Hugh I. Holmes to be postmaster at St. Charles, Mo., in place of H. I. Holmes. Incumbent's commission expired June 25, 1940.

MONTANA

William H. Fluhr to be postmaster at Belt, Mont., in place of W. H. Fluhr. Incumbent's commission expired August 27, 1939.

Burle O. Wilson to be postmaster at Joplin, Mont., in place of J. G. Rolph. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1940.

NEBRASKA

Fay J. Clough to be postmaster at Allen, Nebr., in place of F. J. Clough. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1940.

Frank S. Perkins to be postmaster at Fremont, Nebr., in place of F. W. Fuhlrodt. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1940.

NEW JERSEY

George Stack to be postmaster at Lindenwold, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

NEW YORK

Ruth Doris Huth to be postmaster at Esopus, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1939.

Michael F. Conroy to be postmaster at Milton, N. Y., in place of M. F. Conroy. Incumbent's commission expired August 21, 1939.

Margaret Van Auken to be postmaster at Sea Breeze, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

William Johnson to be postmaster at West Sayville, N. Y., in place of J. J. Hoek. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1940.

NORTH CAROLINA

James R. Lowry to be postmaster at Pembroke, N. C., in place of L. W. Jacobs, resigned. Loyd E. Ardrey to be postmaster at Pineville, N. C. Office become Presidential July 1, 1940

NORTH DAKOTA

Fred A. Sommars to be postmaster at Carrington, N. Dak., in place of G. J. Boley. In-cumbent's commission expired March 18, 1939.

Marjorie Zappas to be postmaster at Jamestown, N. Dak., in place of E. H. Mattingly,

Gien E. Mark to be postmaster at Tioga, N. Dak., in place of S. E. Garland. Incum-bent's commission expired March 11, 1940.

Wellington G. Ward, Jr., to be postmaster at Tolna, N. Dak., in place of B. A. Hennessy, resigned.

Katherine P. Ferrell to be postmaster at Warwick, N. Dak., in place of C. B. Stinson. Incumbent's commission expired February 27,

Herbert C. Glaser to be postmaster at Bellaire, Ohio, in place of Charles Wassman, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Lola Knotts to be postmaster at Langley, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

OREGON

Homer W. Egan to be postmaster at Brooks, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940. Mary Rebecca Osborne to be postmaster at Gilchrist, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

PENNSYLVANIA

Seth Jay Morley to be postmaster at Athens, Pa., in place of S. J. Morley. Incumbent's commission expired April 9, 1940. Mary Brumbaugh to be postmaster at

Brockway, Pa., in place of Mary Brumbaugh. Incumbent's commission expired August 2,

William T. Means to be postmaster at Brookville, Pa., in place of J. J. McMurray, deceased.

Arthur F. Ellis to be postmaster at Cambridge Springs, Pa., in place of H. W. Van Matre. Incumbent's commission expired June 20, 1940.

Lena M. Cole to be postmaster at Coal Center, Pa., in place of D. J. Frantz, Jr., removed.

Marcella T. Pawlowski to be postmaster at Glen Lyon, Pa., in place of M. T. Pawlowski, Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1940.

Llewellyn Angstadt to be postmaster at Kutztown, Pa., in place of Llewellyn Angstadt. Incumbent's commission expired August 27,

John L. Crowley to be postmaster at Lenni Mills, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

Frank C. Swoyer to be postmaster at Mohrsville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940

Luther A. Fry to be postmaster at Reiffton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940. James H. Wales to be postmaster at Templeton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1,

1940

SOUTH CAROLINA

David D. Eison to be postmaster at Chesnee, S. C., in place of D. D. Eison. Incumbent's commission expired June 25, 1940.

Lillie F. Beard to be postmaster at Langley, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Mattie W. Funk to be postmaster at Mc-Intosh, S. Dak., in place of M. W. Funk. Incumbent's commission expired January 28,

TENNESSEE

Marvin McKnight to be postmaster at Bemis, Tenn., in place of Marvin McKnight. Incumbent's commission expired January 31,

Hugh E. Davenport to be postmaster at Crossville, Tenn., in place of H. E. Davenport. Incumbent's commission expired July 18, 1939.

Margaret D. Ashton to be postmaster at Culleoka, Tenn., in place of L. N. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1940.

John Cort Sadler to be postmaster at Gainesboro, Tenn., in place of J. C. Sadler. Incumbent's commission expired April 21,

John H. Warf to be postmaster at Hohenwald, Tenn., in place of G. A. Lester. In-cumbent's commission expired January 20,

Hugh B. Milstead to be postmaster at Hornsby, Tenn., in place of H. B. Milstead. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1940.

Ruby Hensley to be postmaster at Iron City, Tenn., in place of Ruby Hensley. Incumbent's commission expired August 26, 1939.

Albert Seaton Garrett to be postmaster at Konxville, Tenn., in place of H. W. Booth,

Raymond C. Townsend to be postmaster at Parsons, Tenn., in place of R. C. Townsend. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1938.

TEXAS

Bernard H. Cartwright to be postmaster at Boerne, Tex., in place of W. G. Davis, deceased. Clyde Franklin to be postmaster at Rock-dale, Tex., in place of J. E. Cooke, deceased.

VERMONT

Nina L. Heidger to be postmaster at Greens-boro, Vt., in place of N. L. Heidger. Incum-bent's commission expired May 13, 1939.

WASHINGTON

Alvin G. Holzhauser to be postmaster at Holden, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1939.

Robert F. Wheeler to be postmaster at Mon-tesano, Wash., in place of A. M. Robertson, deceased.

Eberhard Nyhus to be postmaster at Westport, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1. 1940.

WEST VIRGINIA

Carl E. Sage to be postmaster at Anawalt, W. Va., in place of C. C. Hurley, removed. John D. Farmer to be postmaster at Mul-

lens, W. Va., in place of J. A. Ball, removed.

Christopher C. Hunley to be postmaster at Sharples, W. Va., in place of Charles Sanders,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 10, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following praver:

Most glorious and most blessed God, accept the tributes of our grateful hearts; we praise Thy excellent name. These are times when we are perplexed by the controlling powers of life and the world; Oh, stay and steady our patience that we may valiantly believe in the sovereignty of the Divine. Allow not thought to grind against thought, will against will, desire against desire, making an overflow of our emotions. May we not be impoverished by impatience, or paralyzed by care and anxiety. Grant, dear Lord, that we may think quietly and deliberate calmly, cultivating the fruits of deep, serious meditation. We pray that we may love our country with all our hearts; cleanse it of industrial strife, of greed, of hate, of disunity that we may fulfill our destiny and give the world its direction for decades to come. Breathe peace into all breasts that give no sign of suffering; all who are rowing and toiling amid winds and contrary waves, O God, do Thou help them. Thou hast taught us to earn our bread by the sweat of our brows but not at the breaking of our hearts. Ever may we rejoice in Thy love; it is better than poets' songs and better than human thought ever conceived and will endure while the ages pass. Through Christ our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 8, 1941, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, following the regular orders already agreed to, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes today.

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

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. MANSFIELD appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ELECTION TO A COMMITTEE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I present the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 53

Resolved, That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Ways and Means: Mr. KNUTE HILL, of Washington; Mr. ARTHUR D. HEALEY, of Massachusetts; Mr. AARON LANE FORD, of The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therewith an article which appeared in the December 1940 issue of the California State Bar Journal, an article from the capable pen of George H. Cabaniss, Jr., of San Francisco, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CAMP CONSTRUCTION AT INDIANTOWN GAP, PA.

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

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, during the summer and fall I visited many of our Army posts and centers, where we are adding to or building new facilities for housing our selective service men when they are called to the colors.

On Tuesday I had the pleasure of being escorted through the Indiantown Gap, Pa., Army camp construction center by the constructing quartermaster of

that unit, Maj. A. F. Kay.

I had previously inspected construc-tion work with members of my committee in different centers throughout the United States, such as Little Rock, Fort Sill, Fort Bliss, Fort Sam Houston, Fort Beauregard, Fort Benning, and a number of other centers, but I had not seen the one in my own State, Indiantown Gap. I am glad to report that the construction work in that camp is not only up to schedule as to time but that the work being done by the contractor is of extraordinary character. It is hard to make yourself believe that in less than 90 days they could do what they have done at Indiantown Gap. They have completed 58 percent of the construc-tion work for housing a population of approximately 25,000. The schedule calls for them to have completed by February 17 enough units to house and care for 17,000 men. Major Kay showed me the construction charts and said they would be a few days ahead of schedule in spite of the weather and the rock formation they did not contemplate in laying their plans.

Picture, if you please, the building of the following in less than 4 months:

(a) A hospital, complete in every detail, to care for 750 people.

(b) Eleven recreational buildings, 37 by 99 feet.

(c) One hundred and thirty-six company recreation rooms, 45 by 25 feet.

(d) Two theaters, each seating more than 1,000.

(e) Two insulated storage houses, 180 by 60 feet, for perishable goods.

(f) Nine other storage houses the same size for nonperishable goods.

(g) Barracks buildings, each housing 63 men sufficiently large to give 750 cubic feet of space to each occupant.

(h) About 50 splendid sanitary mess halls modernly equipped will be com-

pleted February 17, 1941. This camp will house—

First. Two brigades of infantry. Second. One brigade of artillery.

Third. One regiment of engineers, Fourth. One regiment of medical troops.

Fifth. One regiment of quartermaster troops.

Sixth. One regiment of special troops. Seventh. One regiment of mechanized troops, together with house mechanized unit.

Eighth. One regiment of about 1,000 men of station troops.

Ninth. One squadron of air troops of about 125 men adjacent to the Harrisburg Airport.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Army and the contractors should be commended and encouraged on every side for the work they are doing. Keep in mind that the sanitation with reference to sewerage and water air space and all will be as perfect as it is in the best Army posts we have.

Pennsylvania State Adjutant General, Brig. Gen. Edward Martin, suggested the general lay-out for the camp and is cooperating and working with the Army 100 percent. Major Kay, who did constructing work at Fort Knox, Ky., and is doing a splendid piece of work for his men and for the country.

The only delay of importance that they have had was the delay of getting lumber from the western coast and the Mississippi section.

CENTENNIAL OF FIRST CATHOLIC DIOCESE, CALIFORNIA

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks in the Record.

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

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

REPRESENTATION OF AMERICAN LABOR IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

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

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

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have just dropped in the hopper what I consider to be a most important bill, particularly at this time. The substance of this bill is that no alien may represent American labor in collective bargaining in any business or industry. Let no one think that this bill is aimed at the patriotic, constructive alien, who has come to this country seeking the benefits and advantages which this Government gives him, and who is helping us maintain

American standards. But, on the other hand, it is aimed at the destructive type of alien who has come to this country as the agent of a different type of government, to preach communism, nazi-ism, or fascism, and at the same time to carry on a communistic program of destruction by general strikes, riots, disruption, misleading statements, or by any means at his hand to destroy this Government.

I see no reason why a man who is not even a citizen of the United States should come into this country particularly for the purpose of overturning its form of government, then attempting to run it, as has been done in the past. I therefore solicit the vote of every Member of this House to see that this bill is put through.

This is a bill that will permit of absolutely no partisan consideration, and I know that it will be treated in that manner.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a letter which I wrote to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and also to the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia and their replies.

District of Columbia, and their replies.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it

is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SIXTEENTH STREET SUBWAY

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

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the District Commissioners and the National Park and Planning Commission are constructing a subway at Sixteenth Street and Massachusetts Avenue. We have had a subway constructed at Massachusetts Avenue and Fourteenth Street, which is a fine piece of work and a merited project; and to continue the line of traffic east and west it should continue on Massachusetts Avenue at Sixteenth Street. But the Commissioners and the National Park and Planning Commission decided they are going to put the subway perpendicular to the one on Massachusetts Avenue, which will not be for the good of the city of Washington. It will obstruct a construction of the subway up Massachusetts Avenue at some future time.

It seems to me that the Congress, which is responsible for the District laws and operation, should not permit those bodies to construct that subway and ruin the progress of the city and the speed-up of the traffic in that manner. You will find in a very few years that it will be wrong. It is wrong now to even contemplate it. It should continue up Massachusetts Avenue so that it will go under Fifteenth Street, under Sixteenth Street, under Seventeenth Street. under Eighteenth Street, under Dupont Circle at Connecticut Avenue on Massachusetts Avenue, clear beyond Dupont Circle if necessary. It is something that is vital to the welfare of the city, and the Congress should give it its attention. Stop the proposed subway on Sixteenth Street before it is too late. I am more than surprised at the National Park Planning Board, composed of men who should know better, and I certainly am surprised at the District Commissioners that they would sanction such a move. It will not be constructed before you all see the gravity of such a colossal blunder in the traffic system of the District. Stop it. Stop it. Stop it. Put the subway on Massachusetts Avenue at Sixteenth Street.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The letters referred to are as follows:

JANUARY 6, 1941.

Hon. Jennings Randolph, Chairman, District of Columbia Committee.

House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I note in the paper that it is contemplated to put an underpass Sixteenth and Massachusetts Avenue and the trees are now being removed. realize the trees will have to be destroyed to construct the underpass, but in the name of heaven tell me why you want to put the underpass on Sixteenth Street when you made an underpass at the Fourteenth Street and Massachusetts Avenue intersection, running the underpass on Massachusetts Avenue? That was fine. But suppose that some day you want to continue the underpass on Massachusetts Avenue on up the avenue to take care of the traffic at Fifteenth Street and Massachusetts Avenue, which is heavy, and at Sixteenth Street and Massachusetts Avenue, I never knew of anything so ill-advised as to think that you are going to place the under-pass on Sixteenth Street. Why do you not continue it on Massachusetts Avenue?

