. These also will have the special consideration of the boards of honorable and patriotic citizens chosen by the States to make selections. I do not regard the question of amount of wage payment as of paramount importance if all share in making sacrifices for the protection of our freedom. I stated my position on this in my speech on the floor on July 25, from which I quote a pertinent paragraph:

There are four groups of citizens who will first be called upon to sacrifice personal interests in support of the national-defense program. Their response will reveal to the world, as well as to our own citizens, our strength and our weaknesses. If any one of these groups begins by demanding exemption from the responsibilities which citizens face in a national emergency our democracy will indeed be imperiled. It is obvious that these groups are our industry, labor, taxpayers, and young men citizens. If industry should demand cash on the barrel head before undertaking manufacture of airplanes and defense weapons; if labor, which has been stabilized by legislative enactments of the past 8 years, should hesitate to perform its part without increased financial assurances; if taxpayers should revolt against the necessary sharing of income; and if youth should be found unwilling to dedicate to Government a year of service we shall face a tragic era. Our country, also, would be left exposed to attack by those who are capable of united effort. I am confident that those who belong to each group so prize the privileges of our democracy that they will be found united against the sabotage of unwillingness to serve.

Since that paragraph was written, the Senate, and the House committee as well, have provided amendments for the drafting of recalcitrant industry, if it should be found demanding excessive profits before participating in the defense program. Indeed, most of us are agreed that the profit motive shall be entirely eliminated from consideration in relation to all factors I have cited—industry, taxpayers, labor, and military or technical service. Certainly all the fortunate Government employees, including Congressmen, should contribute fully both money and services. I shall support amendments conscripting industry, wealth, and all necessary resources needed to supplement and operate equipment and to sustain our manhood as it is mobilized for our protection. Certainly all classes and groups must yield to our necessities. This is a clear-cut issue which we must face with determination and emphasis, believing that universal service includes industry and all the rest of us.

Nowhere has the point of view which I strongly endorse been expressed more clearly than in a letter just received from the Railway Labor Executives' Association. I quote:

The men represented by our association throughout the land will not decline to perform their sacred duty to protect the greatest nation in the world. However, we refuse to accept any type of political or economic philosophy which invests wealth and industry with an element of sacredness which is denied the cream of our Nation's manhood. Any discriminatory favoritism for industry as contrasted with labor is but an inducement to the depreciation of the high morale which maintains on the part of labor to do its part with the greatest loyalty. We therefore respectfully urge that the provisions as set forth in section 11 of Senate bill 4164, August 30, 1940, be incorporated in such legislation as the House of Representatives is now considering.

LET US ACCEPT OUR RESPONSIBILITY

Full well am I aware of the fact that the vote on this pending bill carries great political significance. Many Members facing elections on the 5th of November of this year will find that it will cost them more votes than any other bill before them during their congressional careers. It will more seriously affect those who vote for the bill than those who vote against it. The voters opposed to the bill will not forget, but will be sure to vote against the man who favors it, while many of those who really believe the bill should pass will, on election day, weigh the merits of the candidate by some other scale. Nevertheless, I regard it my duty to vote for the bill. It is a matter of conscience. I would always feel as guilty as a draft evader if I should side-step this issue. The bill is not exactly as I would have it, but here we learn to make our fight and take the very best we can get under the rule of acceptance of majority opinion.

We citizens of America have a magnificent heritage. Ours is a government founded on ideals strange to the Old World. Under our Constitution and our laws we enjoy the rights of trial by jury, of free speech, of free press, freedom of assembly, and the inestimable privilege of choosing our own manner of religious observances. The 130,000,000 people living beneath the stars and stripes have the best government ever devised and worked out by man.

We who represent the people in this legislative assembly can now, in this emergency, turn for guidance only to our own judgments. We cannot yield to pressure groups, knowing full well that the silent majority is trusting us to do what appears to us best for the country. This is the essence of representative government.

VOLUNTEER OR SELECTIVE SERVICE?

I have had no military training myself and know nothing of war from experience. I do not come from a military family, but from those who have been civilians since the Revolution. My only son was a volunteer in the World War and saw service both in France and Italy, coming home safe and sound after 2 years of absence. I have 9 grandsons, one now old enough for service, and others approaching maturity.

My service on the Appeals Board convinced me that the only democratic and equitable method of securing defenders was through the operation of a selective service plan. Many people believe that the volunteer system is the proper one; that it is the only fair way to secure brave, intelligent defenders of our country. I appreciate the fact that the volunteer in military service is unquestionably the better soldier at the start, at least. I am, however, firmly convinced that, while the volunteer system in emergency takes the bravest and the best, the strongest and the ablest, there are countless others just as fortunate in enjoying the great inheritance of this country, and just as capable of defending it, who stand back and let the more patriotic volunteer make the sacrifice for their advantage. The volunteer system places under suspicion all who do not immediately enlist and under compulsion those whose honor is most sensitive. Each should have an equal interest in doing his part in defense of the country under which his liberties are guaranteed in times of peace. During my service on the Appeals Board I discovered that some men and families make all sorts of excuses and resort to all kinds of subterfuges to keep some greedy, timid, or lazy and worthless renegade from doing his part. The man who has not enough character and gumption to join the ranks and fight, if necessary, to defend America is not worthy to enjoy the advantages of American institutions.

WHY WE ARM

Opponents of this bill decry "compulsory service in time of peace." Its proponents believe it necessary to preserve the peace and to preserve this Government. There would be no excuse for this bill if we were certain that there would be no interference with our national affairs. Any informed person must by this time understand that our country is in danger, as it faces a world controlled almost wholly by those who uphold the totalitarian theory which denies that government shall rest upon the consent of the governed. I have analyzed in my speech of July 25 on this floor the philosophy and the advance of Hitlerism which has destroyed European democracies in quick succession, having gained its tremendous power during the short period of two Presidential terms in our country. News of the daily life in the countries which are now

ruled by Germany is very meager, but we know that those people who have been surrendered to Hitler have no liberties, and that the strong, able leaders are being removed and "liquidated." Without mechanized armies they are unable to shake off their shackles and must submit to the most cruel and inhuman government the world has ever known.

Will England survive? This is the question which we ask each other every day. If that great nation should break, what, then, would be the plight of our country, without trained men to man our battlements, now transformed into mechanized equipment? If Hitler wins the final round which is now being fought, our country also must face the certainty of the assaults of totalitarian economy and totalitarian ideals. I do not expect an actual invasion, but I do expect that we must be prepared to encounter a coalition of the totalitarian nations—Germany, Italy, Japan, and possibly Russia.

I believe that our entrance into the World War freed us from the results of a German peace. I also believe that our preparation to meet any possible attack may now free us from foreign assault.

DEMOCRACY ACCEPTS SACRIFICE

Certainly our only hope of preserving our privileges under a free government rests in the willingness of all our people to unite in giving to the defense program all that each can offer. American ideals have been wrought out on the anvils of bitter conflict. We may have the wisdom and foresight to retain our independence and our privileges without fighting battles. We know we cannot maintain them if we are meekly submissive, weak, and defenseless. Our colleague from Illinois expressed it concisely yesterday when he said that it was better to train without fighting than to risk fighting without training. If we should be forced to fight in an extreme emergency, we must not throw into the front lines, unprepared, the finest flower of our youth. We must prepare a cross section from all those who are enjoying the privileges of American citizens—the greatest privileges enjoyed today by any people on the face of this earth.

I resent the propaganda which declares that we cannot preserve democracy in the world by abandoning democracy in the United States. Just how would these misguided citizens prepare democracy to fight for its own preservation? Do they expect an unorganized mob to face the onslaughts of the most highly trained and mechanized army the world has ever known? I hold that it is not inconsistent for democracy to accept discipline and leadership.

Our democracy is not an undisciplined, headless mob milling around and rushing hither and yon. It is a disciplined, devoted citizenship with orderly procedures, meeting events as they arise. Our men and women willingly face their responsibilities. They are not craven, nor rebellious. They know our country and our Government have not attained perfection, but they also believe that we are going forward in the hope of reaching our goal. Any action is consistent with democracy if arrived at through democratic processes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to follow the distinguished gentleman from Oregon, whom I value as a friend and whose advice, as one of the elder men of this body, I frequently like to ask. I would like to take him back, however, in the counsels of his own party, back to 1900, if you please, and listen to what the men of his party had to say in broad principles that are as true today as they were then:

We oppose militarism—

These were Democrats speaking in convention assembled at St. Louis as they wrote their platform—

We oppose militarism. It means conquest abroad and intimidation and oppression at home. It means the strong arm which has ever been fatal to free institutions. It is what millions of our citizens have fled from in Europe. It will impose upon our peace-loving people a large standing army and unnecessary burden of taxation and will be a constant menace to their liberties. A small standing army and a well disciplined State militia are amply sufficient in time of peace. This Republic has no place for a vast military service and conscription.

In time of danger the volunteer soldier is his country's best defender.

Now, I ask the gentleman——

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE. That was 40 years ago before mechanized war came into existence.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, the principles are the same today.

Mr. PIERCE. No, they are not, brother.

Mr. KEEFE. The principles are the same today as they were then. The gentleman believes in the voluntary system?

Mr. PIERCE. The whole system has changed.

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, how you have changed your philosophy.

PRESENT FUN AND FUTURE FOLLY

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not have an open mind where the safety of my country is concerned.

I do have, however, a sense of wonder at times as to what kind of occasion we are celebrating here today.

WONDER WHETHER THIS IS A PICNIC

Some eminent gentlemen implant in my mind by their example the notion that we are engaged in a Sunday-school picnic, where we can play ring-around-a-rosy, alternate with mumble-the-peg, drink soda pop, and then taper off for the gloaming by playing kissing games with the girls. A new Member may be forgiven wonder at seeing sedate seniority presume upon the acknowledged fact that we in America have the highest political principles in the world. We have the best religion in the world. We have the best aggregation of races in the world. What are such high principles and privileges good for save to rely upon for our safety? That is the moral mood befitting a Sunday-school picnic.