Do not make such an error. It is utterly foolhardy and ridiculous to think that this should be done. Before it is too late, stop it and have the underpass placed on Massachusetts Avenue at Sixteenth Street, and my advice to you would be to continue it from Fourteenth Street or by Sixteenth Street and on up through Dupont Circle at Connecticut That is the bottleneck of your Avenue. traffic and it will speed things up more than anything I know. Whoever is responsible for this blunder of making the underpass on Sixteenth Street ought to give every consideration to this proposition. Do not wait. If it has been contracted for, stop the contract and change the underpass so that it will be on Massachusetts Avenue.

Please give this your every consideration. It is wise, it is sensible, and it is the only way to direct your traffic through an underpass. The way to do this is continue the underpass up Massachusetts Avenue.

Very respectfully,

ROBERT F. RICH.

(Same letter also written to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.)

House of Representatives, Committee on District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., January 8, 1941.

Hon. ROBERT F. RICH,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: This is in reply to your letter of January 6, protesting the construction of an underpass at Scott Circle. As early as last July I had written suggesting a continuation of underpasses as originally planned on Massachusetts Avenue. I received reports from both the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The following is a quotation from a letter from the National Park and Planning Commission of July 22, 1940: "Present plans for the underpass for Scott Circle in the line of

Sixteenth Street are the result of extensive study given during the past several years to the traffic problem at this point by the District Highway Department, the National Capital Parks office, and this commission, working through the Commission's coordinating committee on which these agencies are represented. These studies led to a recommendation submitted to the Planning Commission at its April and May meetings at which preliminary plans submitted by the District Commissioners for the underpass in the line of Sixteenth Street were approved.

"This action is taken in the belief that the underpass in the line of Sixteenth Street is the most economical and satisfactory solution from every point of view, bearing in mind not only the efficiency as a traffic facility but also the relationship to the park areas surrounding the three statues and adjoining property fronting on the Scott Circle plaza. Under the plan the reservation around the General Scott Monument will be materially increased and most of the trees surrounding the Hahnemann and Webster statues will be saved."

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia gave much the same sort of reply. The letters were written me after I had spent 1 hour at the Scott Circle during the busy period.

I have requested the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to forward to you a mimeographed statement showing the study given this question and the reasons for their decision.

I wish there were something I could do to assist you. However, I personally did not feel qualified to dispute the statements made by qualified engineers concerning the desirability of placing the underpass on Sixteenth Street.

Yours very sincerely,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Chairman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief clipping from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief resolution from the Eric County Board of Supervisors on the St. Lawrence Seaway.

St. Lawrence Seaway.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks. The heart of democracy is freedom of thought and action.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR ELIMINATION OF UNEMPLOY-MENT AND FOR POST-WAR ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENT

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in this period, when inevitably for America to achieve the strong defense we believe she must have and to perform her place in the life of the nations of the world, various sacrifices are going to be

asked of every one of us; I want to say that the thing that will give more solid hope, more spirit, and more morale to the American people than anything else is for them to be assured that when this period of great defense expenditure and crisis is over there will not result a period of unemployment and depression, but instead that their representatives in this Congress and elsewhere will in the meantime have provided against that possibility and have developed a program to prevent it.

Therefore, today I am introducing a joint resolution for the creation of a commission charged with the task of developing a long-range solution of unemployment and a program for the orderly adjustment of our Nation's economic life and financial structure when this period of war and conflict in the world shall end. My resolution is introduced pursuant to the recommendations of the conference of representatives of the three great religious faiths of America-Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish-and is companion to a similar resolution introduced in the Senate by Senator WAGNER, of New York.

Some weeks ago, after consulting with several leaders of our great religious faiths who took part in the Inter-Faith Conference on Unemployment held here last spring, I prepared the joint resolution which I am introducing. The Inter-Faith Conference endorsed and urged the appointment of a committee on unemployment, but now economic condi-tions have changed until now I feel the situation demands the creation of a commission, not only on unemployment but also on the very crucial problems of economic adjustment of our national life when the time comes, as some day it must come, when these wars cease and peace is restored again.

Senator Wagner's resolution differs in details as compared with the one I prepared; but as the general ideas are similar and the details of the plan can be developed and harmonized, I am introducing the one I prepared. At the same time, I thought I should also introduce a resolution identical with the one Senator Wagner introduced, so that both resolutions would be before the committee.

We must have in our hearts a dynamic faith in America, what she has stood for. and what she is going to stand for in the future. The greatest truth about the present situation is the fact that we are witnessing one of the great periods of change in all the history of the world. It is marked by a great contest between the principle of dictatorship and the principle of democracy for the allegiance of people around the world. Before this period has passed into history we shall see one of two things-either a reversion of mankind to very old forms of government wherein the people generally are subject to the will of a few all-powerful individuals at the head of great military states, or else a further development of democracy so that all people may really share in the benefits made possible by machinery, electrical power, and technological advance. We cannot, therefore, lay down for one single moment our effort to build in our own country and

under its democratic Constitution a system of distribution and exchange wherein there will be no "surpluses" until all the basic needs of the people have been filled.

Even the extensive aid to the democracies which we must give, even aid based upon great effort by America, is not enough to meet the present situation. Even the defeat of totalitarian arms is not enough to meet it. Ultimately this contest can only be won if the pattern of a new and better day for all democratic peoples, including those who have been unemployed, who have been forced from their farms, those who are young and those who are old, begins now to be made plain by those of us who are charged with responsibility in this democratic Nation.

Democracy can only be truly successful if we now give substantial hope that at the end of this period of crisis and conflict there will not be a period of disastrous unemployment and depression, but instead a period in which balances will really be achieved between the productive output of goods and an active consumers' market for those goods and where unnecessary poverty and unemployment in the midst of possible plenty will become a thing of the past. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter from the professor of history at Centenary College, of Louisiana, and also a resolution of the faculty of Centenary College, Shreveport. La.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing in the RECORD an excerpt from an address delivered by a prominent citizen in my home city.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix with reference to the Selective Service Act.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a composition entitled "A Citizen's Pledge for National Defense."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the railroad brotherhoods' publication, Labor.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WHO CONTROLS MAGNESIUM PRODUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES?

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

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

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week, January 8, there appears in the Appendix of the RECORD an extension of remarks by myself, including certain items from local papers relative to magnesium and the existing critical shortage of that metal. I am today further extending my remarks upon this subject and showing the cause for this shortage. There is no reason why there should be a shortage of magnesium in the production of airplanes at all, excepting the monopolistic control that prevails. The only magnesium metal that we have now is that made from salt brine. This metal is known to the trade as "dow metal." It is inferior in quality to a metal that can be produced from magnesite ore found in great quantity in Stevens County, Wash., almost on the shores of the new lake being created by Grand Coulee Dam.

We have millions of tons of magnesite ore. We have hundreds of thousands of kilowatts of power at Grand Coulee Dam and the ore and the power are located in the same place. By using cheap electricity generated at Grand Coulee, where there will be over 300,000 kilowatts available before the close of this year-and this amount represents only one-sixth of the generating capacity of this mighty project-we can produce metallic magnesium at a price about one-third of that which the Government is now paying for the inferior Dow metal. We pay in the neighborhood of 27 cents a pound at present for magnesium, which is a very essential metal in airplane production. The metal that could be produced by combining the ore found in the mountains at Grand Coulee with the power generated at this dam would be available at 9 cents or 10 cents a pound. We have a right to ask why the National Defense Council does not encourage such production and take steps to break the monopolistic control of the two essential metals in air-

plane production.

I am hopeful, before it is too late, that the National Defense Council and others who have the heavy responsibility of seeing our defense program move forward will lend every encouragement to the production, in great volume, of this very superior and wonderful light metal rather than to continue to encourage expansion and development of the inferior, highpriced, monopoly controlled Dow metal. The only excuse that can be offered why this is not being done is that those in charge of the program have not had the matter brought to their attention, though I know that I have fought against terrific odds and unexpectêd resistance for more than 3 years in trying to get some real action. Now that we are conscious of the great emergency and have come to a full realization that production, and not profits, that unselfish, patriotic devotion, and not selfish, mercenary gain, must be the forces that direct our activities, I am hopeful that immediate steps will be taken to make the most of the remarkable and marvelous possibilities that exist, and are within easy reach of those who exercise control and discretion in our national defense program and the production of the things essential to the Nation's welfare in a period of emergency and crisis.

Again I want to urge you, my colleagues, to read carefully my extension of remarks that appeared in the RECORD on Wednesday, January 8, and that will appear in the RECORD of today. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an excerpt from a certain publication.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. There has just been introduced in the House, as I understand it, by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] a bill further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes, consisting of nine sections and covering four pages. As I understand the procedure in case of a question of jurisdiction of committees which I do not at this time raise, all public bills when introduced shall be referred by the Speaker to some committee having jurisdiction or which the Speaker believes has jurisdiction of the matter, and that a motion to re-refer the bill to another committee is not in order until two things occur: First, that the bill has been referred; second, that the committee seeking jurisdiction of the bill authorizes the chairman of that committee to move to re-refer it. Is my understanding correct?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has stated the rule.

Mr. MAY. A further parliamentary inquiry, if the Chair will permit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will

state it.

Mr. MAY. If the Chair has already referred the bill I mentioned, to what committee has it been referred?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has referred the bill to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MAY. I merely make this inquiry for the purpose of giving notice that if my committee should determine in its judgment that it has jurisdiction of the matter and should request that I seek jurisdiction of it I shall at such time present such a motion.

The further inquiry is whether my understanding is correct that a motion to re-refer is in order at any time the House is in session up to the time the bill is finally reported by the committee to which it has been referred.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Is such motion to re-refer a bill a privileged motion?

The SPEAKER. It is when it is authorized by the committee, and it is not d_batable.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

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

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 2 (a) (11) of the act of Congress approved March 24, 1934, entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," I transmit copies of laws enacted by the National Assembly of the Philippine Islands. Included are laws of the Second National Assembly, first session, January 23 to May 18, 1939; Second National Assembly, second special session. September 25 to September 29, 1939: Second National Assembly, third special session, November 2 to November 14, 1939; Second National Assembly, second session, January 22 to May 8, 1940; Second National Assembly, fourth special session, July 8 to August 10, 1940; and Act No. 585, approved June 7, 1940, enacted by the First National Assembly, first session, June 16 to October 10, 1936. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 10, 1941.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES-ARLINGTON CEMETERY

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the requirements of the act of Congress of March 4, 1921, I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Commission on the Erection of Memorials and Entombment of Bodies in the Arlington Memorial Ampitheater for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES-REPORT OF ALLEY DWEL-LING AUTHORITY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Alley Dwelling Authority for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES-REPORT OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

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

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the act of Congress to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States approved January 16, 1883, I transmit herewith the Fiftyseventh Annual Report of the Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940.

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

LOCKE MILLER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 54

Whereas Locke Miller, a resident of the city of Youngstown, Chio, in the Nineteenth Congressional District thereof, has served notice of contest upon MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, the returned Member of the House from said district, of his purpose to contest the election of said MICHAEL J. KIRWAN; and

Whereas it does not appear that said Locke Miller was a candidate for election to the House of Representatives from the Nineteenth Congressional District of the State of Ohio, at the election held November 5, 1940, but was a candidate for the Democratic nomination from said district at the primary election held in said district, at which MICHAEL J. KIRWAN was chosen as the Democratic nominee: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives does not regard the said Locke Miller as a person competent to bring a contest for a seat in the House and his notice of contest, served upon the sitting Member, MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, is hereby dismissed; and no petition or other paper relating to the subject matter contained in this resolution shall be received by the House, or entertained in any way whatever.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill further to promote the defense of the United States. In view of its importance and knowing the Members would like an opportunity to study it, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this time in the RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not because I want the House to get the information, I have observed rather with regret that the preliminary proceedings up to date have been taken without consulting any Republican whatever. This legislation is for national defense, as the gentleman says. I merely wish to propound the inquiry to the majority leader whether this is to be considered a partisan bill or whether it is to be considered in a nonpartisan manner.

Mr. McCORMACK. To begin with I cannot, of course, accept the statement of my distinguished friend as being correct because we have a Secretary of War, a great citizen, but by politics a Republican. We have a Secretary of the Navy who is a great citizen but by politics a Republican.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I will accept the credentials of these two members of the President's Cabinet. What I had reference to was the lack of Republican legislators taken into consultation.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very much distressed that my distinguished friend should raise the question of partisanship in his inquiry because I assume that national defense transcends partisan politics.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is the point I was trying to bring out in my inquiry to my dear friend. I thought we were trying to approach the great defense problem in a nonpartisan spirit; and, of course, after all we are going to keep it on a nonpartisan basis. I feel, however, that the gentleman in the fairness, which is always characteristic of him, will admit that the Members of Congress who represent 22,500,000 voters, should be given some consideration in the preparation of the program.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not see

where the gentleman's observation has any application because certainly the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and the Assistant Secretary of War are Republicans. The businessmen on the National Defense Commission are all fine Americans. I do not look at it from the political angle, but I have had a lot of difficulty finding a Democrat

among them.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But we did note from the newspapers that our distinguished Speaker, the majority leader, the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee who represent the Democratic Party, different members of the Ways and Means Committee, and possibly several others I cannot recall were consulted. There were no Republican legislators in the group.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want the gen-

tleman to have the correct impression.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not want to prolong the discussion. I realize the part was not under the guidance of the gentleman from Massachusetts. Is it the gentleman's purpose to have it considered in a nonpartisan manner from now on?

Mr. McCORMACK. Is it the gentleman's purpose to have the Republican Members adopt a policy which will be nonpartisan?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Certainly. We consider that in national defense there is no partisanship.

Mr. McCORMACK. The record speaks

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And I spoke along that line; I think the gentleman will agree with me that when you are invited into a nonpartisan consideration of a bill you should be given the courtesy of participating in the preparation of the plan.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think my friend from Massachusetts feels unnecessarily disturbed because, naturally, there was no such intent, and under no conditions would there be any such intent. The gentleman has had wider legislative experience than I have had in this body, and I bow to his views always.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman is too modest.

Mr. McCORMACK. There was uncertainty as to which committee the bill would be referred, and I can assure the gentleman that that uncertainty existed until this morning. There are provisions of the bill which might involve referring it to any one of three committees, and, naturally, it would be difficult to determine the Members to be brought into conference. There was no such intent at all, and the gentleman's inference, of course, is entirely without foundation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am not making any inference. I am simply

asking a question.

Mr. McCORMACK. The inquiry presupposes an inference, otherwise the in-

quiry would not be made.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am sorry the gentleman took it that way. I want to know where do we go from here on. I agree also you have control over

what has happened up to date.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are two distinguished American citizens who in their capacity as Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy participated, and I do not view them as Democrats or Republicans, but in politics they are Republicans. In view of the inquiry made by my distinguished friend injecting the political atmosphere into this, I must call his attention to that.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have not injected any political atmosphere

at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will withdraw

that word "inject."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I purposely tried not to do that.

Mr. McCORMACK. The origin of the political discussion, then, started with my friend.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The origin was the fact there was a conference to which no Republican from either branch of the Congress was invited to attend. That is where it started, if it started anywhere.

Mr. McCORMACK. There were two Republicans there, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

The regular order was demanded.

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial written by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, of Mount St. Mary's College, in the Florida Catholic.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement I made before the Tariff Commission on the subject of tariff on crab meat.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement with reference to H. R. 1585, a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARNOLD Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article entitled "Lin-coln Collection of Henry Horner," late Governor of Illinois, by King V. Hostick.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Engel] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to use the time given me now. But I ask that on Wednesday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and after any previous orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial from the Times-Herald.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. Rogers]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] to print the information he sought to have inserted in the RECORD. I want that bill printed in the RECORD. It is information, and many times I have sought in vain for information. However, objection to the insertion of the bill was my only way to draw attention to the lack of facts given to this House by the administration. I want to direct the attention of the Members of this House to the fact that the Committee on Foreign Affairs-of which I am a member-has not been given information relative to international affairs, either by the President or by the Department of

State, in spite of efforts that have been made personally by me for the passage of resolutions of inquiry or otherwise. Others have sought complete information also. We should be given information regarding our national-defense program. If we had been given such information, today our defense program would be much further advanced instead of in a state of chaos. We have to get such information wherever we can, from radio commentators or from some friend. I understand in this so-called nationaldefense bill we are asked to give the President authority to furnish confidential information to England. I earnestly hope, Mr. Speaker, that the President, the Speaker, and the floor leader will keep the House fully informed as to the grave international situation and the confidential information furnished. Can you imagine giving England information that Members of Congress in the United States do not have? If the House cannot be trusted, Mr. Speaker, who can? Surely not a foreign power. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection. The SPEAKER. It is too late.

PREVIOUS ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hoff-MAN] for 12 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mich-

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I renew my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Reserving the right to object-

Mr. McCORMACK. I withdraw it, then. I am not going to impose on the gentleman's time.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to direct an inquiry to the majority leader. What is the program for the rest of the day?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no further program for the day.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I ask the majority leader the question I wanted to ask him on my reservation of objection? Are Members going to be given an opportunity to be heard before the Committee on Foreign Affairs with regard to the gentleman's bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, that is something I cannot determine. That is a matter for the committee to determine.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield for a discussion, because it comes out of my time.

The SPEAKER. This will not be taken out of the gentleman's time.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. For the informa-tion of the Members, Mr. Speaker, I renew my previous request about printing in the RECORD the bill I introduced today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it

is so ordered.

There was no objection. The bill referred to follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as "An act to promote the defense of the United States."

SEC. 2. As used in this act-

(a) The term "defense article" means-

(1) Any weapon, munition, aircraft, vessel, or boat:

(2) Any machinery, facility, tool, material, or supply necessary for the manufacture, production, processing, repair, servicing, or op-eration of any article described in this subsection:

(3) Any component material or part of or equipment for any article described in this subsection:

(4) Any other commodity or article for

defense.

Such term "defense article" includes any article described in this subsection: Manufactured or procured pursuant to section 3, or to which the United States or any foreign government has or hereafter acquires title, possession, or control.

(b) The term "defense information" means

any plan, specification, design, prototype, or information pertaining to any defense article.

SEC. 3. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President may, from time to time, when he deems it in the interest of national defense, authorize the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the head of any other department or agency of the Government-

(1) To manufacture in arsenals, factories, and shipyards under their jurisdiction, or otherwise procure, any defense article for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States.

(2) To sell, transfer, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of, to any such govern-

ment any defense article.

(3) To test, inspect, prove, repair, outfit, recondition, or otherwise to place in good working order any defense article for any such government.

(4) To communicate to any such government any defense information, pertaining to any defense article furnished to such government under paragraph (2) of this subsection.
(5) To release for export any defense arti-

cle to any such government.

(b) The terms and conditions upon which any such foreign government receives any aid authorized under subsection (a) shall be those which the President deems satisfactory, and the benefit to the United States may be payment or repayment in kind or property, or any other direct or indirect benefit which the

President deems satisfactory.
SEC. 4. All contracts or agreements made for the disposition of any defense article or defense information pursuant to section 3 shall contain a clause by which the foreign government undertakes that it will not, without the consent of the President, transfer title to or possession of such defense article or defense information by gift, sale, or other-wise, or permit its use by anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of such foreign government.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the head of any other department or agency of the Government involved shall, when any such defense article or defense information is exported, immediately inform the department or agency designated by the President to administer section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), of the quantities, character, value, terms of dis-position, and destination of the article and information so exported.

Sec. 6. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this act.

(b) All money and all property which is converted into money received under section 3 from any government shall, with the approval of the Director of the Budget, revert to the respective appropriation or appropriations out of which funds were expended with respect to the defense article or defense information for which such consideration is received, and shall be available for expenditure for the purpose for which such ex-pended funds were appropriated by law, dur-ing the fiscal year in which such funds are received and the ensuing fiscal year.

Sec. 7. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the head of the department or agency shall in all contracts or agreements for the disposition of any defense article or defense information fully protect the rights of all citizens of the United States who have patent rights in and to any such article or information which is hereby authorized to be disposed of and the payments collected for royalties on such patents shall be paid to the owners and holders of such patents.

SEC. 8. The Secretaries of War and of the Navy are hereby authorized to purchase or otherwise acquire arms, ammunition, and implements of war produced within the jurisdiction of any country to which section 3 is applicable, whenever the President deems such purchase or acquisition to be necessary in the interests of the defense of the United States.

SEC. 9. The President may, from time to time, promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this act; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred on him by this act through such department, agency, or officer as he shall direct

THE PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL MESSAGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, this question of partisanship first arose, as I recall it, when the First Lady of the land took occasion, through the press, to charge the Republican Members with partisanship. That is the first time it came up. She seems to be greatly distured because the Republicans did not give what she considers to be a proper degree of applause to the President on Monday.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. HENDRICKS. May I ask the gentleman if Mrs. Roosevelt actually castigated the Republicans for not cheering Mr. Roosevelt or for not cheering the principles he set forth? I read the article, and I do not find a word where she castigated you for not applauding the President. It was the four principles he set forth that she said we all ought to be able to agree on. Is not that true?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. She found fault because we did not applaud her lord and master. She may have written that speech and was disturbed when we did not yell and cheer as he delivered it. What she said, among other things, was that we reminded her of that old nursery story, "I don't want to play in your yard," because we did not applaud enough to suit her. But more about that later. DISILLUSIONED-BY THE PATRIOTIC ATTITUDE OF THE PEOPLE'S REPRESENTATIVES—SURPRISED BY FAILURE TO APPLAUD WAR SPEECH

Headlines in a Washington paper of January 7 tell us the President's wife was "astonished and saddened" by what she is pleased to term the "partisan attitude" of Republicans who listened to the President's message on the state of the Union.

She just cannot understand the failure of anyone to applaud everything a Roosevelt says. She is amazed because Republicans receive with serious mein and solemn consideration a message in which the President challenges foreign powers to fight us, takes another step toward involvement in a war which will furnish a reason for violation of his pledge not to send an army of American youth across the seas.

WHAT SHE ACTUALLY WROTE IN HER COLUMN

In her column of the same date she wrote that she was not only saddened but astonished to notice that the applause came almost entirely from the Democrats, and that it looked to her as though the Republicans were saying to the coun-

We are Republicans first. We represent you here in Congress, not as a citizen of the United States in a period of great crisis, but as members of a political party which seeks primarily to promote its own partisan interests.

THE FIRST LADY SPOKE AS A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ADMINISTRATION

What the First Lady, as an individual, thinks or says about Congress or Congressmen is of but little importance. What she, as the First Lady, says publicly about Congressmen and Congress, because it is typical of New Deal thinking, is of importance,

She forgets, as did her husband, when he wanted to destroy the judicial branch of the Government, that the Constitution provides for three distinct and separate departments of this Government. And she evidently forgets that the Executive has no authority over Congress or the Members thereof.

She forgets that we have a duty to perform to those who sent us here, and that we would be unfaithful to the oath we have taken if we fail to use our own judgment on matters which come before

Well might we say, in view of the President's words and actions, that he is more interested in establishing his own form of government, or as the candidate for Vice President said, in remaking America than he is in maintaining our form of government.

A PARABLE FOR THE PRESIDENT

The President is fond of parables. Long ago One was taken up into a high mountain and shown all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time, and was told, "All shall be thine if Thou therefore wilt worship me."

All people desire to see prosperity and happiness throughout the world.

THE PRESIDENT TEMPTS US

On Monday the President took the American people and the Congress upon a high plane of thought and told them to look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms, four very

desirable objectives and he told us that we might attain those objectives if we would but follow him.

Because we failed to fall down and worship him, the First Lady, speaking as the First Lady and in a capacity she has no right to assume because some of us failed to fall down and worship, publicly denounced us "as members of a political party which seeks primarily to promote its own partisan interests."

In charging Republicans with partisanship and lack of patriotism, Mrs. Roosevelt but gave expression to the characteristic Rooseveltian intolerance. We represent our constituents, not the President. Mrs. Roosevelt forgets that over 150 Republicans were sent to Congress by their constituents because those constituents did not believe in the New Deal. Had they wanted in Congress worshipers of the President they would have sent to Congress rubber stamps or Democratsnot Republicans. Of course the Republican Members join the President in looking forward "to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms-freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, freedom from fear." But we are realists, and we know how impossible it is for us to attempt to take freedom of speech to the people of Russia or other parts of Europe, to guarantee freedom of worship in all parts of the world, to see that the millions of India have freedom from want, to banish from the whole world freedom from fear. The President promised that he would not send an army to fight in Europe. Our people do not want to send an army across the seas, nor do they want to enslave themselves to provide freedom from want, that is, to feed, and clothe, and house the people of Europe or of any other continent. Some of us knew, as we listened to the President, that his words were as "sounding brass and tinkling cymbals." We remembered, as we listened to him, that expediency comes first with him.

We recalled a long, long list of campaign promises, but at the moment we remember not one, no not one, that he has kept.

THE PRESIDENT ASKS FOR ALL THE WORLD THE FREEDOM HE HAS DENIED US

As I listened to his demands for freedom of speech, I remembered that his Labor Board has prosecuted and persecuted Henry Ford and many others who tried to exercise that constitutional right. When I heard him express a desire for freedom from want, my mind turned back to the hundreds of thousands of women and men who desired to work to free themselves from want during that period of time extending from the 1st day of January 1937, to the 10th day of June of that same year, and who were by force driven from their jobs, kept from their jobs, because the President failed to protect them when they sought to exercise their constitutional right to work.

THE PRESIDENT ASKS FOR FREEDOM FROM FEAR BUT TRIES TO FRIGHTEN US

When he spoke of "freedom from fear," I remembered that by club and stone, knife and gun, many a man and not a few women, through fear, had been driven and kept from their jobs. When he spoke of "freedom from want," I had

in mind his earlier statement that there must in this land of ours be an "equality of opportunity" and at the same time knew, as he knew, as he knows today, that there are here in Washington and throughout this land of ours many, many men who are in want because political supporters of the President deny them the opportunity to work.

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY DENIED AMERICANS

While the words "the equality of opportunity" were in his mouth, he knew as he knows now that an equality of opportunity to work was here in Washington and throughout the land denied hundreds of American citizens because he, the President of the United States, had been and was failing to perform his constitutional duty to protect our citizens, that he was permitting political organizations which supported him during the campaign to deprive American citizens of the opportunity to work, that he was permitting those organizations to collect hundreds of thousands of dollars for "permits to work."

AMERICA FIRST

Mrs. Roosevelt does not realize that many of us are Americans first, British-Americans, hyphenated Americans second. It just does not enter her mind that we love our country more than we love any other Nation. Her mind is not open to the thought that many of us have not yet conceded that only a Roosevelt can safely guide our destinies. Perhaps without realizing it she has reached that state of mind where she considers herself on the throne of an empire or at the side of a dictator.

It is a sad, sad commentary on thinking in high places that members of the Roosevelt family are so self-centered that because we do not after being shown the high places of the world, after his promise to give us dominion over the whole world, "fall down and worship," they fail to understand our refusal to do so.

Mrs. Roosevelt has evidently reached that state of mind typical of dictators and tyrants; who can see no other views but their own. It is one characteristic of the New Deal thinking and of the New Deal statements during the past 8 years. All who have ventured to question the President's judgment or his policy have been classified as lacking in kindness, in charity, in humanity, in patriotism. He and his, and those who surround him assume the typical egotistical, intolerant attitude of the absolute ruler.