Maybe this is a Sunday-school picnic in which we are engaged. Maybe our high moral, religious, and political principles just naturally implement themselves and so constitute all we need for national safety.

If that is the kind of occasion this is, then I for one am in favor of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER], that we depend upon voluntary contributions of money to help finance the military enterprise at which some quaint Members like to think they are playing. Let voluntary money support voluntary men, and everybody do what he pleases when he pleases; that is the way to run a picnic all right.

Is this a picnic?

WONDER WHETHER THIS IS A POLITICAL RALLY

Or is this, perchance, a political rally, as other exemplars tempt me to suspect? Are the battles that now and then we hear mentioned but episodes in a merry war of words? I wonder whether that is the nature of the occasion which we pass in debate today. Remembering that this is September 5 and that the 60-day delay of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] would just overpass the national election, I cannot but marvel at "the long arm of coincidence" which I seem to see enshrouding many an electoral fear. [Applause.]

If this be but a political rally, then let us lose no cpportunity to wave the Stars and Stripes, to call each other traitors in all good clean fun, and to join in fine fellowship tonight when each can celebrate the aching void left by this collective spilling of all our laryngeal liquidity. That is all fitting and proper if this be a political rally. Is it so?

ANOTHER WONDER: COULD THIS BE WORRY ABOUT WAR?

There are those, however, Mr. Chairman, who think this day's debate marks an occasion of quite another sort than any such gay good-timing. I am impressed by their earnestness. Maybe they are right. Even the chilly thought that they might be right makes a mighty difference. They talk of religion and invoke upon their earnestness the majestic name of the Almighty. Let poets help such politicians say well what they mean. One such poet—Dr. M. Whitcomb Hess, in the Catholic magazine Spirit—has of late said:

Three ways His fearful followers flee:
One leads to Rome as Caesar's page,
The second to a hermitage,
And the third climbs to Calvary.

At the solemn thought of such unpleasant alternatives—not an ounce of jollity in any one of them—all my mood of picnic good-timing flees away and all my patience is cut short over grinning politics played with loaded guns.

Now I do not myself profess on this matter of conscription to know the will of the Almighty, more than you or you. In private life I am only an ignorant man and philosopher, and even the gracious lathering we here give one another's ego has not yet, alas, elevated me into a seer. Nor can I allege for your guidance a conscience deeper or purer than yours or yours. It never seemed to me a virtue to make easy simplicity of lives not my own.

But of my own I am yet the master, and I prescribe for myself one simple home-made rule: "To sleep on the floor means not to fall out of bed." It is a rule, gentlemen, which seldom disappoints me and one which now and then furnishes some gentle surprise. It counsels me, while hoping for the best, to expect the worst and to be full ready for the worst, even before it arrives. But a mighty poet has said it better than can I. So let me take his words to be this day my own:

I to my perils
  Of cheat and charmer
  Came clad in armour
    By stars benign.
Hope lies to mortals
  And most believe her,
  But man's deceiver
    Was never mine.

The thoughts of others
  Were light and fleeting,
  Of lovers' meeting
    Or luck or fame.
Mine were of trouble,
  And mine were steady,
  So I was ready
    When trouble came.

—*A. E. Housman.*

This pessimism I do not try to exact of you, my colleagues, however much it has seemed to me necessary as protection against the world. I would not be a kill-joy on a picnic nor a cynic on a crusade. Others may picnic if they will, even today. But as for me, I somehow do not like delayed bombs for my holiday syncopation, nor yet relish my hamburgers broiled in human blood. Please excuse me, gentlemen; I really do not feel like picnicking today. And if you will allow me the further personal liberty, I believe I will pass my turn to applaud even your highest principles, if you insist on my taking them neat, naked in their purity and animated only with your own idealistic breath.

A principle without a carrier is today like an unmounted gun: If it goes off at all it shoots aimlessly. I like even my patriotic principles mounted now on disciplined morale and pointed with steely eyed determination. Especially I like them so as a citizen of a Nation now potentially menaced from all sides: battalions to the west of us, bluffing across the Pacific; bombs to the east of us, bursting across the Atlantic; belligerency to the north of us, preoccupied to the death; and equivocality to the south of us, begging to be bought off with markets or protective munitions.

If you do not mind, gentlemen, today I think I will not play any politics, and I will print on my Sunday-school card for the next lesson that grim observation of a contemporary German philosopher, Nicolai Hartmann, which being translated runs thus: The higher the ideal the longer the fall, and the lower the principle the sterner the stand. Principles without persons to bear their brunt are powerless today; and persons without principles to guide their hand are pusillanimous for all their potency. We have, as always, the high principles—give us now, as in crises before, the men. And give us the men now, that all our high principles do not utterly perish from the earth.

I am against the picnicking amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER].

I am against the political amendment to the bill offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

I am for the conscription bill itself—and for it without further delay.

I am against trifling, however distinguished; and I am for defensive action, however trifled with through these precious hours. I do not relish petty talk against precious time.

For I would not myself be, nor doom the humblest citizen to become, that conscientious objector to action whose obituary you have been reading in each morning paper each day now for these 6 months. He talked against time.

He stood, and heard the steeple
  Sprinkle the quarters on the morning town.
One, two, three, four, to market-place and people
  It tossed them down.

Strapped, noosed, nighing his hour,
  He stood and counted them and cursed his luck;
And then the clock collected in the tower
  Its strength—and struck.

—*A. E. Housman.*

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall make only a brief observation regarding the Fish amendment. The preliminary census figures for 1940 will indicate approximately 132,000,000 people in the United States. It is proposed by the pending bill to conscript 1,000,000 of those, or, roughly, a little less than four-fifths of 1 percent.

The first paragraph of the bill recites that this is an imperative condition; that it is urgent; that in fact a situation of acute danger confronts the country. The thought has occurred to me as I tried to anchor my own sentiment with respect to this whole principle, as to the enormity of the confession that we would make to our own country, the enormity of the confession that we make to the whole wide world, that in an hour of acute danger we cannot procure four-fifths of 1 percent of the people of this country to come forward and volunteer to defend the American way. To me, that is far more tragic than the confession of which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] spoke just a short while ago.

We have been told that 71 percent of the young men of the country, according to the allegations of the Gallup poll, are in favor of some form of compulsory selective military service. If that be true, what an amazing confession we must make in this bill—that we cannot by a volunteer system get 1½ percent of the young men who have gone on record, allegedly, in the Gallup poll to stand up and do their duty, pay their tribute of military devotion to the American way and to the purposes of democracy. That, to me, in this hour is truly tragic, and that is the greatest confession we make to our own country, and it is the most enormous confession that we make to the whole wide world.

Every Member of this House in the last 2 years has read of the statements made by the dictators of Europe; how they have charged that our process is unstable; how they have charged that the democratic way is inefficient; how they have charged and declaimed that the democratic process is one of confusion. Great God! Are we to be the first to prove it for them? What a tragedy that would be. That is the best argument I know of for delay and for one more chance at least for the democratic process. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to raise an army of 1,000,000 men for immediate service and to build a reserve force of 4,000,000 enlisted men by 1945. The bill is limited in its terms to 4 years.

We have come to a peacetime crisis in the history of this Nation when we must embark for the first time upon a conscription or selective-service program for the defense of the Nation. I do not believe anyone here can seriously challenge the statement that this is the most critical hour in the peacetime history of this country. The time has come when we must bring a proper balance between personnel and matériel if we are to have a well-rounded force for the security of this Nation, and this bill is for the security of the Nation and nothing else.

Those of us who are supporting the bill and who are vigorously opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] are as vigorously opposed to involvement in war. We feel that the steps we are taking are the surest steps we can take to keep the Nation out of war. Yes, this is a critical hour, and it is a commentary upon present conditions when we must embark upon such a program. It was a remarkable statement that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] made a moment ago and it proves the point: The young men who must fight, if we are to fight, want this bill. Eighty-five to ninety percent of the American people probably want this bill. I think they are ahead of the Congress in demanding security. [Applause.]

This is a fair and an equitable way, and a just way to raise 1,000,000 men. No nation, including our own, has ever raised an army of 1,000,000 men by the volunteer system, and I dislike very much to hear earnest and sincere men rise on the floor of this House and say that this is not the American or the democratic way to raise an army. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the facts are that our national-defense program does not depend upon the passage of the Burke-Wadsworth bill.

Not many Members of this House have 5 sons and daughters of draft age, but I have. You ask, What about the daughters? I answer that it is the women who weep when there is war.

Secretary Knox stated before the Military Affairs Committee a week ago that we did not need this draft. That the Navy has a waiting list of 8,100 volunteers and that the Army quotas to date have been filled.

I have listened to these men from the South today state that many more people from the South had enlisted than from the North. There is a very sound reason for that, and it is to be found in the administration's agricultural program. Last fall I sailed to Panama on a transport with 1,000 enlisted men mostly from the South. I addressed them on the boat and talked with many of them. And they gave their reason for enlistment like this:

> We raised cotton until the price went down and the Government fixed quotas. Then we went into tobacco, then the Government cut out quotas till we could not live. Dad could not keep us and we could find no work, so the only thing we could do was to join the Army.

So it was not love for country but want of bread that put them in the Army. A good price for cotton or tobacco would have kept them home. Had there been a call for volunteers to defend our liberties there would be a different story.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I deplore the fact that it seems necessary in what so many men call a crisis to limit a man to 2½ minutes.