THE PRESIDENT'S THREAT

The President expressed his thought in his address when he said:

The best way of dealing with the few slackers or trouble makers in our midst is, first, to shame them by patriotic example, and, if that fails, to use the sovereignty of government to save government.

Throughout his administration, the President has been using the latter method against all those businessmen and industrialists without whose wholehearted cooperation he cannot now save the Nation from the danger into which he has plunged it. For several years he has used the sovereignty of Government, exerted through the Labor Board to force industry to yield to the demands of the C.I.O.

and its allied Communists. The same governmental agency was used to keep American workingmen from their jobs; to force them into the C. I. O. His threat to use the sovereignty of Government is but the threat of a Hitler, of a Mussolini, a Stalin, to silence all opposition, all criticism.

He has come to believe, and the First Lady of the land, publicly at least, apparently agrees with him that he and he alone is competent and patriotic, and has the welfare of the Nation at heart.

He has consistently arrayed class against class; preached envy and jeal-ousy; the doctrine of hatred and fear and his egotism is only equalled by his ignorance when he assumed that patriotic Americans, who for many years have done their own work, earned their own living, will tamely submit. He will learn eventually that his effort to make this country subservient to Great Britain will be no more successful than that of George

Had Mrs. Roosevelt been an accurate observer she would have noticed yesterday that not only Republicans but Democrats sat silent during the greater part of the President's address.

A WAR SPEECH, NO CAUSE FOR APPLAUSE

A defiance, a castigation of other nations, of the heads of other nations, a challenge to come on and fight, a declaration that we are to join, even if it be but in the second line of battle, the supply line, in a war, world-wide, certainly is not the occasion for wild applause. It is time for sane, for sober, for unemotional thinking.

Some of us not only see the boys marching off to war, we not only hear the beating of the drum, the blare of the bugle; we not only see the waving of the flag as the boys come marching down the street, but we see in the future some of those same young men returning from the war broken in health, mangled, and disfigured. We see on many a hill, an unmarked grave. We see many a home shattered, sorrowing and broken-hearted parents, wives, and orphans. We see the hospitals filled with those who have paid the price, whose lives have been destroyed.

No, Mrs. Roosevelt, we see no occasion for wild cheering, for tumultuous applause for a speech, for a policy which would drag us down into the hell of war. Had Mrs. Roosevelt looked carefully she would have noted that the applause, when it came, was led by Reverend Phillips and by a few Members of the House who are ardent New Dealers, and who usually applaud vociferously on the slightest pretext, anything that reflects on the German people or Hitler.

Referring to this lack of applause, Mrs. Roosevelt wrote:

This is to me shocking and terrifying. There was running through my mind as I watched them, in what would have been an act of childish spite if it had not been such a serious moment in history, the lines of a song which was popular when I was young, "I don't want to play in your yard. I don't love you any more."

Let us carry her illustration just a little farther, "I don't want to play in your yard." Well, who does want to play in the President's yard, as he has now

established it? Some time ago he said that our frontier was on the Rhine, and when taxed with that statement, denied it. Then he moved our frontier, enlarged our yard, to include Spain and Greece and apparently all of the Eastern Hemisphere. The "democracy" of "red" Russia, of course, has been part of our yard since early in the Roosevelt reign.

ONE OF HIS PLAYMATES

Now, he blandly announces that our yard is everywhere in the world—that it embraces the entire universe; and as one of the Republicans said after listening to the President's speech, "the President has now taken in the whole world—has left only heaven and hell," and one of his playmates is Joe Stalin.

Who wants to play in the President's yard when he is setting the stage for a pitched battle in that yard? Who wants to play in his yard when he is giving away all our playthings, that is, our munitions of war, including our ships and our bombers, our fighting aircraft, which, if one-tenth of what he says is true, we may so urgently need for the preservation of our own national life.

Who wants to play in his yard when he has invited into it not only Stalin, and "red" Russia, but the warring nations of Europe, and we know that soon his yard will be the playground of warring nations of Europe?

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. Mr. WOLCOTT. Since the incident to which the gentleman refers occurred, I have talked with a great many Members of Congress to determine their reaction. It seems to me, summing it all up, that the reason a majority of the Republicans did not applaud the President's speech, and likewise a goodly number of Democrats, is that Members of Congress are taking this situation much more seriously than the President himself is.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No question about it. It was a serious occasion; one that did not call for applause.

Mrs. Roosevelt can lightly talk about "playing" in somebody's yard, but to me the President was making a provocative speech, one that invited war, which

would be followed by suffering and death for many of our people, and strange indeed must be the mental process that can find reason for applause in such a prospect.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr.

Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.
Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. should like to quote what President Wilson said when he returned to the White House after delivering his war speech at the time of the World War. He said to his secretary, Joseph Tumulty:

How strange that they should have applauded my message today. It was a message of death to young men.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to go on with the First Lady's statement about playing in his yard.

THE PRESIDENT'S PLAYTHINGS

His "playthings" are cannon, bombs, tanks, bombers, warships, instruments of death and destruction, and, necessary as they may be in a war-torn world, instead of keeping them in our yard for our protection, he is sending them across the seas and soon will be expecting us, if we would "play" with them, to follow with our Navy and our Army.

His "play yard" is a battlefield, where men's bodies are torn and shattered by the playthings; a burial ground not only for human beings, but it may be, if fought at the wrong time and place, the burial ground of democracy and civilization. "Play" in that sort of a spot if we must, but we enter it with sorrow and with prayer, with grim determination, but many of us never with wild applause. If we enter, we will go in with the spirit of a crusader, never with the joyous acclaim of an ambitious war-crazed leader.

"I DON'T LOVE YOU ANY MORE"

Of the attitude of the Republicans, says the First Lady, "I don't love you any more." Twenty-two million and more of us never did love him. Why now should we love him, when we see him getting ready to violate another of his campaign promises-that he would keep us out of war; that he would not send an army to Europe? Is there any reason why we should love him any more when many of us believe that he is more British than he is American; that he has at heart more the interests of the British Empire than he has the welfare of these United States; that he is willing to gamble with the fortunes and the lives of millions of young Americans; yes, with the very future of the Nation itself?

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

You will recall that near the last of his message the President said:

The basic things expected by our people of their political and economic systems are simple. They are equality of opportunity for youth and for others.

An American citizen, a resident of Washington, wrote this letter received by me this morning:

I am an American citizen, white, 39 years of age, married, full support of seven children. I have tried to get on a national-defense job. Even though I am willing to pay into some union I have been unsuccessful. I have 23 years' experience as plumber and steam fitter and conducted a shop in the District of Columbia since 1926.

Although a man with my experience cannot get on, men with little or no experience are being hired. The other day while waiting for the foreman I watched five men in a ditch from 11 a. m. to 3 p. m., and in that time one man carried two buckets of mud, one man carried two buckets of tar, one man packed two joints, one man put the runner on two joints, and the fifth man kept a lookout for the boss. Those two joints cost someone from \$50 to \$60.

After waiting from 11 a. m. to 3 p. m. to see the foreman, and while talking to him, some man came up with a young boy about 18 years of age and the foreman told me that he would have to put him on as the man with him, a plumbing official of some kind, was the boy's uncle, and that he would have to put him on, and for me to come back about next Monday and he would see what he could Now, this has happened to me at Camp Meade and Fort Belvoir, and if this is equality of opportunity-

Let me repeat that-

And if this is equality of opportunity-

which the President, by the way, said we must guarantee to all the world-

I am sure missing the opportunity.

If you happen to know of some project where a man who is willing to give a day's work for his hire, I would be thankful for the opportunity.

Can any reasonable man, whether a member of this body or not, applaud the President's statement that we are going to bring equality of opportunity to all the world, when we know that at the time he uttered those words, he knew as has been pointed out, that equality of opportunity was being denied to citizens here in Washington and in places on defense projects all over this country of ours?

Can you applaud a man who makes a statement about what he wants to do in India and in Russia and in some other country across the sea, when we know he is denying that equality of opportunity to our own citizens right here?

Let him first give American citizens that which he wants to give to citizens of Russia and of India-freedom from want

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. Mr. PATRICK. You are not giving equality of opportunity.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You never have anything constructive to offer. You still think you are "barking" at some carnival.

Mr. PATRICK. Yes; I know my place, you see.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then why do not you sit down? [Laughter.]

Mr. REED of New York. Last night at 8:30 a fine, clean-cut young man from my district, 23 years old, came to the hotel. He was stranded. He had managed to raise enough to pay his way into the union, \$50, and he came down and received 4 days' employment at this fort out here in Virginia. He is a trained carpenter. He is left here stranded after paying the \$50. He wants to help national defense and he also wants to earn his right to a bed to sleep in and his bread and butter. I just bring that to your attention and there are literally thousands of such cases.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have dozens, yes, several hundreds of such letters in my files now, and until the President shows some indication of making his acts match his words and his promises there is no reason why any citizen should grow enthusiastic over his words.

Mr. PATRICK. I want to make a constructive remark, if the gentleman from Michigan will yield-very constructiveexceedingly constructive.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May I have order, Mr. Speaker? This gentleman from Birmingham has not the floor.

Mr. PATRICK. I believe the gentleman from Michigan unconsciously vielded.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has the floor.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman knows that I have also spread upon the RECORD some such letters, and I wonder how he feels since in this House only perhaps

two other Members, let alone any of those in executive authority in this Government watching this racketeering of the unions, preventing a man getting work on defense projects without paying a high price to join, and none in authority do anything about it. Has there been anyone to join the gentleman even here? Are we all cowards? I ask the gentleman how he feels there standing alone?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I feel very grateful to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Gifford]. I know that this un-American and unpatriotic procedure has deeply grieved him and that were it in his power the situation would be quickly and effectively remedied.

I have faith enough in our people; in their sense of fair play to believe that some day, to our people, equality of opportunity will be given.

WILL THE PRESIDENT KEEP HIS PROMISE?

Prior to election the President promised that, by all that was great and good, he would not lead us into war; that he would not send an army to Europe; and, though many of us did not believe him. that is no excuse for a violation of that promise. As we see him day by day adding provocation to provocation until any self-respecting nation must take some offensive action against us, our failure to applaud his utterances, his policy, and his methods, instead of shocking and terrifying any true American, should bring hope that Congress at least will remember that America comes first and that American interests should guide our every action.

FOOLISH NOTIONS IN HIGH PLACES

No doubt the First Lady was disappointed. She and the President have entertained so many royalists from abroad that apparently they have come to believe that from all America should come unquestioning adulation. From this close association the Roosevelts apparently have in some way gotten the idea that they are entitled to receive homage and applause as our King and Queen. Perhaps the First Lady made her statement in pique over her disappointment when her guests in the House Gallery, Crown Princess Martha and Crown Prince Olaf of Norway, did not see each and every one hail the President as a dictator or perhaps as a king.

If the President's message and the attitude of the House did no more than to bring home to her the realization that this is still a government where the people, through their representatives, have some part in it, the day will be well spent.

REPUBLICANS ATTENTIVE AND RESPECTFUL

Republicans sat or stood in respectful silence while the President delivered his message. The President would deny the opposition the right to criticize his words or actions; the First Lady goes one step farther—she not only would deny us the right to criticize but she would compel us to bend the knee, to bow the head, and, in addition, to applaud our own servility. Perhaps The Roosevelt, or some Roosevelt, will some day be King or Queen, will some day rule this land as dictator, but not yet, though he has gone far on that road since first inaugurated as President.

As he boasted in his first administration, some of our people might meet their match; in his second he expressed the hope that they would meet their master; perhaps in the third his wish will be fulfilled, but some of us at least will fight until the bitter end, not against the man, not against the personality, but against the system of government which he advocates, against the betrayal of America to a foreign power.

Many of us can see no reason for wild applause of a policy which would lead us to national suicide, which would use us as pawns in the game played by the money changers and the war lords of Europe.

WE ARE AMERICANS FIRST, LAST, AND ALWAYS

Some of us, at least, will not subscribe to his doctrine that America is so helpless; our country so poor in resources; our people so lacking in spirit that we cannot adequately prepare to defend ourselves here in America, but must hide behind the British Fleet for protection against an enemy 3,000 miles away. There are those among us who believe in America: who believe in our form of government; who believe in the courage, and the patriotism, and the loyalty of our people and who are willing to sacrifice, not a part, but everything we have, not in behalf of those nations of the Old World whose principal business is warfare, but to maintain here in America our government for America. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. Mr. RICH rose.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore made, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cochran] is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, after the other special orders for today I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri for 10 minutes.

CONDUCT OF OFFICIALS OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to talk, but I feel that I owe the House an explanation. I have never made a promise to the House that I have not kept. Many months ago the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Church, secured some information in some way relative to an investigation that was being made by the General Accounting Office concerning officials of the Home Owner' Loan Corporation or the Federal Home Loan Bank Board-I do not recall the official names-of charges that they had abused the travel privilege. He made specific charges. I was in the Chamber at the time, and although I have not looked up the record, as I recall it, he referred to me because at that time I was the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and he asked me to make an investigation. As I recall it, I promised him that I would immediately call for a report, and that when that report was received I would bring it before the House. I rise to keep that promise.

Much of the criticism centers around alleged week-end travel, most of it several years ago, by members of the Bank Board and high officials of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, agencies of the Board. Anyone who understands the emergency nature of the operations of these agencies, particularly in those early years, would hardly question the necessity for weekend work and travel.

These officials, with their heavy obligations and long hours of overtime, have been commended time and again on this floor for their tireless efforts in behalf of distressed home owners.