I think the proposal in this bill to conscript the youth of this country in time of peace is almost an open slander in view of the history of volunteering in this country. There is not a man on this floor who does not know that if the President were to call for volunteers, the War Department could not take care of the number of men who would rally to the call. It has never been tried. In justice to the young men of this country whose patriotism has never been found wanting in any contest from the beginning of the history of this country to the present day, the volunteer system should be given a chance that they might respond, that they might keep their record clear.

Another thing, this proposed peacetime conscription is not according to the Anglo-Saxon method. For the first time we are departing from it, we are going over to the system of Europe. It is not necessary, and I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the three definitions of militarism given by Woodrow Wilson in order that this House may understand what he thought of militarism in this country.

WHAT IS MILITARISM

President Wilson defined militarism as a monster whose essence is size, at another time as a monster whose essence is form, at still another time as a monster whose essence is purpose. Quotations:

> Militarism consists in this, gentlemen: It consists in preparing a great machine whose only use is for war. (Speech at New York, January 27, 1916.)
>
> It is inconsistent with the traditions of the country that their (the people's) knowledge of arms should be used by a governmental organization which would make and organize a great army subject to orders to do what a particular group of men might at the time think it best for it to do. That is the militarism of Europe, where a few persons can determine what an armed nation is to do. That is what I understand militarism to be. (Statement to Committee from American Union Against Militarism, White House, May 9, 1916.)
>
> Militarism does not consist in the existence of an army, nor even in the existence of a very great army. Militarism is a spirit. It is a point of view. It is a system. It is a purpose. The purpose of militarism is to use armies for aggression. (Speech at West Point, June 13, 1916.)

Have those in authority who demand conscription given an answer to these questions?

What are we planning to defend and against whom?

Are we to defend the East Indies to insure access to strategic raw material—rubber and tin?

Is the defense plan to be such as to be capable of defending the Philippines, even though the United States is legally committed to withdraw from the islands in 1946?

Is it to be a defense plan broad enough to defend the Roosevelt philosophy described as "a way of life not for America alone but for all mankind"?

Just what area of the globe does the proposed defense program comprehend?

Is the defense program to be organized on the theory that our frontier is in Portugal or on the English Channel?

What theory of land defense does the General Staff intend to rely upon?

Is it the intention to use highly armored corps, consisting of tanks and mechanized troops, as the principal striking forces?

Or is it to be a compromise force, largely infantry, supplemented by mechanized divisions?

Has any plan of national defense been formulated which requires that all men between the ages of 18 and 35 shall be conscripted for 12 months' training?

Assume that such a program has been worked out, will 12 months' training prepare these millions of men for the type of service now required in a mechanized army?

Has the necessity for the immediate conscription of 400,000 men been shown, and if so, by whom?

Should such a system be inaugurated in peacetimes unless the necessity for it is definitely established?

Does the defense plan, if there be one, require that emphasis be placed on technical mechanical training, or just general camp drill for 12 months?

Will the conscription of men between the ages of 18 and 35 for 12 months meet the problem which the airplane, the armored car, the trucks, and the tanks, each requiring mechanical skill to operate, presents?

If mechanized units and mechanical skill are to be major factors in our national defense, will it not mean fewer but more highly trained men at the front, using new material, and more skilled workmen at home manufacturing it?

Has it been determined just what length of time a man should be trained to prepare him for the type of military service required?

If the conscription bill is enacted into permanent law is it not fair to assume that it will lead to more intense regimentation of industry, labor, and business?

Does not this proposed conscription legislation raise the question as to the extent individual freedom in peacetime will have to be sacrificed?

Will not this enormous power given to the President to mobilize almost the entire manpower of the Nation supply more men than the Army is prepared to train at this time for the type of mechanized defense now required?

Unless the necessity for such a drastic draft of men in peacetimes is fully established, should freedom from compulsory military service traditionally associated with our Government, be sacrificed?

Is conscription to be supplemented by the President's proposal for "universal Government service for every boy—and perhaps every girl—regardless of class or station in life" under the leadership of Sidney Hillman?

Is the necessity for conscription sufficient to warrant taking the boys and girls out of our schools and colleges and thus wrecking our educational system?

Viewed from every angle is not the proposed conscription, mobilization, and regimentation program in peacetimes in essence and in fact totalitarianism?

Woodrow Wilson in 1912 cautioned his countrymen that—

> The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power, we are resisting the processes of death, because concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties.

I shall vote for this amendment to give the boys a chance under the volunteer system, but I shall vote against this bill whether the amendment is adopted or not. I am not going to adopt at this time, in peacetime, any dictatorial system of Europe. We should approach this problem in the Anglo-Saxon way. You cannot do it by stirring up all the psychological and war hysteria that we have here. The thing to do is for sound men to think this thing through and think it through straight, produce the materials for the men to use, and may I say to you who are talking about men from the South volunteering for foot service that when the time comes, if it does come, when we need to defend this Nation, it is going to be done with a mechanized force, and we shall have trained men. We have mechanically trained men now in New York State, Pennsylvania, New England, and the industrial North, but you have not the mechanically trained men in the South to put into the Army. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, we have heard considerable discussion here this afternoon with reference to what Stalin, Mussolini, and Hitler may think about what we are about to do in this Congress. We have also heard a great deal said here today that a vote this way, or that way, on this measure will empty many seats in this Chamber. With reference to such statements or arguments, I have this to say: That it is no concern of mine what Stalin, Mussolini, and Hitler think about what we do, or do not do. As to emptying seats by votes it is a matter of comparatively little moment what happens to any of us politically, and what the result of our vote does to us politically. Such affects us only as individuals. Our places would be filled at once and the country would carry on just the same, but it is of great moment what we do here today, tomorrow, and the next day, or as long as this bill is before Congress for action. To me my country comes first and last. Mr. Chairman, I am for preparing this country for defense, but when I say defense, I mean defense. I am not in favor of raising an army to go to Europe by any front or back door. The streamlined method today of declaring war is just go out and start to fight. I have pledged myself to my people that I will never vote to send our young men to fight in Europe's wars. I will keep that pledge.

An increase in our Army may be necessary on account of what may happen in the Western Hemisphere. Personally I am opposed to militarism. The carrying of guns and the clanking of swords create a war psychology. Generally speaking, nations with large armies are usually at war. They naturally become aggressively militaristic. Such as this reminds me of the days in Montana when I first went there. It was not uncommon to see fellows go up and down the street and road with guns strapped on their sides. I noticed those fellows were usually in trouble. The people who did not carry guns got along. What we need today, if we are threatened by Germany, and undoubtedly it is this Nation we are preparing against, is young men to go to work for the Government and become mechanics and pilots to handle and use machinery and war equipment such as Germany is today using. Before her mechanized forces the gallant and matchless Army of France fled in terror. We must be prepared to meet such a condition with machinery and equipment and that is why we are voting these huge appropriations for tanks, airplanes, and all kinds of heavy implements of human and property destruction. The time may come in this country when conscription is necessary. However, it is my firm belief that if the American people can be shown that they are liable to be invaded, or that their rights will be violated, or that their liberty may be taken from them in any respect, conscription will be unnecessary. The American people will rise to the occasion. The volunteer has always been, and always will be, our best fighter. Some men may like army life, others have a bent for the law, medicine, farming, mechanics, and so forth. The men who volunteer do so because they want and because they like army and navy life. They will make the real soldiers. I am for this amendment because it will direct the President to issue a proclamation immediately upon the passage of the bill and its being signed by the President, to call for volunteers. In the meantime we are assured by the author of the amendment, in answer to a question I propounded to him this morning, that the setting up of the draft machinery will be in no way delayed and if there are sufficient volunteers it will simply suspend the operation of conscription. Therefore, let us give voluntary enlistment a try.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that in this entire discussion regarding the pending amendment the time element is that which is prominent. I was also encouraged by the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], when he said that certainly 2 months would be required before anything definite could be done. I was encouraged by both of these points of view, because it helped in carrying out the particular end in this matter which I have in mind.

As I listened to the debate here today and yesterday I wondered if in the midst of different points of view we were not really for the moment losing sight of the man who is quite intimately concerned; that is, the man who is going to be inducted into the service if this bill passes. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts hit the nail squarely on the head when she wanted to know about the man's health after he is inducted into service. So closely does that concern me after a third of a century in the practice of medicine and after experience as a medical officer in the Army during the World War that I am going to introduce an amendment that induction into service shall not take place until there have been prepared and are ready the necessary facilities to take care of those men. This Congress has a responsibility not only to the Government in this matter but also to those of its citizens who may be inducted into the service. We must not lose sight of that responsibility and later on if given the opportunity I shall offer such amendment. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I shall expect to support this amendment that will defer the conscription of men as provided by the terms of the bill, for a period of 60 days. I regret that I cannot support the bill in its entirety. But, Mr. Chairman, why not extend the period for voluntary enlistments until January 1, 1941? This will provide a more reasonable time during which to try out voluntary enlistments for a period of 1 year, instead of 3 years, and the pay will be on a basis of $30 per month and not $21. Personally, I would raise the base pay to as much as $35. Pay them as much as you pay the C. C. C. boys and the W. P. A. and N. Y. A. You do not hesitate to pay the commissioned officers, especially those higher up, plenty of salary; and, by the way, you insist that this is to be a peacetime army. We are told enlistments are now coming in at the rate of 30,000 to 40,000 per month, and that this month there will be a decided increase, possibly 50,000. Certainly there will be a definite increase if you provide for a year's enlistment and a raise in pay. It will not put the program at a standstill. You will have enlistments at the rate of 75,000 per month.