A disgruntled employee of the organization presented certain accusations to the Attorney General, who, in turn, referred them to the General Accounting Office for investigation. Employees of the General Accounting Office visited the offices of the Corporation and were given access to all of the records. They then prepared their report. I had taken the matter up with Mr. Fahey, the head of the Corporation, and he promised me that an investigation would be made, and a complete report submitted and that I would receive a copy of it. The present Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Jesse Jones, is now also the head of these agencies that are involved, and Mr. Jones sent me a copy of that report several weeks ago. That report was delivered to my old office. an office that I had vacated, and I did not even know that the report was there until a few days ago. It consisted of a copy of a letter of some 21 pages that had been written by Mr. Fahey in response to the request of Mr. Jones for a complete report on the charges made by Mr. Church. As I said, that report came into my possession just a few days

Yesterday the press carried a story that our former distinguished colleague, Hon. Lindsay Warren, who is now Comptroller General, had in his annual report referred to this matter in very critical terms. As you all know, Mr. Warren never left this body until November 1. At that time he assumed the duties of Comptroller General. One of the first things he did when he took office was to ask about the annual report of the Comptroller General. He was informed that it had been prepared. He therefore wrote a brief foreword, which you will find in the report, saying that the activities of the office during the fiscal year covered had been under the control of the former Comptroller General, Mr. Brown, and the Acting Comptroller General, Mr. Elliott, who had served during the period that Mr. Brown was ill. In other words Mr. Warren had nothing to do with the preparation of the report.

The report sent to me by Mr. Jones not only contains the letter written by Mr. Fahey, but also 15 exhibits in all, one by each of the officials who were accused by

Mr. Church and the General Accounting Office of abusing the travel privilege. Anyone can read the letter, but unless they refer to the exhibits they will not get the reply of the public officials criticised. They responded without exception to each charge. In the exhibits will be found letters and telegrams that were sent prior to the time the officials made the visits, which show conclusively that only official business was to be transacted on the trips that they are accused of having made for pleasure purposes, or for visiting their families, and so forth. I believe in all fairness to public officials that they should not be accused of an illegal act until they have had their side of the story stated. A copy of the letter written by Mr. Fahey to Mr. Jones, together with a copy of each of the exhibits was sent to the General Accounting Office before Mr. Warren assumed office. The chief investigator and the investigator who looked into the charges admitted that while they read the letter written by Mr. Fahey, they had not opened one of the exhibits up to yesterday.

It really appears to me my newspaper friends took advantage of the fact that Mr. Warren is now Comptroller General and thus attributed to Mr. Warren a criticism of a Government agency. Of course any time Mr. Warren assails Gov-ernment officials it will be a real news item but in this instance Mr. Warren had absolutely nothing to do with the report as his foreword explains. As I said the report was prepared during the period Mr. Elliott, Assistant Comptroller General, was in charge of the office. Mr. Elliott, as the older members know, served in this House for a number of years and was chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds when the Republican Party was in control. In all fairness I think the investigators of the General Accounting Office should have read the report of each official accused as well as the letter written by Mr. Fahey to Mr. Jones.

I think the Members of this House know me well enough to believe me when I say I would not condone any fraud against the Government, no matter who was connected with it. I believe in punishing those who violate a public trust. As far as I am concerned, I will always have that opinion. I am not here to condone any offense whatsoever, if there is any fraud involved; but I insist that the investigators who made the investigation of the accounts of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the affiliated corporations should have taken the time to look over those exhibits and changed their reports, or at least mentioned that each and every official had filed an answer in detail.

For instance, I only mention one case. There is an official whose home is in Seattle, Wash. There was some correspondence with him with reference to whether or not he would accept a position with one of the corporations. The record shows that he flew here at his own expense for a conference and then paid his way back to Seattle. Later on he received an appointment. There were a number of matters on the Pacific coast,

including some in Seattle, that required investigation. He was requested by Mr. Fahey to remain and look into them before he came to Washington. He took his oath of office in the State of Washington-not the city of Washington. He entered upon duty there. The telegrams and letters exchanged with Mr. Fahey, and showing his activities in detail, are all set forth in the exhibits attached to Mr. Fahey's letter. After he had completed that task, he came to Washington and presented his report. He felt and I feel, as his explanation shows, that he was entitled to travel allowance from Seattle, Wash., to the city of Washington after he had been placed upon the pay roll and had performed official business for the Corporation. Had he been required to travel to Washington before taking the oath and entering on duty and had then returned to Seattle to perform the assigned tasks, it would have cost the Government the additional fare across the continent and several days' additional time and per diem.

I think if anyone will go over the reports which I have in my office, he or she will have a different view of this situation. It is true that some of the men were assigned to duty in the locality of The explanation by Mr. their homes. Fahey is that they were better informed with reference to the conditions in that locality than men who might have lived in other parts of the country.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COCHRAN I yield. Mr. PATMAN Is it not a fact that most of the mutual savings banks are up in that section of the country? In fact, practically all of them are in New England and New York.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will be frank with the gentleman and say I do not know where they are. around the country.

yield to me?

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

Mr. GIFFORD. As a member of that committee, I recall the matter very well. Does not the gentleman think that Mr. Jones, who now has authority, will attend to this matter? Can we not depend upon Jesse Jones, who is now Administrator, to look into this and to take care of the matter?

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I entertain the same opinion of Jesse Jones that his former colleague, Mr. Luce, expressed upon this floor. In the 15 years I have been a Member of Congress I never heard a Democrat or a Republican talk about a Democrat or a Republican in such high terms as Mr. Luce spoke of Mr. Jones, although they are of opposite political faiths

Mr. GIFFORD. And I also.

Mr. COCHRAN. I feel if there is any individual who has abused the travel allowance, who has committed fraud, Jesse Jones will not only make him pay that money to the Government but, furthermore, he will not be with the Corporation any longer. [Applause.] [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman should put in those affidavits and statements and information, in view of the fact that the charges were made and printed in the RECORD.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman that I will not put them in the RECORD because they would take up from 150 to 500 pages of the RECORD. are so complete. There are 15 volumes. I would not be guilty of putting such a tremendous amount of matter in the RECORD. But if the gentleman and the House wants me to do so I will put in the

Mr. PATMAN. I think the gentleman should insert a summary at least.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will put in the letter of Mr. Fahey to Mr. Jones, if the House so desires, but, as I said, one must read the reports before they can get the real picture.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. We ought to at least have that.

Mr. COCHRAN. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, and to include that letter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the letter written by Mr. Fahey to Secretary Jones follows:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD, Washington, September 16, 1940. Hon. JESSE H. JONES,

Administrator Federal Loan Agency, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JONES: Under date of February 8, 1940, the General Accounting Office wrote you with regard to certain travel of members of our Board and executives of the Board, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. Your letter of February 27, 1940, enclosed a copy of this letter from the General Accounting Office and requested that we report to you on the matters therein contained. We do so herewith.

This letter of the General Accounting Office included, first, quotations from a letter which had been received from the Department of Justice containing extracts from a communication which the Attorney General had received from one of our former employees alleging improper travel by 5 named executives the Board and its agencies; and, second, criticisms of certain travel of our 5 Board members and of 10 officials and employees of the Board and its agencies, including the 5 executives first mentioned above.

The criticisms are accompanied by 15 schedules lettered A to O. Each schedule relates to one of the Board members or employees and contains lists of travel vouchers with comments by the examiner who was sent over by the General Accounting Office to examine these vouchers after receipt by that office of the letter of the Department of

Our answers to the criticisms are contained in exhibits A to O, transmitted herewith. In these exhibits, which correspond to the schedules attached to the letter of the General Accounting Office, the comments of the examiner are reviewed, and full explanation is given as to the necessity for the trips re-ferred to. These statements show that there is no foundation for a belief that any of these persons made trips at public expense for personal convenience or pleasure or for any purpose except necessary official business.

In so showing, these statements reveal clearly that the accusations made in the communication to the Attorney General by our former employee, whose resignation we were obliged to demand, were utterly without foundation, and that he must have known this when he wrote the communication.

The fictitious character of these allegations and the animus behind them, as well as their lack of validity, cannot be understood fully, however, without an explanation of their background and the irresponsibility of their source.

The individual who wrote the letter to the Attorney General was first employed in the legal department of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and later performed legal services for both the Insurance Corporation and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. For some time, because of his lack of self-control, he was the subject of persistent complaints concerning his relations with those with whom he worked. He exhibited traits of personality in the form of arrogance, petulance, and a disposition to assume unwarranted authority and deal harshly and arbitrarily with others, all of which caused an unduly high turn-over among his subordinates and made it difficult for others to work with him. Criticisms of his attitude by persons in the field with whom he worked even reached the point of requests that he be separated.

In May 1938 the position of general counsel became vacant, but a new general counsel was not immediately appointed. In this situation the attorney in question conceived the idea, and so stated on occasion, that he would be appointed general counsel for the Board and the Insurance Corporation, although the fact was that because of his lack of self-control and stability he was not even considered for the place.

A general counsel was appointed in March 1939. The attorney was not given the position for which he had hoped. When this occurred, he became imbued with the notion that his failure to receive the appointment was due to opposition on the part of the five executives whom he later named in his communication to the Attorney General, one of them being the general manager of the insurance corporation.

Meanwhile, in 1938, the accounts of the treasurer of the insurance corporation had been audited by the General Accounting Office at the treasurer's own request. This employee had long harbored a grudge because he was not granted an unjustifiable increase in salary or given a more important position for which he was not qualified. He first sought to obtain his demands through outside pressure. When this did not succeed, he developed a violent prejudice against his superior, the general manager of the insurance corporation, whom for some unknown reason he blamed for the failure of his plans, though the fact was that at one time the latter favored assigning him to more important work with increased compensation. Thereupon he persistently sought to discredit his superior, building up an elaborate file of criticisms.

For these reasons we are now convinced that his motive in seeking this audit of his accounts, without consulting or even informing the Board, was to discredit his superior. In this connection, it is pertinent to note that all questions raised by the General Accounting Office as to the vouchers of the general manager as a result of this audit were investigated and found to be without merit, and we so informed the General Accounting Office in a letter dated December 14. 1938. However, a Member of Congress was in some way informed as to the existence of this correspondence between our office and the General Accounting Office inserted copies of it in the Congressional Record (see Con-GRESSIONAL RECORD, June 19, 1939, pp. 10510-10516) and, by the simple process of terming our explanations "nonsense," used the correspondence as a springboard for an attack on the Board and its agencies. We may note here that the attack was fully answered by us in a report of July 20, 1939, to the chairman of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (see Congres-SIONAL RECORD (Appendix), August 15, 1939, pp. 15872-15873).

This attack was made on June 19, 1939. Four days later, on June 23, 1939, the attorney above referred to sent to the Department of Justice the communication accusing the five named executives of making trips for personal pleasure and other private purposes at public expense.

Following this an examiner was sent over by the General Accounting Office. This examiner was a former employee of ours, who, after seeking a promotion for which he was not fitted, and while we were contemplating his separation, presented his resignation. Although we were not informed as to the accusations which had been made by the attorney aforesaid, nor that the examiner's presence was due to these accusations, we placed every convenience and facility at his disposal and granted every request for information which he made.

During his presence in our office the examiner was in frequent contact with the treasurer of the insurance corporation. Part of the time he made use of space, and located his headquarters, in the office of that employee. The extent to which the other employee, the attorney, contributed to the criticisms is apparent from an examination of the schedules.

Throughout this period the examiner's conduct was far from being that of an unbiased and impartial investigator. On one occasion, when he made inquiry concerning a particular travel voucher, it was suggested to him by one of our auditors that further examination would show promptly that there was no basis for criticism. His response was that he was not interested in such matters and that the particular voucher submitted to him was of no value to him. Profane and insulting references by him to Board members and executives whom he had never met, and even to the President of the United States, were the occasion of frequent comment at the time by employees of the Board. These facts were reported to the General Accounting Office, but we have not thus far been informed as to any action taken by that Office.

Shortly after the new general counsel was appointed there was a reorganization and reduction of force in the legal department, and it became clear that the services of the attorney in question could not profitably be retained in his existing position. However, despite the criticisms of an employee's work and his conduct in office it is the policy of the Board, whenever practicable, to give such employee an opportunity to make good elsewhere in our organization. In line with this policy this employee was not separated but was transferred to the legal staff of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation on July 28, 1939, in the hope that he might work out to better advantage in the new relationship. At the same time he was warned that conditions might necessitate his separation and that it might be well for him to seek another position outside our organization.

As an example of his general emotional attitude after this transfer it should be explained that he indulged in outbursts of temper, made most extravagant statements concerning his superiors, declined to follow the instructions of the general counsel or to accept any instructions except in writing, and gave notice that he had retained an outside attorney who would take legal action against the Board if he was separated. At this time his instability developed to the point where he suspected that a long list of officers and employees of the Board and its agencies were engaged in a conspiracy against him.

Later it became apparent that his services could no longer be advantageously utilized in any available position, and on October 16, 1939, we approved his separation, to be effective as of the end of his annual leave. Even then he did not tell us of his letter of June 23 to the Attorney General, though at the time he orally made accusations of a most malicious nature, later proved to be groundless, against one of our executives.

A short time later separation of the treasurer of the insurance corporation was under consideration. His services had not proved satisfactory, and he had been a constant source of irritation. When he was informed that his separation was imminent, he asserted to us that certain travel of the general manager of the insurance corporation was improper, and, when asked as to the source of his information, said that it was contained in a letter from the Department of Justice which, he stated, had been shown him in August by a representative of the General Accounting Office. This was the first intimation we had had as to the existence of that letter, or of the statements made by our attorney and quoted therein.

It will be noted that each of these employees, by the statements made by him against fellow employees, convicted himself of having knowingly concealed information which it was his duty to bring immediately to the Board's attention in order that it might be thoroughly investigated and the accused employee promptly cleared if the accusations were found to be untrue, or appropriate action taken if they were found to be true. Each of them, by his own account had culpably delayed revealing this information until he knew that his separation was imminent. Little credence should be placed in accusations made by a person who has indulged in this type of conduct.