More than you can care for. As a matter of fact, I think they will come as fast as they can well be assimilated in the Army and as rapidly as housing and equipment can be furnished. You need these extra 2 months to provide for the proper housing and clothing of these boys. The way you propose to handle it, you are going to call 400,000 boys right away and huddle them by the thousands in Army camps that are not ready for them. Thousands of them will be living in tents, I fear, during the cold weather. You will have disease and sickness on your hands, unless proper arrangements are made to care for them. It has been demonstrated that we really do not have the facilities to take care of them all at once. These boys come from all walks of life and from different climatic conditions. To put them right into camp in winter is hazardous at best. This deferment will not interfere but will, in my judgment, provide for a more orderly and democratic way of handling the situation. If you are for a peacetime program, this is the way to handle it. After you have given the voluntary enlistment plan a fair trial, and you find that there is such an emergency, that the situation is imminent, and that our country is imperiled, then will be the time to yield to the plan you are putting through this afternoon.

I still think that when the people find that their country is imperiled they will respond.

Mr. Chairman, we are embarking on a pretty far-reaching plan and program this afternoon. I want a national-defense program just as much as you do. It must be built as rapidly and orderly as possible. But I really do not believe you are willing to give the volunteer method of raising a peacetime army a fair and reasonable chance. Increase our armed forces? Yes. But let us do it in an orderly manner. In this day of modern warfare it is not numbers so much that we need but men who are well and highly trained in mechanized warfare.

Mr. Chairman, I know, as you do, the Old World is pretty sick this afternoon and no one can prophesy the outcome of the crisis across the seas.

Mr. Chairman, I realize this House will not support an amendment in line with my suggestion, but let me remind you again, if I may, that this is not just a universal-training bill. It is a selective service conscription bill.

Every conscripted youth goes into the Regular Army. He is there for a year's service and training. Then that particular youth is the subject of the military authority of this country at any time during a period of 10 years. This bill does not provide for training the youth of this country. It provides, let me say again, for selective service in the United States Army of certain boys whose names happen to be drawn and who may not be exempted, under rules and regulations, not passed by Congress but promulgated by the President and the military authorities of this country.

Mr. Chairman, let me pay tribute to the able and distinguished chairman of the committee, and with whom I do not see fit to agree this afternoon, for the very fair manner with which he has conducted the discussion on this bill as well as the amendments that are proposed. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, nearly 2 years ago the President of the United States communed with Andrew Jackson and gave the Democratic Party a message from him. Last night I communed with Daniel Webster and delved back into history, and he gave me a message to be delivered to this House today on the conscription bill, and this is what he said to me:

> Is this, sir, consistent with the character of a free government? Is this civil liberty? Is this the real character of our Constitution? No, sir; indeed it is not. The Constitution is libeled, foully libeled. The people of this country have not established for themselves such a fabric of despotism. They have not purchased at a vast expense of their own treasure and their own blood a Magna Carta to be slaves. Where is it written in the Constitution, in what article or section is it contained, that you may take children from their parents and parents from their children and compel them to fight the battles of any war in which the folly or the wickedness of government may engage it? Under what concealment has the power lain hidden which now for the first time comes forth, with a tremendous and baleful aspect, to trample down and destroy the dearest rights of personal liberty? Who will show me any constitutional injunction which makes it the duty of the American people to surrender everything valuable in life, and even life itself, not when the safety of their country and its liberties may demand the sacrifice but whenever the purposes of an ambitious and mischievous government may require it? Sir, I almost disdain to go to quotations and reference to prove that such an abominable doctrine has no foundation in the Constitution of the country. It is enough to know that that instrument was intended as the basis of a free government and that the power contended for is incompatible with any notion of personal liberty. An attempt to maintain this doctrine upon the provisions of the Constitution is an exercise of perverse ingenuity to extract slavery from the substance of a free government. It is an attempt to show, by proof and argument, that we ourselves are subjects of despotism, and that we have a right to chains and bondage, firmly secured to us and our children by the provisions of our Government. It has been the labor of other men, at other times, to mitigate and reform the powers of government by construction, to support the rights of personal security by every species of favorable and benign interpretation, and thus to infuse a free spirit into governments not friendly in their general structure and formation to public liberty.
>
> The supporters of the measures before us act on the opposite principle. It is their task to raise arbitrary powers, by construction, out of a plain written charter of national liberty. It is their pleasing duty to free us of the delusion, which we have fondly cherished, that we are the subjects of a mild, free, and limited government and to demonstrate, and to demonstrate by a regular chain of premises and conclusions, that government possesses over us a power more tyrannical, more arbitrary, more dangerous, more allied to blood and murder, more full of every form of mischief, more productive of every sort and degree of misery than has been exercised by any civilized government, with a single exception, in modern times.
>
> Those who cry out that the Union is in danger are themselves the authors of that danger. They put its existence to hazard by measures of violence, which it is not capable of enduring. The talk of dangerous designs against government, when they are overthrowing the fabric from its foundations. They alone, sir, are friends to the Union of the States who endeavor to maintain the principles of civil liberty in the country and to preserve the spirit in which the Union was framed.

[Applause.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I used to think a few years ago that I knew something about the science of speech, because I spent many years of my life teaching people how to prepare and deliver a speech. I will confess, however, I never quite came across the chapter in any speech book which would teach a man what he is supposed to say on a momentous occasion like this when he is limited to 2 minutes. I believe perhaps I should have spent more time studying the pecularities of parliamentary government presuming to guarantee "free speech" under a "gag rule" and less time studying the composition of a speech. What we need at a time like this is a more sensible parliamentary procedure rather than the impossible ability to develop an idea in a 2-minute speech.

In the paltry time at my disposal I wish to say that the arguments of the opponents of the Fish amendment are curiously miscellaneous, to say the least. Some of the gentlemen rise here and say that the Fish amendment will not work because it is an attempt to scuttle the defense program, since we will not get sufficient men to have adequate defense quickly enough. Then the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and other opponents of the Fish amendment rise and say quite to the contrary that the proponents of the Fish amendment are going to scuttle the defense program because we will bring in men so rapidly we will not be able to take care of them and equip them fast enough.

One group of opponents to the Fish amendment say in substance, "You can't get enough men to volunteer in this 60-day period to make it worth the trial," and the next group of speakers in opposition to the Fish amendment argue, "You'll bring men in so fast by such a period of volunteer enlistments that you'll bog us down and outstrip our ability to equip them." The arguments of these two groups nullify each other and leave us standing just where we were before we started. More candor and considerably more consistency would be helpful if opponents to the Fish amendment would use it to show what valid reasons, if any, exist for not adopting this amendment which in no sense postpones or delays the enlistment of men and which at least gives our traditional

American system of recruiting a peacetime army a 60-day chance to demonstrate itself while the War Department is getting ready to utilize other methods if the volunteer system fails to meet their demands for men.

The authors of the conscription act, themselves, state its provisions cannot be set up and become operative in less than 60 days; this amendment does nothing to delay the necessary groundwork which would have to precede conscription, but it does provide that during this 60-day interim Americans shall be given the opportunity to volunteer for 1-year's training in a citizens' army under the precise provisions which they would find themselves should they be drafted for a similar service. Instead of delaying the enlistment of men it provides for speedier action in increasing our manpower than the conscription act itself. If it is speed of action and men for defense we desire, the Fish amendment provides the method for immediate action and for recruiting men for training to begin not 60 days from now, but immediately upon the passage of the act and the proclamation by the President asking for volunteers for a citizens' training army. Thus, this amendment answers those who would oppose it because they say it provides delay by actually providing speedier action than would the bill without the amendment.

Now a word to those who, like the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] would oppose this amendment because it might enlist the men we need faster than we can be prepared to equip them. The gentleman from New York, HAMILTON FISH, has already given the retort adequate to that argument. If the stipulated 400,000 are enrolled in this citizens' training army the first 60 days, or even the first 30 days of this period, the War Department will retain the power to muster them into service as they are needed and as it is prepared to equip them. There need not be one iota of difference between the manner in which these men are called in by groups of 75,000 or 100,000 under the voluntary system and the manner in which the calls for men are staggered under the draft system. Let us not have our thinking confused by arguments which answer themselves as we consider this important legislation. I shall have more to say about the importance of sane thinking and careful consideration in the permission granted me to extend my remarks at the end of this very brief talk, but I do want to nail down these points right now.

I believe that we must recognize the merit of the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] who says that if the 400,000 should volunteer the second day, it does not mean they have to be inducted into the Army on the third morning. They can still be brought in as gradually as they could under the schedule worked out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. [Applause.]

Now, ladies and gentlemen of the House, let us approach this problem of promoting our national defense with cool heads, with clear minds, and with sincere hearts. Our decisions are of too vital significance to our country's welfare and its future development to warrant their being made in the atmosphere of fist fights on the floor and name calling among our Members such as we have already witnessed in this debate. Disagreement and discussion are the stuff from which democracy is made. In our zeal to protect and preserve democracy let us not resort to the intolerance and intimidation of dictatorial systems.

You and I, and the country we represent, are faced with a twofold problem. We desire to perfect our national defenses and we desire to preserve our American institutions and ideals. It is because we are so united in our desire to do the latter that we are so determined to do the former. This House has demonstrated again and again that it is eager to make America impregnable. That is our common objective. No Member should presume to say that his particular proposal, or that any particular proposal, is the one and only method of accomplishing that goal. There may be many different routes to the same destination. Some may be better than others, but I am sure that each of us is in his heart trying to find that route which is best. We are not divided in our objective; that we are divided at times over the best route to follow is a heartening manifestation that democracy still lives in America, and not a cause for hysterical emotionalism, name calling, groundless generalities, or foolish pessimism.

We should act with dispatch, but in our desire for speedy action we do a great disservice to America if we act with disregard for anything but speed. We should arm ourselves quickly and raise the necessary manpower to meet every conceivable emergency. We should marshal the resources of our Nation to the full defense of the Nation which has made these resources productive and profitable. As we are 100 percent for national defense, so, too, should we be determined to work out equitable and democratic methods for distributing the sacrifices required for this defense over 100 percent of our people. As we are determined that no man in America shall again make a profit out of war we should take steps to be sure that no man in America makes an unreasonable profit out of the perfection of our national defenses. And above all, we must so wisely act that we shall not promote the methods of Hitler in America in order to protect America from the menace of Hitler or of any other totalitarian power whose aggression we prepare to avert and whose techniques of government we prepare to resist and repel should they some day unhappily be headed our way by either invasion from without or by imitation from within.

We must be sure as we proceed, my colleagues, that the result of our deliberations is to produce more of defense for democracy than of danger to democracy. If we rush along too blindly giving too much power too eagerly to our Executive to conscript men, money, and materials in peacetime we may find ourselves enmeshed in a web of dictatorial decrees at home where labor, farmers, businessmen, professional men, and even educators and the clergy will be but conscript servants of the Government here as they are in Europe. If we proceed too far, too fast, we can conceivably lose this fight against totalitarianism without so much as firing a single bullet in the war. We must protect ourselves against subversion from within as well as protecting ourselves against invasion from without. It is said that we must act without delay in perfecting our national-defense establishments and with that I am in complete and total agreement. But that is telling only part of the story. It is also true that time is a vital element in the protection of our American institutions of liberty and freedom against too much subversion from within. We have already endowed our President with more powers than yesterday's Princes. We have no more guaranty that we shall have time enough after while to reclaim for ourselves our democratic institutions and policies at home than we can be sure that we shall have time enough to safeguard ourselves against possible dangers and inroads from without.

The significant phrase, "it may be later than you think," applies alike to our attempt to rescue ourselves from one-man indispensability at home and to our determination to repel any doctrines or armies of one-man indispensability from across the seas. Let us therefore try with all our might and intelligence to develop our national defenses fully and quickly by whatever means can best attain that end while at the same time safeguarding us as much as possible against accepting here techniques which we abominate as we observe them in action elsewhere.

To my mind, the Fish amendment offers us all the best route to follow in our desire to become strong while remaining free. It safeguards our traditional Americanism by providing the opportunity for free enlistments in our armed forces, and it safeguards our defense needs by providing that when and if these methods prove inadequate a selective service call will operate to fill the ranks of those who did not volunteer. It involves nothing of delay and, in fact, offers more of action in quickly enlisting men than does this bill without the amendment. As Senator TYDINGS said on the floor of the Senate not long ago, it provides an approach which most nearly represents the cross section of American

public opinion today—it assures our completely supplying our needs of manpower and it resorts to conscription only as a last resort should the volunteer system fail to fill the ranks of this peacetime citizens' army.

If it is men we want and men we need, this bill, with the Fish amendment, cannot fail to supply these men in the quickest possible time. It should satisfy all those, both in and out of Government, who desire men to train to man the equipment which we hope soon to have available. Only those should be dissatisfied who are more interested in establishing a system in America than they are in enlisting an army. It is true the Fish proposal, if it raises the needed men, will not establish the system of peacetime conscription in America. If it fails to work, the imposition of the system becomes automatic, and no time will have been lost, as the voluntary enlistments and the development of the predraft machinery will go forward simultaneously.

Few Americans will disagree in the conclusion that since America needs men for training, she must provide them by one method or another. I for one want to see our equipment fully manned. I am interested in securing men enough to do the job. I favor that program. But, except as a last resort, I oppose the system of peacetime conscription. I believe it is repugnant to our American concepts of life to conscript men and money and materials in peacetime. I know enough of history to realize what such systems have done to perpetuate the heartaches and misery of repetitious war in the Old World. I hope it may be avoided here. Peacetime conscription of men is likely to be but the first step in a chain of conscript services which are likely to invade every farm and home and office in America if adopted as a permanent policy.

If we must come to peacetime conscription, I hope we do not adopt the system. I hope and pray we simply borrow it for a few short years to guard our country until brighter skies beckon to us from across the seas.

If I vote for this bill it will be in an effort to safeguard our democratic way of life, and not to sabotage it. It will be to increase our preparedness for peace; not to promote our preparedness for war. It will be to accept for a few short years a system I hope we can soon discard and not as an indication that I want this system as part of our American way of life for all time to come. It will be as the choice of the lesser of two evils, preferring as I do to be sure we are strong enough to protect ourselves from without and trying with all my might to make sure we are safe from one-man trends existing within this country of ours. I believe the proposal introduced by the gentleman from New York, HAMILTON FISH, will do these things. I shall support it. I urge its support by all of you whose desire is fundamentally to train the men we need at the time we need them rather than being interested fundamentally in the adoption of a system which, at best, had its origin in the ancient tyrannies of the Old World.

I am gratified by one thing I find in all this legislation. Even the sponsors of this legislation admit the idea of permanent peacetime conscription in America is repugnant to them. They provide for its automatic repeal in 5 years. I hope it can be closer to 2 years than 5. But it is gratifying that even the legislative sponsors of this bill do not favor its continuance as a steady diet in America. They further provide that no inductions into service under provisions of this bill shall take place unless Congress specifically provides the funds to finance them. Thus, Congress retains an annual check upon the operation of this system. Should the need grow less the Congress at any time within the 5 years can dissolve the system or reduce the size of its operation by its control of the Budget. These are gratifying signs to me. They indicate that the spirit of freedom in America is not dead and that the determination for peace prevails in this country of yours and mine. I hope that the Fish amendment will be adopted and that its operation will succeed so well that conscription will be unnecessary. We shall be "thrice prepared" if the Fish amendment passes and succeeds; we shall have the men, we shall have the equipment, and we shall reveal to all the world that democracy here is so strong and so hallowed that men without compulsion rally to its defense with a valor and a vigor that no armies of any dictator in all the world could either emulate or conquer. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I rise in support of the amendment of our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. What does the amendment of the gentleman provide? Conscription is suspended and the President is authorized, on the passage of the bill before us, to issue a call for 400,000 qualified men between the ages of 18 and 35 to volunteer for training and service for 12 months in the land and naval forces of the United States, and if less than 400,000 men volunteer within a period of 60 days after the call of the President, then in that event the conscription provisions of this bill shall go into operation to make up the difference between the number who volunteer, if any, and 400,000 by January 1, 1941; and the President is authorized to make a second call for 400,000 volunteers on January 1, 1941, and if a less number than 400,000 volunteer within 60 days after January 1, 1941, then the conscription provisions of this bill shall go into effect so as to secure 400,000 additional men by April 1, 1941.

This amendment is worded so as to meet the contentions of the President and the proponents of this legislation that we must have 400,000 men by January 1, 1941, and an additional 400,000 by April 1, 1941. In other words, they desire to secure 800,000 additional men before April 1, 1941.

The chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, [Mr. MAY] and other proponents of this draft legislation are fighting the Fish amendment with great vigor. Many speeches have been made against it; but why?

We are told by the President and others pushing this conscription bill that our Nation is in danger, that we need to increase our Army and we must have an additional 400,000 men by January 1, 1941. If this bill is passed at all, it will pass and become a law within the next week. The Fish amendment merely proposes to suspend the operation of the act for 60 days and calls upon the President to issue a proclamation calling for volunteers and if 400,000 qualified men do not volunteer within 60 days—that is, on or about November 15—then the provisions of the draft go into effect to make up the difference so that 400,000 men will be acquired by January 1, 1941.

The proponents of this bill say if this measure is passed the first call will be on or about November 7, a few days after the November election, for only 75,000 men and others will be called from time to time so as to get 400,000 by January 1, 1941. The plan of the proponents is to get perhaps less than 100,000 men by the middle of November. Under the Fish amendment 400,000 will be secured by the middle of November. In other words, let us give the volunteer plan, the American way, the policy that has been followed by our Government in peacetime ever since it has existed, a chance to prove whether or not we can get sufficient manpower without conscription. Let us not forget that the Navy has thousands of men on the waiting list. More are volunteering than can be taken in. Let us also remember that the Air Corps some time ago stopped receiving applications for enlistment in the Air Corps.

Thousands more of young men have volunteered than the Air Corps could receive. We must all agree that the Navy with its auxiliaries and the Air Corps are our great units of defense in case of attack from any other nation or nations. We have now approximately 1,000,000 in our Naval and Military Establishments subject to the call of the President, about 800,000 for the Army alone. I refer to the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Reserves. No one contends seriously that we have equipment, supplies, or quarters necessary to accommodate a third of these men. Mr. Knudsen of the Defense Council testified recently that we would not have the equipment, supplies, and quarters for an army of 750,000 men before 1942. Until last June we had restrictions on enlistments. We were getting more men than we needed. When the restrictions were removed the volunteer enlistments jumped to 23,000 in June, 32,000 in July, and an estimated 42,000 or more for August, and these men enlisted for 3 years at $21 a month. This conscription bill provides for 1 year

at $30 a month. What an outpouring of qualified young men there would be if we fixed the period of enlistment at 1 year with at least $30 per month and with the proclamation of the President that we needed volunteers and especially with the assurance that they were being called for the defense of our country and not to intervene or meddle in the wars of Europe, Asia, or Africa.

The Fish amendment provides that the President shall renew this call for an additional 400,000 on January 1, 1941; but instead of urging enlistments, the President has discouraged volunteer enlistments and so has the Army. They do not want volunteers—they want the conscript plan. They want to create a pool of 25,000,000 men so they can reach out and get them at any time and in any number.

But as we have at least twice as many men as we can care for now in our Army, why call 800,000 or 1,000,000 more men? This great number of men called into the Army without proper equipment and quarters means an epidemic of flu and other diseases.

I venture to say there are more than 1,000,000 able-bodied single men in this country out of employment who would welcome an opportunity for a year's training and service for the benefit of themselves as well as rendering a service to our country. This would not disrupt the economic life of our country. Why this opposition to giving the volunteer system a real chance? It always has worked in this country. Out of the nearly 3,000,000 that entered the service in the Union Army in the Civil War, all but about 350,000 volunteered. President McKinley called for volunteers in the Spanish-American War, where every man was a volunteer. They volunteered in such great numbers that tens of thousands could not be accepted. We have never seen the time and I never expect to see the day when this Nation will lack defenders in the hour of peril. Is this great conscript program for defense of our country or is it to engage in the wars of other nations across the seas?