An explanation of this background has been necessary in order that you may fully understand the motives and circumstances under which the present allegations arose. We come now to a discussion of the allegations themselves.

As we have already stated, the criticisms which have been made are discussed fully in exhibits A to O attached hereto. These statements show conclusively that there is no basis for any belief that any of these trips were taken, or expense incurred, for private purposes or otherwise than solely for necessary official business.

A number of the comments of the examiner, particularly with reference to the travel of the general manager of the insurance corporation and two other executives, are merely quotations from statements by the attorney above referred to, in some cases in the same words as quoted in the letter of the Department of Justice, in other cases with additional embroidery by the attorney. Every one of the allegations of this attorney, both those quoted in the letter of the Department of Justice to the General Accounting Office and those quoted by the examiner, is squarely answered and shown to be false in the individual statements annexed hereto. His motives and his malice have already been set forth.

Let us now deal with the examiner's comments. In this letter, of course, it will be possible only to review the more frequently occurring criticisms. For more detailed answers to the criticisms, we refer you to the attached exhibits.

The most frequent criticism is simply the words "week end." If by this the examiner meant simply that the period of the trip included a Saturday or Sunday, or both, there would be no need for further answer. It is perfectly apparent to anyone that where business is transacted and completed on Saturday at a place other than an employee's official headquarters, he must necessarily travel on Saturday or Sunday, or both, to be back at his official station Monday morning, and

that such travel is not properly subject to criticism

Also, it is clear that where he is to transact business on Monday morning at a place other than his official headquarters, he must necessarily travel on Saturday afternoon or Sunday, or both, if he is to fill his appointment.

Standing alone, therefore, the comment 'week end" means nothing. However, it is "week end" means nothing. However, it is clear, from the instances in which the com-"week end" is amplified by the examiner, that the use of this term is meant to imply that Board members and employees made trips for personal convenience or pleasure and not on official business.

Not only is this untrue, as the attached exhibits show, but the distorted publicity which has been given to these unwarranted and groundless statements has caused outrageously unjust reflections on honest and honorable men, who have given their best, without reserve, to the public service. The fact is that our Board members, executives, and employees have had to give up innumerable nights, Sundays, and holidays to their work, at great inconvenience to themselves and neglect of their families. In frequent instances they have been able to make absolutely necessary field trips only when they could be spared from Washington at the end of a week or the first of a week.

As illustrative of the pressure of work which has faced our organization, we point to the fact that the overtime in the several offices of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation worked by employees of the Corporation, not including the overtime of Board members, superand executives, represented 1,200,000 hours during the last 3 years, 1937-39, alone. If total overtime had been paid for even at the rate of average salary cost, the expense would have been approximately \$1,000,000 for the 3-year period.

Complete overtime figures for the years previous to 1937 are not available, but they may fairly be estimated at 2,500,000 hours, representing a value to the Corporation of over \$2,000,000. Board members and executives have, of course, performed far more overtime than the average employee.

The Board takes no satisfaction in this overtime work. It has done everything possible to prevent it, but unexpected conditions are constantly arising which make it necessary to enlist the cooperation of all classes of employees, which has been given in the freest spirit of service. The figures given are here presented simply as illustrating the great volume of work which has been performed and the devotion to duty which prevails throughout the Board and its agencies, from the Board members to the employees in the lowest salary ranges.

This spirit is evidenced by the fact that our Board members and executives have not hesitated to make use of week ends for necessary official travel, where by so doing they have been able to reduce the time spent away from

posts of duty in Washington.

The Board members have from the first been obliged to devote a large part of their time to the meetings of the three Boards on which they serve, namely, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Board of Directors of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the Board of Trustees of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. It should be remembered that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board was not created until 1932, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation until 1933, and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation until 1934. In the early days, when the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was setting up the organization through which it made loans of more than \$3,000,-000,000 to more than a million home owners who were threatened with the loss of their homes through foreclosure, Board meetings were frequently necessary at night as well as during the day. As the work has developed over 7 years, meetings have usually had to be

held both forenoon and afternoon practically every day of the week with the exception of Saturdays, and it has not infrequently been necessary to hold meetings on Saturdays.

Some realization of the problems which have confronted us may be afforded by a brief survey of some of the work which the Board has performed since its creation in 1932.

As you know, the Board is the supervisory body of the Federal Home Loan Bank System. consisting of the 12 Federal home-loan banks and their approximately 3,900 member institutions, with assets of nearly \$5,000,000,000. The banks act as a credit-reserve system for their members, which are composed of building and loan associations, savings and loan associations and similar institutions, savings banks, and insurance companies, engaged in long-term home financing. Also, the Board charters and regulates Federal savings and loan associations, which bear the same relation to State-chartered savings and loan associations and building and loan associations that national banks bear to State banks. There are now some 1.400 of these institutions, with total assets of approximately \$1,700,000,000.

Besides this, the members of the Board compose the board of trustees of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, which insures, up to \$5,000 for any one investor in any single institution, the safety of investments in the shares and accounts of Federal savings and loan associations, and of such State-chartered building and loan associations, savings and loan associations, and similar institutions as apply and are found to be eligible. Insured institutions now number approximately 2,200 and have total assets of approximately \$2,700,000,000.

In these three capacities the Board from 1932 down to December 31, 1939, passed upon 4,755 applications for membership in the Federal Home Loan Bank System, 2,027 applications for charters for Federal savings and loan associations, and 2,882 applications for insurance by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. In addition, the Board was vested with the function of passing on all applications by institutions desiring to have investments made in them under the program for rehabilitation of the home-mortgage structure by which \$50,000 .-000 was appropriated in 1933 for investment by the Secretary of the Treasury in Federal savings and loan associations and by which \$300,000,000 was later authorized for investment by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in Federal savings and loan associations, other Federal home-loan bank members, and institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. The Board has examined in detail more than 7,400 of these applications, of which it has granted more than 6,700, in the amount of approximately \$270,000,000.

In addition to handling these 17,000 applications of various types, the Board has been obliged to pass upon innumerable problems of regulation and supervision and vast numbers of policy matters.

As graphically as these figures indicate the pressure which has forced long daily Board meetings and frequent night, Sunday, and holiday work on the part of Board members, executives, and others, the circumstances which made this work necessary cannot fully be understood without a reference to the operations of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

In coping with the unprecedented homemortgage crisis which the country faced in 1933, 1,886,491 applications for mortgage relief, amounting to \$6,173,355,652, were dealt with by the Corporation under the supervision of the Board and through the various offices. Loans totaling 1,026,411 and amounting to \$3,093,451,321 were made under the management of the Board and in accordance with procedures developed by it. To carry on this task the Board was called upon to supervise and direct the efforts of as high as 20,000 employees in as many as 458 offices and in the field. As the burden of applications grew, it became necessary to organize 11 regional offices, each supervising the work of a group of States, and procedures for efficient operation in these offices had to be developed and revised from time to time as conditions changed.

There were no existing facilities in 1933 for the administration of the program. Relief had to be given without delay if the flood of home-mortgage foreclosures sweeping over the country was to be stemmed. A stupendous organization had to be built up almost overnight, and adjustments and rearrangements were constantly necessary to deal with the steadily increasing work load. Office quarters had to be obtained, personnel had to be selected in the State and district offices, and organizations and procedures had to be inaugurated and perfected in every State and district. Later, in 1934, the regional offices had to be set up, and in 1936, with the expiration of the Corporation's lending authority, the whole set-up had to be changed from that of a lending agency to that of a collection and liquidating agency, with the perfecting of the Corporation's loanservicing machinery and the expansion and development of its property sales and man-agement organization.

During all this time Board members and executives were obliged to be in Washington as much as they could during the week to give personal attention to major problems of policy and procedure. Down to the end of the Board, in its three capacities, had held upward of 4,000 meetings, it being often necessary to hold three meetings, one in each capacity, on the same day. The time spent in actual attendance at these meetings tells but a part of the story, as extensive preparation and preliminary study has been required for an informed consideration of the multi-

tude of matters dealt with.

These are the reasons why in many cases our Board members and executives could make absolutely necessary field trips only when they could be spared from pressing duties in Washington and largely at the end of a week or the first of a week. Throughout this entire period these men have given freely of their time without complaint, not only on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, when their time should have been their own, but month after month far into the night on countless occasions.

Another criticism frequently made in the examiner's comments is that travel has been made by certain of our Board members and officials into areas in which their homes or former homes have been located. Sometimes this comment stands alone; at other times it is coupled with the further comment that the travel was over the week end.

With respect to this criticism, it is to be recalled that our Board members come from different sections of the country. It is plainly desirable that the major geographical areas be represented on a national board of this kind, which must deal with problems arising in every section of the country. Such a board should be composed of men who, in combination, can bring to their work a firsthand familiarity with each of the major areas in which operations are conducted.

Necessarily, in order to obtain any practical advantage from this familiarity with local conditions, each member must pay some particular attention to problems arising in the area which he knows best. This was clearly recognized in the early days of the Board and its agencies.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation was organized by the Board on June 14, 1933. At this meeting, at which Mr. W. F. Stevenson, the then Chairman, presided, it was agreed that because of the extreme conditions of distress no effort should be spared to expedite the opening and organization of offices. It was decided informally that the individual members of the Board would assume the responsibility for supervising the development of organizations in those sections of the country from which they came or with which they were most familiar.

Under this arrangement Mr. Stevenson accepted the task of personal supervision of a group of Southern States; Mr. T. D. Webb, vice chairman, another group of largely Central States; Mr. Walter H. Newton, a western and northwestern group; Mr. Russell Hawkins, a group of Pacific coast and Western States; and the present Chairman, the Northeastern States.

On September 26, 1933, as appears from the minutes of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and of the board of directors of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the arrangement was perfected and extended to the Federal Home Loan Bank System. On that date the then Chairman, Mr. Stevenson, designated all Board members to act as a committee for attention to all matters relating to the functioning of the Federal Home Loan Bank System and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, respectively, and designated the individual members to act as committeemen for territories comprised by the different Federal home-loan bank districts, as follows:

The present chairman (from Massachusetts): Districts 1 and 2, roughly comprising New England (including, of course, Massachusetts), New York, and New Jersey. In this territory State offices of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation were located in Boston, New York City, and elsewhere, regional offices being later located in these two cities, and Federal Home Loan banks were located in Boston and in Newark, N. J. (later moved to New York City);

The vice chairman (from Tennessee): Districts 3, 5, and 6, comprising the districts in which were located the Federal home-loan banks of Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, and Indianapolis, as well as offices of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in all these places, and in Columbus, Ohlo; Louisville, Ky.; Detroit, Mich.; Nashville, Tenn., and elsewhere, and in which regional offices were later located in Cincinnati, Detroit, and Memphis;

Mr. Newton (from Minnesota): Districts 7, 8, and 10, roughly comprising the Western and Northwestern States and that part of the Middle West which is west of the Illinois-Indiana line;

Mr. Hawkins (from Oregon): Districts 11 and 12, roughly comprising the far West, including the Pacific coast, in which Federal Home Loan banks were located in Los Angeles (also a State office (later a division office) of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation), and Portland, Oreg. (also a State office of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation) and in which a district office (later a division office and a regional office) of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was located in San Francisco, a State office in Seattle, and State or district offices at various other places;

Mr. Stevenson, the then chairman (from South Carolina): Districts 4 and 9, comprising roughly the Southeastern States and the Southern States as far west as Texas, together with New Mexico.

Mr. Hawkins, of Oregon, was succeeded by Mr. Catlett, of Washington, who thus became vested with the same functions for the far West and the Pacific coast. Mr. Stevenson, of South Carolina, was succeeded by Mr. Frank W. Hancock, Jr., of North Carolina. Mr. Newton, of Minnesota, was succeeded in turn by two appointees from Ohio, of which Dr. William H. Husband is the present incumbent.

We do not mean to say that the Board members have confined their attentions exclusively to the particular areas above indicated. Each member of the Board is, of course, responsible for all its operations in every section, and each has been called upon

to familiarize himself with conditions in other areas and in the country as a whole, the territorial division above mentioned having been an assignment merely to special. and not to exclusive, attention to particular Again, with the first appointment of areas. an Ohio resident as successor to the Minnesota member the Cincinnati area became a particular concern not only of the vice chairman but also of the current Ohio incumbent. Special difficulties arising in certain areas, of which New Jersey is only one example, have also required attention by Board members outside the areas specially assigned to them. But to a considerable extent the original arrangement continues to be observed.

It is clearly an advantage, other things being equal, that Board members and home office executives sent out to deal with field matters be persons who are fully informed as to conditions in the area in question. This is especially true when programs are first being organized and set in motion and while they are in the stage of rapid expansion and development. Many types of problem cannot best be handled by executives viewing an area for the first time, but only by executives who can relate their observations to the background of a long acquaintance with conditions in the area. Also, it is in the areas from which they come that their contacts have been established and they are in a position to draw on valuable and sometimes indispensable outside assistance in advancing the work to which they are assigned.

From this brief statement, it will be apparent that what the examiner has done is to read a strained and erroneous interpretation into a situation which anyone at all familiar with the facts would have recognized as proper and logical. Our organization has naturally availed itself of the background that its Board members and officials possess as to the different sections of the country from which they come. Their travel into these areas is not, as the examiner implies, the result of accommodation to their personal interests. On the contrary, to the extent that they have traveled into these areas more frequently than others, they have done this because it was to the best interests of the organization that they should do so and because it was in those areas that they were equipped to render more effective service.

We pass over the instances in which the examiner has erroneously stated as the destination of a trip a place which was not visited at all; the instances in which a place merely passed through is listed as the destination; the instances in which it is stated that a week end was passed in a given place, when the time at which the traveler was there included neither a Saturday nor a Sunday, or when the only time spent there on either of those days was during regular business hours on Saturday; the instances in which the destination is listed merely as a designated place when that place was only one of several or many points at which the traveler performed official business: the instances in which the destination is described as a designated place "and various places when the designated place was only one of several or many points at which the traveler performed official business; and the many other comments which are either erroneous or designedly or inadvertently misleading. These instances are pointed out in the attached exhibits; we mention them here only to guard against the drawing of any infer ences from the listing of trips in the schedules or from the description of them in the examiner's comments.

Also, we wish to point out that in many instances the examiner has listed only a part of the trips taken by the particular official named in the schedule, and that this in itself gives a distorted picture of the travel of the particular official during that period with reference to the places covered, which would be corrected if the schedule named all trips

taken by him during that time. Again, therefore, we point out that a mere scanning of the schedules and comments may tend to give a totally erroneous impression which should be guarded against.

The criticisms mentioned above, and all other criticisms made, are answered in the exhibits attached hereto. However, one particularly revealing example of the many unjustified insinuations may be pointed out. With reference to travel of one of our executives to New York City, the implication is made that his statement that except for the winter period of 1935-36 his Forest Hills house has been either closed or rented, and that he and his family have maintained permanent residence in Washington, D. C., since 1936, must be false, because, during that period, travel vouchers submitted by him showed that his automobile bears New York license No. F-2. The fact is that the automobile, though registered in New York, was also registered in the District of Columbia, and the reason why the executive in question took steps to retain this particular New York number, though living in Washington, should be apparent to anyone.

Since the letter of the General Accounting Office, in criticising the travel of this executive to New York and Boston, quotes from a further attack (see Congressional Record, August 2, 1939, pages 14987-14990 made on us by the Member of Congress above referred to, in which it was alleged that there had been mismanagement and unduly high losses in Massachusetts and the original New York region (New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut), we feel it would be desirable to point out some of the peculiar problems and difficulties which have existed in these two areas. Not only has there been need for closer oversight of these areas, with greater necessity for attention from the Washington office, but the available comparisons show that while the losses of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation there have been higher than in other areas they have been so much lower, comparatively, than those of private lending institutions that the record is a cause for commendation rather than for criticism.

It is well known that these sections felt the impact of the depression with greater force than other areas; that they have had to meet the greatest unemployment and relief problems in the country, and that they suffered the greatest mortgage collapse in world history. In Massachusetts the migration of the shoe and textile industries has played an important part in this development, and similar migration of other industries has taken place in New York. Special difficulties existed in New Jersey also, as is later pointed out.

In both New York and Massachusetts the tax burden has been far out of line with that in the country as a whole. The records of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation show that in these two States the average requirements of our borrowers to meet their tax obligations are more than double the average for the country as a whole with these two States omitted.

These factors, and others, produced in these areas the worst home-mortgage collapse in the country. Some intimation of the chaos which existed is afforded by the crash of the New York title and mortgage guaranty companies. Nearly all these companies, which held about \$3,000,000,000 of mortgages, had to be taken over by the State of New York for liquidation or reorganization.

The allegation made in the attack referred to is that the higher losses per property in these areas on properties acquired by the Corporation and resold is the result of faulty and excessive lending when the Corporation's loans were granted. The records of the Corporation show that this is not true. Far from being more liberal, the Corporation's lending in these two areas was less liberal than elsewhere. In the country as a whole some 54

percent of the loans applied for were granted. In New York and Massachusetts the corresponding percentages were 50 percent and 49 percent, respectively. In the original New York region the figure was 48 percent. Nationally the Corporation granted loans on 9.5 percent of the total number of owner-occupied nonfarm homes. In New York and Massachusetts, the two States to which the attack was most pointedly directed, the figures were 7.9 percent and 5.9 percent, respectively. For the original New York region the percentage was 7.8 percent.

percentage was 7.8 percent.

The reasons for proportionately greater losses of the Corporation in Massachusetts and the original New York region than elsewhere must be found, therefore, in some other cause than excessive lending or other weaknesses of internal management. The true explanation lies in the unusual economic conditions which have prevailed in these two

At the same time the record of the Corporation in disposing of its acquired properties is so much more favorable than that of private lending institutions as to be a cause for congratulation.

A recent analysis of 321 properties of the Corporation sold in Brooklyn showed that the recovery averaged 70 percent of their assessed valuation. The corresponding ratio for 57 comparable properties sold by private holders was only 51 percent. This survey was made and the data compiled by the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce.

In the Borough of Manhattan the Real Estate Board of New York published an analysis of the 1938 real-estate market which showed that of the 122 sales listed therein the selling prices averaged 52 percent of the assessed valuation. In 80 recent sales throughout the metropolitan area, the Corporation recovered an average of 79 percent of assessed valuation.

Recently the Cooperative Central Bank of Massachusetts sold 120 properties in two communities in the central part of the State, with an aggregate recovery as against the costs at acquisition of 54 percent in 65 cases and but 45 percent in the remaining 55 cases. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation in the resale of its Massachusetts properties has recaptured an average of some 64 percent of costs at acquisition, these costs, including delinquent interest, repairs and rehabilitation, and foreclosure costs. While the mortgages on the properties sold by the Central Bank originally represented not to exceed 66% percent of the underlying property value, the loans of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in Massachusetts, as in other States, represented loans up to 80 percent of appraised value.

The facts stated refute the allegation that the losses sustained in the New York and Massachusetts areas have been due to mismanagement. At the same time they show that there has been need for constant attention, with proportionately greater travel of Board members and executives into these areas.

These conditions of home-mortgage collapse in these areas have not only affected the operations of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation but also those of the Federal Home Loan Bank System and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. For example, in New Jersey, which is in the original New York region of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and is a part of the district served by the Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, there were in 1932 1,553 building and loan and savings and loan associations with assets in excess of \$1,146,-000,000, the highest total assets and the second highest number of associations in the country. Virtually all these institutions be-came tightly frozen in 1932 and 1933, and the working out of a plan for the rehabilitation of these institutions through reorganizations and mergers, with insurance by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, has required many contacts and conferences by Board members and executives, and executives of the Insurance Corporation, with officials of the Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, and of the New Jersey Department of Banking and Insurance.

Although the supervisory task of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has been of unprecedented size in the field of mortgage finance, the travel expense of the Board has been surprisingly small.

During the 6½-year period ending December 1939, the total travel expense incurred on Home Owners' Loan Corporation matters by all five members was only \$19,019. The annual average for all members was but \$2,926, or less than \$50 a month per member. The travel expense of Board members represented by one-one hundredth of 1 percent of the Corporation's total administrative expense over this period.

It may be noted that the travel expenditures of the Board were heaviest in the years 1936 and 1937, when a little more than half the total expense of \$19,019 was incurred. During the first 6 months of 1936 the Corporation was bringing its lending program to an end and exerting extra effort to dispose of all eligible applications before the June 12 deadline established by the statute. More particularly, it was during these 2 years—1936 and 1937—that the Corporation was in the midst of changing itself from a lending to a collection and servicing agency and expanding and developing its property sales and management organization. Throughout this period, close supervision was necessary.

In addition, offices were being reorganized and consolidated. From 1936 on, the organization has undergone a drastic retrenchment both in expense and in personnel. In December 1939 the persons employed by the Corporation numbered 10,386. This was less than half of the peak figure of 20,811. Administrative expenses during the fiscal year 1939 amounted to \$25,163,000, or \$10,600,000 less than during the fiscal year 1936.

Not only have these curtailments necessitated careful administrative attention, but they have been realized much more quickly as a result of it. Since the fiscal year 1938, when its administrative expenses first became subject to the requirement of annual authorization by Congress, the Corporation each year has spent materially less than the amount authorized by Congress. During the fiscal year 1938 its administrative expenses were \$492,000 less than the amount authorized; in 1939 they were \$1,160,000 under the authorization. The saving for the fiscal year 1940 is estimated at \$1,050,000. The total savings for all 3 years are some \$2,703,000.

It should be realized that during the period when a total travel expense of but \$19,019 was incurred by the members of the Board in carrying out these plans of organization and supervision, many of the 458 offices originally set up had to be reorganized, and a considerable number moved, and that the total number had been consolidated into only 132 by January 1, 1940, and 98 by July 1, 1940.

With the completion of the major phases of the program, the total travel expenses of Board members on Corporation matters declined from \$5,097 in the peak year, 1937, to \$1,918 in 1938 and \$906 in 1939.

The travel of Board members in connection with the other activities under their direction is even less than that incurred with respect to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Cumulatively, up through the close of the calendar year 1939, the total travel of our Board members for all these other activities together was but \$9,792, an average of \$1,506 a year, or only \$25 a month per member.

Similar analyses would show likewise that there has been nothing excessive about the travel of our other executives. The conditions under which they have been required to exercise oversight and supervision of field operations have been identical with those which faced the Board itself.

From what has been said in this report we believe you will conclude that the travel which has been made the subject of criticism merely represents the natural, normal, and proper conduct of the operations which have been entrusted to our charge. As we have shown in the first part of this report, the present criticisms were initiated as a result of unjustified antagonisms, and not only was the examiner himself misled, but his own attitude was distinctly not that of an unbiased, objective investigator searching only for the facts.

We regret that it has not been possible to furnish this report to you at an earlier date. You will appreciate that in most cases no day-to-day record was made as to each trip separate from the records arising out of the regular conduct of business. This being true, much material had to be secured from reports, office memoranda, and other sources going back over a period of nearly 7 years.

Also, we regret the length of this letter and the volume of the exhibits, but in view of the nature of the report made by the examiner we feel it is our duty to make full explanation and furnish such detailed information as is in our possession. If there is any additional information which you would like to have concerning particular points, we will endeavor to supply it.

Very truly yours, JOHN H. FAHEY, Chairman,

THE C. I. O. AND THE DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to mention a very important matter. From newspaper accounts, we are now going to be asked to grant the President unlimited authority and unlimited money to carry on our defense program and to help Britain. I, for one—and I think the majority of the Members of this House—will be for a well-planned program of defense and aid for England, but, on the other hand, there are many of us in this House who resent and disagree with at least one thing that is being done, namely, the strikes that are being carried on by the destructive element of the C. I. O. union and their attempt to dominate the defense program.

Many Members of this House, including myself, and the great majority of our people, would like to go along with this program and have full confidence in it, but none of us can have that full confidence in this program as long as it is dominated by the destructive element, the C. I. O. racketeer leaders, who seek not defense but to enrich themselves, and to increase their power and control over government. The President said no one should grow rich out of the nationaldefense program. Why, then, should these destructive leaders become rich and increase their power? I do not believe this House is going to accept this program as long as the C. I. O. dominates it, and I do believe, on the other hand, that the very first thing that should be done, if the administration will not control this situation, is to enact legislation that will control these racketeering C. I. O. leaders, and make them take their places with other patriotic Americans.

All other elements in this country today are patriotically cooperating toward the building of a real national defense, including business, industry, and the American Federation of Labor; but, unfortunately, the C. I. O., backed up by Hillman and Madam Perkins, takes the stand that what they claim to be their interests are paramount to the safety and welfare of this Nation, and particularly paramount to the national-defense pro-

We have seen where the Government has adopted a strong attitude and strong language toward the public in general, and toward business and industry particularly, but we have also seen where no one in this administration, including Mr. Hillman, Madam Perkins, or anyone else, has told the C. I. O. that these destructive strikes must cease in plants that have millions of dollars of nationaldefense orders.

Has the time come when the C. I. O. is so strong that it can influence the administration of the Government of the United States and write the instructions for this whole Government? I do not believe that it has. They are not only causing these strikes at this time but are now demanding that they administer the draft legislation, which they opposed.

It appears to me and to many other thinking people that the main purpose of the C. I. O. is to sabotage the defense program and the defenses of this Government, change the form of government, and control the Government. They must be told that "they cannot pass," and that they will never be able to accomplish any such purpose. This is a challenge to every patriotic American, and particularly every Member of this House.

We should meet this issue here and now, face to face, and squarely. We should tell the administration that we are for the defense program but we do not propose to grant all of this authority and spend all of this money, on one hand, and to see the national-defense program stopped and sabotaged, on the other, nor will we write a blank check to the C. I. O. We should not sit idly by and see the cost of this program increased by the C. I. O. for the enrichment of themselves. We should, therefore, tell the administration that until such time as all people-and I would include specifically the C. I. O .are told what to do, we will oppose the program on the ground that it is useless to waste our money and not receive national defense until it is too late to do us any good.

I believe if this action is taken by the Members of this House, that the C. I. O. group will be told. Then if they will not agree to abide by the instructions they are given, then this House should pass, before it does anything else, legislation that will outlaw this destructive element of C. I. O., if necessary, and put them in a position where they can no longer sabotage our program. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein certain excerpts taken from Government bulletins dealing with the food value of the dried pea bean produced in Michigan; also to insert in the RECORD along with those remarks a brief editorial from the Detroit Free Press which deals with the subject, and a statement from the magazine Science, prepared by the Georgia Experiment Station.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPPARD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore made I may be permitted to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the address of the gentleman from South Dakota I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rich] for 5 minutes.

THE PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL MESSAGE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days we have heard much about the fact that the Republicans did not give applause to many portions of the address made by the President on last Monday. I know how much applause I could give to anything I did not believe in. I was not brought up that way.
Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will

the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. RICH. I cannot yield until I finish my statement.