Great Britain has existed for nine centuries. She has never resorted to conscription except in time of war, and many times not in time of war, and she has never lost a war. France and other countries that have always had conscription have lost many wars. Does anyone contend that a volunteer army, made up of men who desire to get into the Army and serve their country, would be less patriotic or less helpful in our national defense than a conscript army, many of whom would be in the Army against their will, and with families and business ties back home that might distract their interest? Many of the volunteers would likely continue in the service.

Conscription would deny training and service to many men who greatly desire it and would force training and service on many others to whom military or naval service has no appeal. Of course, we are now talking about peacetime service. If war should come, the manpower and the wealth of the Nation must be dedicated to the service and defense of our country.

What are the President and the proponents of this bill after? Do they really want the necessary men to meet present conditions, as they say, or do they want to fasten conscription as a policy on the American people? It is true that this act by its terms will expire in 1945, but by that time the conscription policy will be so ingrained into our national life that with the influence of a powerful administration and a powerful Army and Navy we may not be able to rid ourselves of this undemocratic policy.

All boys and young men now 16 years of age and less than 21 years of age, representing perhaps more than 5,000,000 men, will come within the provisions of this conscription bill by 1945; therefore, in all, this bill will cover approximately 30,000,000 men. Thirty million young men will have this barrier thrown across their pathway in peacetime; 30,000,000 men will be subject to the orders and direction of the President; 30,000,000 men cannot plan their future. Is it necessary to forsake the American way of democracy and "Hitlerize" our own country? Our Nation has not been attacked or even threatened by any other Nation. There can be no justification for tying up the lives of 30,000,000 men and making them subject to the dictatorial control and power of any President. Our country will not be in a war unless we continue deliberately to butt into it.

I want our Nation to have all the men necessary. The Fish amendment will get sufficient volunteers for all requirements. I strongly oppose conscription in peacetime, and I therefore am happy to have an opportunity to vote for this amendment and give the volunteer system a chance. [Applause.]

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against the Fish amendment because I believe Congress should pass on this question now and not put it off until after election. But I do not believe that the Burke-Wadsworth bill is going to solve our problem. For the last 15 years I have heard leaders of both political parties go up and down the length and breadth of my State and say that if war ever comes again, never again will we ask one young man to offer his services and his life to his country while we allow his next-door neighbor to stay at home and make more money than he ever made before. We have not solved that problem. The Burke-Wadsworth bill is not a universal-service bill, and it is not a bill that will take the profit out of war; neither has this Congress passed legislation that will take the profit out of war.

Several times during this debate somebody has risen and addressed himself to the gentleman in the Well and said, "Did not the gentleman vote for these bills?" I for one voted for the bills, but no member of the War Department or no member of the Committee on Military Affairs has told Congress yet how many men it will take to man the equipment we have appropriated the money to buy. That has not been given to us. But still, in the hearings, we find the testimony of General Marshall in which he said that 500,000 men would be war strength to defend the United States of America. I know he has changed his mind since then, but nothing has happened in world affairs of which I am aware that should change that opinion between July 1 and now. General Shedd testified in those hearings that voluntary enlistments would have to stop about the middle of December of this year because they had to keep 40,000 places open for volunteers who wanted to volunteer in the Air Service but who could not be taken care of by the War Department.

This bill does not solve our problems and, until we get something that will insure universal service, I cannot support it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MASSINGALE] for 3 minutes.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to run through a dipping vat for even 2 or 3 minutes. This is a matter that is very important from my way of thinking.

I want to say this to all of the Members of Congress who are here this afternoon, and you had better take notice of it. You know there was a great howl that went through this Republic when the Senate held this bill so long over there debating it. The people wanted something done, and the cry was that the Senate either ought to pass the bill or quit.

Now, the same criticism will apply to you if you vote to amend this bill for that period of time that will enable the Army to determine whether the volunteer system will raise the number of men they want raised, and the kind of men they want to get, in the time that they want to get them. It will apply to you even with greater force than it was applied to the Senate—you have had the benefit of the Senate debate and the additional newspaper discussion about the bill. You have been advised that the American people want immediate action on this matter and that our military advisers believe that now is the time to act. The American people think the time for dilly-dallying with a matter of this grave importance has passed and that it is up to the House of Representatives to enact this law, for the general run of the people of the country think this legislation is imperative

to the welfare of this Republic. They believe that delaying the passage of the bill may jeopardize their country, and they want the Members of this Congress not to do that thing that will put the United States in the same position that Belgium and France and other countries in Europe put themselves. We know what happened there. We can guess what may happen here.

I want to put the question to you in this way. Suppose that we had appropriated the money to take these men into the Army under this system and that we had the equipment to train them, or probably I should not say that because I do not know the extent of the equipment that we have, but suppose we had the money unspent and had already voted to call the men, and the business element of the country would come and say to you, "Here you have the men, you have the money that Congress has appropriated—get out there and spend it so you can speed up business in America. Spend this money for equipment and materials and machines for warfare so that men can be put to work where they can be paid good wages. You owe that to the businessmen of this country. We urged you to make these huge appropriations. Now get busy and spend it for the things for which it was intended so that we may begin to make profits out of our factories and shops." There would not be one of you on either side of this House who would hesitate a minute, but here you are dodging your duty and responsibility to the Government of the United States. You are just doing like I have done a thousand times and more as a country lawyer practicing law, especially criminal law. When I had a case that I was unwilling to take a stand on and submit the issues to a judge or jury because I was afraid to do so, my procedure was always to postpone and then to alibi, and every lawyer in this House who has ever practiced law in the country knows that. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, I will tell you what you will find out if you should delay this program. When the 60 days are up you are going to find the same group that wants to delay the passage of this bill now, clamoring for delaying it again; and if you do, you may do an untold and undreamed-of harm to the people of this Republic. I am sure that I am not possessed of any hysteria. If I have any hysteria at all, it is not because I am fool enough to believe that Hitler or anybody else from Europe could move directly against this country and attack us with any degree of success. You know and I know we are marked for attack by him if you can rely on his boasts, and we must remember that he has the most perfectly organized and powerful military machine at his beck and call that any man ever in the history of the world had before him. I am sure in my own mind that were it not for the strength and power of the United States Navy, we would have, before this time, received many directly threatening statements and directions from him as to where and which way to head in. For that we ought to be very grateful to the President, who has seen to it that our Navy is superior to any other navy afloat. This, I believe, has had a sobering effect on Hitler. Of course, I am not in a position to say whether or not we need a million men, 400,000 men, or 4,000,000 men—but we have military advisers who, if they do not know, they ought to know, just what we need in regard to self-defense and how soon we ought to be supplied with the things we need. They have told us that, and I do not know anything else to do than to follow their advice, for I am just not going to take any chance about it. I am not going to lie down after having been warned by our advisers that this Republic will be in the same situation, with reference to unpreparedness, as Belgium, Holland, the Netherlands, France, and England found themselves. I know that if America intelligently prepares and if we do not sit around and let the time come when we shall be precipitated into this world conflict, we can whip all the totalitarian governments of the world combined. We cannot do it unless we intelligently prepare with the proper kinds of implements of warfare to prevent them from overrunning us as they have the countries of Europe. I much prefer to make a mistake, if it is a mistake, to call too many men to the service, to have too many planes, to have too great a number of tanks—I had rather be guilty of making that mistake than to be guilty of just not having enough and of not having men trained and prepared to use such equipment effectively against what we know to be almost for a certainty our chief antagonist in a war that may break most any day either through Mexico or some other country to the south of us, or from any other direction so far as that goes. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, it is my candid judgment that in the long number of years I have walked upon this earth, that no other hour in those long years has brought to me a graver responsibility than that which rests upon my shoulders at this time. I am convinced that the word "emergency" which has so often been used here, is a mild way of expressing the situation.

I want to take as the basis of my remarks this evening the testimony of one of the greatest soldiers of all the world, Gen. George C. Marshall, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, who told the Military Affairs Committee, that he knew of no way to obtain the required men except by some form of military service and, certainly, there is no other way to obtain them as required by the present situation, and as I speak to the House of Commons of the American Government this evening, and as I have witnessed the apparent efforts at delay here to put off conscription for 60 more days, which, in effect, will scuttle the program, the Members of the House of Commons of the last English-speaking nation in the European Continent, driven to bay, is seeking shelter in their cellars. And then men and women in the American Congress will pause to debate whether or not a simple conscription, democratic way of building an army, shall be put into force now or 60 days later. Oh, I am not going to impugn the motives of any man or woman on the floor of this House. I am not going to criticize anybody, but I cannot refrain from responding to the remark of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], who said a while ago that this Congress ought to do this job in the Anglo-Saxon way. I would like to remind him that that is the way in which France and England did it and, today the English lawmakers are in their cellars dodging the bombs that might have been stopped at Munich if they had had a gun instead of an umbrella. [Applause.]

My God! Men and women, have we come to the day in this country when we are afraid to vote until after the polls are counted in November?

Let us let American women and men know, let us let God Almighty and the nations of Europe know, that this Congress is determined that the women and children of America shall not be driven down the highways of America by a marauding dictator after it is too late. Let us let the world know that a training period for young men is beneficial to them, and that it is not war we seek, but it is a program to prevent war. And here and now I would like to say that no man admires any more than I do my neighbor or my neighbor's boy who will volunteer his service for the safety of his country, but I am unwilling to see a large quota of boys volunteer all over 14 States of this country, far beyond the quota of other States, and then say that we will not have it equalized so that every State shall stand fair and square on the same basis as every other State.

So that every American, be he black or white, shall stand upon the same footing with every other American. Let me say to you that in the long years that I have been chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of this House I have never seen a more ruthless and inexcusable proposal than this amendment by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, the time for debate has not yet expired. If no one else desires to speak at this time I want a few minutes, and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] may be allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WARREN). The Chair at this point would like to make a statement. It appeared to the Chair, because various speakers who had asked for time were not

here to claim it, that the debate would close at 20 minutes after 5 rather than at 5:30. Before the names of the speakers were taken down and before the Chair asked to be relieved by another presiding officer, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], the majority leader, requested me to reserve 5 minutes for him. Although the minority has consumed much more time in this debate, with many more speakers, the Chair would be willing to continue the time of the gentleman from Kentucky for 2 more minutes, then allot 3 minutes to someone on the minority side, and let the majority leader close with 5 minutes, if there is no objection.

Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be but one issue before the House at this time, and that is the issue of time. Everybody agrees that a man has a right to volunteer if he wants to, and yet the substitute offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is in identical language with that of the House bill which you have under consideration, reported by your Military Affairs Committee after 6 weeks of diligent and patient study. So that a man can walk up and volunteer tomorrow and the next day and every day from now on until the quotas are filled, why is it not equality, why is it not equal to the proposal that they make here? The only thing the Fish amendment would do would be to put it off. Oh, it was a day of putting off things when Chamberlain stood at Munich last September. He was putting off because they were not ready, and today the British Navy is seeking a hiding place in the English Channel and the waters of the seas around the islands. There is no Maginot Line left. There is not even a Hindenberg Line of 1918 when we had allies. But under the circumstances today they are fighting with their backs to the wall, their legislators are in cellars, begging and pleading for help from this great, colossal democracy where its representatives sit today in peace in a house where there are no falling bombs to let the roof down from overhead.

I appeal to you, my colleagues, to defeat this amendment, because if you do not you will scuttle the bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone on the minority side desire recognition for 3 minutes?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I do not need 3 minutes. This debate has gone on all day, and no valid opposition or reasons have been presented to this amendment, which merely provides an opportunity to those American youths who want to volunteer. All my amendment does is to require the President to officially call for 400,000 volunteers, and I, for one, believe that the patriotic youth of America will respond in an overwhelming fashion and that there will be a virtual avalanche of recruits regardless of partisanship, Republicans and Democrats alike.

But of equal importance, if this amendment is adopted, the bitterness and the resentment that still exists in the hearts of many people in this country against peacetime conscription will be lessened or wiped out, because they will know that the Congress of the United States has, by its vote, afforded an opportunity to the youth of America to come forward and volunteer in their own behalf. It will take the curse off compulsory peacetime conscription and give the volunteer system a fair chance. This amendment does not delay by 1 day or 1 hour or 1 minute the full quota called for by the Regular Army and the General Staff. It will promote good will, cooperation, and national unity, and allay suspicion, distrust, and growing discord.

Therefore in the name of justice, in the name of democracy, and in the name of the American volunteer system I appeal to the House to vote for this amendment. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], in his closing 3 minutes was willing for the Congress to give the President authority to issue a proclamation with reference to volunteers. That is the only prerogative of Congress I have ever known the gentleman from New York to want to commit to the hands of the President. [Applause.]

The gentleman from New York says we have debated this amendment during the whole day but that no valid reason has been given why it should not be adopted, and he pleads for the volunteer system. If I am not mistaken the volunteer system is not repealed by the bill as it was reported by the Committee on Military Affairs.

My friends, I think most of you know that I am not given to excitement. I try to stay reasonably cool under any and all circumstances. I am not excited now even though I witness about me and throughout the world conditions more chaotic than I have ever known to exist.

The great Napoleon, probably the greatest military genius if not the greatest trained soldier who ever lived, had one great asset—he got upon the battlefield and chose his ground before his opponent got there. He believed in men, in munitions, and in money, but Napoleon Bonaparte said, "Time is everything." Time there was for England, time there was for France, and Belgium; but they did not use that time. So today Poland lies under the heel of the dictator, so does peace-loving Holland, great little Belgium, and half the area of the Republic of France. Sixty days would have meant a great deal for France, for Belgium, for Holland, and for their ally, England.

If we have the courage, if it is our intention to prepare and have an Army by what I take to be the democratic method of selection, then let us have the courage to meet it now instead of postponing it for 60 days. If we are to select an Army to be ready, to let the countries of the earth know that this hemisphere shall be defended, let them know today instead of 60 days from now. [Applause.]

The passage of this amendment, my friends, is bad psychology, it is bad business. We have appropriated billions of dollars to buy equipment for soldiers and for sailors. Are we going to man those instruments of war with soldiers and begin now, or shall we wait? Ah, my friends, I fear the wait means more war. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired; all time has expired.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NICHOLS. In the event the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is adopted, the motion will recur upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. If that amendment is defeated, then, of course, both amendments would fail. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. NICHOLS) there were—ayes 133, noes 129.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]: At the end of the amendment insert "*Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to receive and accept voluntary financial contributions and place them in a separate fund to be available for the purpose of helping to defray the cost of our national-defense program, including that portion provided by this act."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the bill.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill carries the title:

To protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training and service.

One of the most important institutions of the United States is our almost bankrupt Federal Treasury. If we can receive many hundred million or several billion dollars through voluntary contributions to be used to pay for a portion of our national-defense program, including that portion provided in this bill, that contribution will materially protect the integrity of our institutions, particularly our almost bankrupt Federal Treasury. My amendment is clearly germane and in order and should be adopted in the interest of the national defense and the perservation of the integrity of the institutions of the United States. The pending Fish amendment provides for voluntary service of God-created man. My amendment provides for voluntary service of man-created dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is clearly not germane. The point of order is sustained.

The question recurs upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the Chair was in doubt.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. MAY and Mr. FISH.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 185, noes 155.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WARREN, 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. 10132) to protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training and service, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks which I made in the House today and to include certain quotations.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks which I made in the House today and to include certain quotations.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a telegram and resolution from Cleveland citizens protesting against peacetime conscription, and the names appended thereto.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter from a constituent on the matter of conscription.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Springfield Daily Republican.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain tables to which I referred.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include copy of a speech delivered by the Second Assistant Postmaster General.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement appearing in the New York Times on the death of Dr. Hans Zinsser, awarded the Distinguished Service Cross by the Government.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include therein a certain table.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House today for 5 minutes after the disposition of all business in order for the day.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DUNN and Mr. GEYER of California asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon and to include certain excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by John B. Frye, one of the outstanding labor leaders of this country.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by David Lawrence.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole this afternoon and include therein all or part of the Fish amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Dr. Thomas Parran, of the Public Health Service; also figures regarding the comparative health of the Army and the civilian population from General Magee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Hon. James M. Cox, of Ohio.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Alien Menace.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein short extracts from the testimony taken before the Committee on Military Affairs on the pending bill, and one or two other brief statements.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the life and character of Lillian Wald.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ANDERSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

UNIVERSAL SERVICE

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I think there is still time for this committee to reconsider this proposed law which will fasten conscription on our country in time of peace, and substitute for conscription the Swiss system of universal service, which is a system which preserves democracy.

Conscription is the system of the totalitarian governments, and there is nothing democratic about it. We shall never get rid of this system if we once adopt it. It is foreign to the American genius, dangerous to American liberties; it is of doubtful efficiency and is by common consent the costliest system that could be devised.

This militaristic system which Congress is about to make the law of the land will give the United States in time of peace a great standing Army of professional soldiers, whereas the Swiss system creates a citizens' Army.

It would be much more thorough, efficient, and economical if we would train 250,000 men for 1 month every year, and another 250,000 the second month, and so on each month to the end of the year.

What is the Swiss system? It is a system that has been developed in a free republic much like our own free Republic, which is divided into cantons, each with a measure of self-government, as our Republic is divided into States.

Switzerland, like America, is inhabited by a liberty-loving people who are willing to be ready at all times to go to the military aid of their government and to this end to prepare themselves by training for such service as may be required of them.

How well the Swiss military system has worked we can all observe today. Switzerland, surrounded on all sides by wars and dictators, has maintained her liberty in the middle of a Europe which is torn by war and which has passed into a state of virtual slavery with all freedom and liberty destroyed. Switzerland almost alone remains free and at peace.

An excellent description of the Swiss military system of universal service is contained in a column In the News, by Mr. William Randolph Hearst and published in today's Washington Times Herald. For more than 40 years Mr. Hearst has been one of the foremost advocates of preparedness in this country, and he speaks as a student of military training with the voice of authority. I ask unanimous consent to include this article as a part of my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of September 5, 1940]

IN THE NEWS—THE SWISS SYSTEM OF UNIVERSAL SERVICE IS TRUE DEMOCRACY

Citizens! Let us make one last appeal to the United States Congress to continue this country as a democracy and not transform it into a militaristic state.

Let us endeavor to persuade the Congress to adopt the defensive system of Switzerland, a true and enduring republic, instead of the systems of the totalitarian powers.

Let us try to secure for the defense and perpetuation of our American liberties a citizen soldiery, instead of a great standing army.

The present Burke-Wadsworth bill before Congress provides for continuous service in the Army of not less than 1,000,000 men.

It proposes to take a million young Americans from productive and acceptable employment and by compulsion to make professional soldiers of them for a period not to exceed 5 years.

The number of men under arms and at the command of the Executive may at any time be increased, however, by subsequent measures, when the principle of a great standing army is established.

The force necessary to compel acquiescence with such a demand, or any other demand of an autocratic government, is fully provided, once a great standing army under the control of the Government is created.

Democracy is not necessarily a permanent form of government. From the time of ancient Greece and Rome, we have seen democracies disappear and tyrannies take their places.

All that we can say of democracy is that it is the noblest form of government—the happiest form of government—the freest form of government.

But to preserve democracy a people must deserve democracy.

They themselves must be noble and worthy of the liberties they enjoy.

They must appreciate their happiness, rejoice in their freedom, and realize that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

They must certainly have the simple intelligence and the common knowledge to know that militarism is the most usual means of corrupting and destroying democracy and that universal citizen service, in defense of a free country, by a free people, is the surest and safest way of preserving democracy.

What system, then, of citizen soldiers—of giving protective military service while remaining free and unenslaved citizens—is the best and most effective means of both defending and preserving the Republic?

What system has been in operation in a free republic for the longest period of time, and with the greatest measure of success?

What system now operates with the highest success in a republic most nearly like our own free land?

What system has been amply proven to protect a free people in their rights and liberties, and is so popular with the people that enrollment in it is sought as an honor and benefit as well as a civil duty?

There is only one answer—the Swiss system of universal popular military service.

What is it?

First, we must remember that Switzerland is a republic exceedingly similar to our own, that it has a free government like our own, and that it is divided into cantons or states, each with a measure of self-government like our own.

Second, we should remember that Switzerland is inhabited by a virile people like our own who cherish freedom and who have fought for it, secured it, and preserved it.

Third, that Switzerland in the midst of the clash of arms which continually surrounds it on every side has so remained free—and neutral—that its national emblem, the red cross, has become the insignia of peace and neutrality and freedom throughout the world.

The complete analogy between the Swiss people and nation and government and our own having been established, the appropriate application to us of the military system they have found most desirable to defend such a people, nation, and government, becomes apparent.

In the Swiss system, every citizen is a potential soldier, but no soldier ever ceases to be a free and productive citizen, residing in his own home and pursuing his chosen occupation.

A limited but adequate military training is merely a part of his life and his duty—his pursuit and his pleasure.

At the age of 14, a reasonable physical and military training begins in the schools.

At the age of 20 to 21, 3 months of active military training and practice is given the youth as an introduction to his duties of citizenship.

After that the field military training is confined to 1 month of each year, or even less, and all in addition that is demanded of soldierly duty from the citizen is that he take his equipment home with him and keep it in good condition for the field practice of the coming year.

The physical training for boys is provided by the cantons (or states) under the supervision of the Federal Government.

The military training of adults is carried out entirely by the military department of the Federal Government.

Officers are trained in cadet schools as in our United States.

Service is compulsory, but desired and sought for.

Moreover, it is not accepted unless the candidate for the military honor is qualified physically, mentally, and morally, as determined after authoritative examination.

Those who are unable to pass the examination are rejected, and rejection is regarded as a humiliation and misfortune.

A candidate may be reexamined in subsequent years.

If unable to pass examinations he pays a special tax in lieu of military service.

The amount of the tax depends upon the citizen's income and property.

All successful candidates are assigned to the branches of military service for which they are best suited, as determined by the occupations, professions, or businesses which they habitually pursue.

So that for the 1 month or less that a citizen performs his military practice in the field he still adheres to the general line of occupation which he follows during the 11 months of his regular business.

There is no more a policy of depriving a citizen of his habitual and sustaining occupation in the Swiss system than there is of depriving him of his home and his family life or of transforming him from a creative, free man into a military robot.

Indeed, the period of 14 to 30 days years military practice is regarded as a pleasurable and beneficial outing, and enjoyed not only as a patriotic obligation gratefully performed but as an agreeable vacation.

Nevertheless the citizens while performing their military duties receive pay, and furthermore their families are aided by the Government if any inconvenience is suffered through the temporary absence of the head of the family on his military outing.

The Swiss system of universal military service preserves the family life of the citizen, preserves the occupational productivity of the citizen, preserves the rights and liberties of the citizen, and maintains the Republic in the full military strength and in the firm affection of its people.

Why should not the United States adopt such a provenly successful and effective system instead of a system so dangerous to democracy as forced conscription in a great standing army?

Why should the citizens of this free country hazard their freedom to follow the plan and policy of an alien-minded New Deal, contemptuous of American institutions—an administration which has made a financial, political, and social failure—a constructive and organizational failure—a national and international failure of every policy it has proposed, and every plan it has pursued?

Why should we experiment in doubt and danger when we can adopt a proven program with certainty and security?

Why should we become the military autocracy we are presumably organizing to oppose?

Why should we adopt any autocratic system when there is a democratic one ready to use at our hand?

A popular system, a democratic system, and a more effective system—more effective because under the system of Switzerland we could have in the same proportion as to population an army of 10,000,000 free men to save the Republic, instead of a bureaucratic standing army of a million men to menace it.

Let us have an effective army adequate for our defense, but let us remain Americans and continue to be free.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. O'DAY, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members of the House, I would like to state that it is expected that we will meet tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock and begin the proceedings on this bill immediately after the reading of the Journal. If we can possibly complete the consideration of the bill tomorrow night, we will do so. If not, I shall expect to ask that we meet on Saturday.

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

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

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman suggested it was expected that we finish the consideration of the bill tomorrow night, if possible. Of course, it would be possible if we should run late into the night. Does the gentleman contemplate a night session tomorrow night? Many of the Members are interested.

Mr. MAY. It will depend on how much progress we make with the bill before night comes.

Mr. MICHENER. We certainly can finish the bill if we have to have a Saturday session, but it does seem that we should not be compelled to work late into the night tomorrow and also work Saturday.

Mr. MAY. I made the announcement for the purpose of letting the Members know that we want to complete the bill this week. My statement, of course, is subject to any reasonable condition that may appear tomorrow evening. If we read the bill through toward the last section at 6 o'clock, I think we should finish it up, but if we are in the middle of the bill we might go on over.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 6, 1940, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 7694. A bill to amend section 4311 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2917). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 9918. A bill relating to citizenship requirements for manning of vessels, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2918). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 602. Joint resolution to authorize Jesse H. Jones, Federal Loan Administrator, to be appointed to, and to perform the duties of, the office of Secretary of Commerce; with amendment (Rept. No. 2920). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 9996. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans for the development of deposits of strategic and critical minerals which in the opinion of the Corporation would be of value to the United States in time of war, and to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make more adequate loans for mineral developmental purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2922). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 10412. A bill to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2923). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. KING: Commitee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 10219. A bill for the relief of Dr. Wilhelm Wolfgang Krauss; without amendment (Rept. No. 2919). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. House Resolution 584. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Navy to transmit information on airplane contracts (Rept. No. 2921). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 10464. A bill to assist in the national-defense program by amending sections 3477 and 3737 of the Revised Statutes to permit the assignment of claims under public contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10465. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 10466. A bill to amend section 16 (b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 10467. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Ignaz Braunstein; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 10468. A bill for the relief of Michael Lewenczuk; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 10469. A bill for the relief of Michael Lewenczuk and Stella Lewenczuk; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 10470. A bill for the relief of Clara E. Deane; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 10471. A bill for the relief of Clara E. Deane; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 10472. A bill granting a pension to Clara E. Deane; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 10473. A bill for the relief of E. A. Wailes, receiver of Delta Oil Co., and the Tupelo Oil & Ice Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 10474. A bill for the relief of John Ruston; 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:

9268. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of the Clyde Gustine Post of the American Legion, Excelsior Springs, Mo., urging the Members of the National House of Representatives and the Senate to submerge their personal ambitions, factional and partisan politics, and adopt immediately, as statesmen of fortitude and integrity, the legislation requested by those charged with the Nation's defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9269. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of D. Walter Bell and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., urging that we permit the sale of 50 or more United States destroyers to Great Britain; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

9270. By Mr. GREGORY: Petition of Bryan Tolley, W. B. Davis, and Harold C. Curry, resolutions committee of the Lions Club, of Murray, Ky., assuring the President and Members of Congress of their support of the program to protect and defend our country; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1940

(Legislative day of Monday, August 5, 1940)

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

Rev. W. L. Darby, D. D., executive secretary, Washington Federation of Churches, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Thou God and Father of all mankind, we come before Thee today with reverence and humility. Thou hast made us and Thy power sustains us day by day. This is Thy world and Thou art its ruler, above all kings and emperors, whether great or small. They continue for a while, but Thou dost abide forever.

Help us, therefore, to remember Thee in all our plans and purposes and to ask divine guidance for ourselves, our families, our communities, and for the Nation we love. Give us a deep realization of the priority and permanence of things spiritual, for the material things are transitory and soon pass away. We would seek to be righteous in our individual lives and just in our dealings with others. Let this be the controlling principle of our Nation; also that we should act in accordance with the Golden Rule in our relationships with other peoples everywhere.

Make us sensible of the responsibilities we bear; especially may this be true of the Members of this body, who have so many important decisions to make. May they seek constantly the wisdom which comes from above, so that they may be guided aright.

We are well aware of our own weaknesses and imperfections, our sins, and shortcomings. Grant us divine forgiveness and strengthen our hands for the tasks before us. Amid the confusion and tumult and terror of these days help us to keep clear heads and courageous hearts, facing the future with faith that, out of the distress and despair of our time, we may yet, with Thy guidance and blessing, build a better world.

In the name of Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Thursday, September 5, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Danaher	La Follette	Schwellenbach
Andrews	Davis	Lee	Sheppard
Ashurst	Downey	Lodge	Shipstead
Austin	Ellender	McCarran	Smathers
Bailey	George	McKellar	Stewart
Barbour	Gerry	Maloney	Taft
Barkley	Gibson	Mead	Thomas, Idaho
Bilbo	Green	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Guffey	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Gurney	Neely	Townsend
Bulow	Hale	Norris	Truman
Burke	Harrison	Nye	Vandenberg
Byrd	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Hayden	Overton	Walsh
Capper	Herring	Pittman	Wheeler
Caraway	Holt	Radcliffe	White
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Russell	
Connally	King	Schwartz	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SLATTERY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.