I cannot applaud the things I do not believe in. I have received letters from people back in my district saying it was a shame that the Republicans did not ap-

plaud the President's address. I had always thought that the President's annual message to the Congress on the state of the Nation was one advising us of what we needed and the pitfalls of wrong advice. President Roosevelt used most of the opportunity to say what we should do to aid and assist Great Britain and foreign powers against other foreign powers-meddling in other people's affairs. For the last 8 years the President has been talking about the good-neighbor policy, to all nations of the world, and exemplifying it by his reciprocal trade agreements. Now he wants to send battleships, submarines, airplanes, TNT, dynamite, and other deadly weapons to Europe to kill people, to massacre them, to destroy them. When I think of that and of the suffering that is going on in Europe today, I fail to see how anyone could want to applaud things of that character. Then I came to the conclusion that there would be something wrong with me if I did.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Mr. RICH. No; I cannot yield.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we received the second message from the President, in which he asked that we appropriate \$17,-500,000,000 for, as he called it, national defense, and for the operation of the Federal Government. A terribly large sum. Where will you get the money? The Treasury statement of January 4 this year shows that on that date we were \$2,340,000,000 in the red. Every Treasury statement I have seen during this administration, from the time it came into power until the present, shows the Government's fiscal affairs to be in the red, and this notwithstanding the fact the President, in 1932, said he was going to reduce the cost of Government by 25 percent. That he would consolidate departments, he would balance the Budget. He has made so many promises that he has not fulfilled. Should we not expect him to do as he says? I am for him when he is right, and I am opposed to him when he is wrong. The President asks us, in the administration bill, which was presented here today to put full authority . for lending and spending money, battleships, submarines, airplanes, powder, TNT, and so forth in the hands of the President. If the people of my district want to applaud that and say that that is the thing for Members of Congress to do, God forbid.

You fellows all better get back home and get there just as quick as you possibly can. If you approve such a course. We want no dictator. Any man who would vote to do that at this serious time in the history of our national life is not fit to stay here in Congress, and I do not care who he is-any man who would grant the Chief Executive power to take from this country the things we have built up for our own national defense, of warships and auxiliary vessels, our airplanes, and military equipment of all kinds, and then say: "Mr. President, we will let you do anything you want to with them." remember an old saying to this effect: "We may not be fools, but we do the things that fools would do."

I hope we shall give every thought and attention to the things that are vitally essential to the welfare of America; that we shall be able to build up our forces 'o the extent that we can guard America and American liberty and independence; and that we shall act with the people of foreign countries in such way as to support the policy we adopted 2 years ago when every one of the leaders in this House, and the House itself, said they were for neutrality.

What do you mean by the word "neutrality"? What do you mean when you say you want to be neutral and aid and assist all cuntries of the world? Let us be merciful to people, let us try to preserve and aid and assist those who are in need: but let us do it with bread and the milk of human kindness, not battleships, dynamite, and bayonets. Keep America out of war. [Applause.]

[Here the the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the completion of the special orders for today I may have the privilege of addressing the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the special orders for today, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Bulwinkle]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Case] is recognized for 3 minutes.

A FREEDOM WE WILL DEFEND

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a good deal of discussion about the proposition of whether or not Republicans joined in applauding the President's address the other day. Personally, I applauded part of the time and part of the time I did not. It seems to me a rather silly discussion. Although some of us did applaud at times, have we gone so totalitarian in this country that we must applaud every sentence? Or should we applaud those portions of a speech with which we disagree, or which we think mean war? And since when has silence meant total dissent?

The President contended in his speech the other day that we would always fight for the maintenance of freedom of speech and expression. That implies the right to grant or to withhold approval of what other people say, also. May I point out that there has been one time during this session when all Republicans joined in the applause and that was when the Speaker in his opening remarks said that he intended to fight to preserve the prerogatives and power of the House of

Representatives?

It is becoming apparent to the people of the country, and certainly it is to those who are watching developments here, what kind of mandate the President and the administration thinks it received in the recent election. Four years ago, much to the surprise of most of the country, the administration thought it had a mandate that permitted it to revamp and pack the Supreme Court. Today it is apparent that the administration thinks it has a mandate to go to the aid of any country in the world that engages in war if the President of the United States says that in his estimation it is our war.

According to press reports on the bill introduced today, it is proposed that the Congress shall give to the President of the United States a blank check to go into any part of the world and say, "This is our war, because it is part of the defense of the United States," and then to lend on any terms that he may decide any part of our military equipment.

Mr. Speaker, one of the essentials of representative government, one of the essentials of free speech, for which the President spoke the other day, is that the representatives of the people shall have a voice in any declaration of war. Our Constitution declares it; common sense and justice demand it. Yet here it is proposed to rush a bill through the Congress, have it considered briefly by a committee, and probably railroaded through the House, to give the President of the United States a blank check to declare that any war is our war.

I protest such a proposition. I want to assert as one Member of the House that it is part of the power of the Representatives and a part of our responsibility to have a voice in any decision on taking this country into a war in any

part of the world.

I also want to protest the proposition that a bunch of bumbling, fumbling statesmen in any other country, on their own initiative, in secret councils, making deals for their own purposes, can declare war on some country, then get in a bad way, and come to us and say: "We need you. We are fighting your battle."

To accept either proposition is to surrender the right of the Congress to declare war—in the one case to the President, in the other to foreign ministers often not responsible to their own people, much less to the people of the United States.

Furthermore, when it becomes true that other countries are fighting our battles, we should not lend them materials; we should give the materials to them; and you may be sure that point will be made before pay day if we lend on the theory that they are fighting in our defense.

Free speech, Mr. Speaker, calls for determination in the Congress and on the floor of the House of Representatives whether it is our war. If it should be decided that it is, then we ought to have a voice in determining its prosecution and a voice in determining the conditions upon which the war will be continued or terminated. Mr. Speaker, this is the meaning of free speech and representative government. It is a freedom we propose to defend. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, after the other special orders for the day have been disposed of, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 minutes and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. Rogers]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman fron. California [Mr. Voor-HIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I suppose that one way for Congress to go about the task of trying to push through a program of national defense and to meet the present crisis in which our country finds itself, would be to have an all-around criticism of all groups of the population by various Mem-

bers of the House. But to my mind that is the destructive way to approach the problem. To my mind it would be far better for us to exert such effort as we can in pointing out the constructive efforts being put forth by different groups and elements in our population and showing where perhaps that effort might be improved and bettered.

We have heard in the House in the last few days a tremendous amount of criticism of the administration, of organized labor, of practically the whole of what one may call the rank and file of the people of the United States. However, I have not heard any corresponding criticism voiced against the more powerful

economic groups.

There is one thing I think it is important to say over and over again, and T propose to say it over and over again, and that is that the future of democracy and the success of America's effort in this great crisis is going to depend upon whether we take all of our people, their hopes, and their spontaneous loyalty along with us. It is going to depend on our gaining voluntary but real cooperation, and upon our avoiding if possible a situation where any group is driven by compulsion. It will depend upon the extent to which we are able to say that the burdens are being equally borne in proportion to ability to bear them. It is going to depend upon whether we make it clear that when this great effort is over the end result is to be a truly better and brighter day without unemployment or depression or distress or bankruptcy. America's great national-defense program is more than ships, planes, tanks, and guns.

It is the health of our people, the training and opportunity of our youth, the security of our aged, and the soundness of our economy. America's national defense begins and ends in full use of all her productive powers, human and natural, mechanical and electric, and in a capacity of our people to buy and to afford a market for all we can purchase beyond the implements of military defense itself

Either this is the beginning of a new and better day for all the people or else it is the twilight of civilization itself.

It seems to me that we should not have heard on the floor a criticism of the President because instead of giving one man supreme power over the whole defense program he chose two men and picked one of those men from the ranks of labor to act with a great industrialist. He charged those men to work out cooperatively the program between them, and I think he did a truly wise thing, not one subject to criticism but one upon which perhaps the very future of this program depends. Because if there is one thing that means the difference between success and failure, one thing that should be the very badge of the cause which America must represent, it is this: That under our present leadership we are not going to make of the defense program an opportunity for advantage or undue profit to be taken by any economic group, especially by economically strong groups, or for the rights of the rank and file of the people to be taken away.

We have heard criticism here of inequalities in the wages of various types of

labor. I wish those inequalities were not as great as they are, but when you have men whose job it is to go up in the very sky on the top of great skyscrapers that are being constructed to do structural iron work, you are dealing with men whose courage and whose work is worth a lot of money. Furthermore, when it is pointed out that W. P. A. wages are too low, it is because of the legislation Congress passed in connection therewith, and there is no one to blame except Members of Congress themselves. Perhaps the time has come when more Members would agree with those of us who have wanted to make of the W. P. A. more of a work program with better wages and less of a relief program.

Instead of all this criticism of some of these rank and file organizations of the people, I should like to hear some of the constructive things pointed out. I should like to have heard on the floor of the House some mention of the fact that in the shipbuilding union affiliated with the C. I. O. the executive board passed an order that no Communist, Nazi, or Fascist should hold any position in connection with that union. I should like to have heard more said about the action of the A. F. of L. Metal Trades Unions, where they said that no strikes should take place under any circumstances and where they made an agreement voluntarily with their employers to the effect that disputes should be settled by arbitration and conciliation for the duration of the de-

fense program. These things are really progress, because they come from the hearts of the people, and they are engaged in voluntarily on the part of both employers and labor. They are a tremendously greater justification of democracy than any such procedure as was suggested here on the floor this afternoon, that the Government ought to tell everybody exactly what they should do. As soon as you come to that, you then must assume responsibility for every wage paid in this country, for every circumstance of every person. For with the exercise of such power there must always go responsibility, too. I am not saying that in the course of the work of building an impregnable defense for America there may not come a time when we will have to say that certain duties are to be imposed upon the people, as we already have, indeed, said in certain circumstances. I do not want to see one single strike take place. I believe they can be avoided. I believe we are going to work out a way in which they can be avoided. I hope that way can be a way that avoids governmental compulsion, and I know that we can help. We can help most by encouraging the voluntary making of these agreements between employers and labor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the

gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes: I

vield briefly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Has the gentleman noticed in the paper that officials of the Government have said, and that Johnson, speaking for Knudsen last night in Detroit, told them that if they did not do certain things the Government would take over these industrial plants?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Congress

passed a law to that effect.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman approves of that, does he not?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I believe it was necessary; yes. May I point out to the gentleman that if Congress ever did take over one of those plants there would never be a strike in that plant; it would never be allowed to take place. It would be fair and equal—50-50—as far as management and labor were concerned. I hope neither of those things will be necessary.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So do I, but does not the gentleman believe that the same rule should apply to the employee that applies to the employer?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I believe it does, and I do believe that. That is the way the law should operate exactly.

A great deal has been said about the raising of the cost of some of these things on account of wages. And a good deal has been said about inequality of opportunity. I could make a speech here for 2 hours about inequalities of opportunity. I would start in by pointing to a few people who have inherited vast fortunes, even those not possessed of ordinary common sense, living in the lap of luxury. I would point to other people on some of the farms of America and coming out of the great cities of America where young people have to scratch for every chance they get-even for the chance to go to school. These things are indeed wrong. They are things to which the attention of Congress should long ago have been more earnestly directed. But if there has been any effective force against inequality in all our great country that has been effective it has been the force of the organizations of the people-of the people as workers, the people as farmers, the people as consumers, the people in all their walks of life.

I am not going to say that I agree with the charging of exorbitant initiation fees. I believe the unions ought to work out a plan where the payment of those fees could be spread over a period of time so that men seeking those jobs could afford to take them right now.

But I believe, in fairness, in view of all the rest that has been said, that some of the figures on the profits made by some of the corporations that are making things for the national-defense program ought to be put in the record, too. They are the figures put out by the companies themselves. They have to do with certain of the aircraft companies, as it happens.

I am glad the aircraft industry is on a profitable basis. A lot of it is centered in my own section of the country. But when I find that in the first three-quarters of 1940 the average profits of Curtiss-Wright were 32 percent; of Douglas Aircraft 70 percent; of Glenn Martin 36 percent; of North American 47 percent; of United Aircraft 30 percent; and of Wright Aeronautical 40 percent; I say those are pretty fat earnings. If Congress is going to be fair about this matter it is important for us to listen to the only word I have heard yet about the question of profits that are too large, and that was in the President's message where he warned that under these circumstances there should not be advantage taken of the Nation in connection with this program. I believe he is right. I believe we must take heed. Above all, I believe we must be fair. And I would ask you to contrast the profit record quoted above with some of the criticism made of the men who asked \$22 instead of \$20 a week in wages.

The key to America's success in this great defense effort will be found in a simple principle. There must be willingness on the part of every group to do its full share, there must be a great unwillingness to take advantage of the Nation's need, and where there are burdens to be borne or sacrifices to be made they must be made in accordance with ability to bear or make them.

Our consideration must be fair and balanced. Every wage scale in all America is public property. Why then should defense contracts, the prices charged the Government for materials ordered, not be equally publicized to the people of the Nation?

For certainly one of our crucial tasks is to see that no person, no group of persons, shall take undue advantage of our whole people at this time. Certainly it is part of the duty of Congress to see that value received by our Government upon its orders equals the money it expends. This is why I have been urging that a committee be set up to review all defense expenditures, that we do this now instead of waiting.

No; I do not have one shred of criticism for a good businessman who shows for his company a good profit in fair competition with its rivals. But there must be even-handed justice here—yes; and progress for all our Nation and its people—or we shall not gain the great goals that have been set before us.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the figures on these profit totals in connection with my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Without further comment I submit herewith the following figures:

Annual rate of return on net worth of selected aircraft companies 1

(In pe	ercent		0.00	31	MAN D
in being soll and	1939	1940			
ur va l'imperiment		First	Second	Third	First 9 months
Aviation Corporation Curtiss-Wright Corpora-	(2)	(2)	(2)	7	1
tion	15	28 52	44	24	32
Douglas Aircraft Co. Inc. Martin, Glenn L., Co	21 23	52 48	46	113	70 36
North American Aviation, Inc.	74	22	77	41	47
United Aircraft Corpora- tion	29	29	47	37	38
poration	29	39	43	38	40

¹ Net worth is capital and surplus as shown on published balance sheets at end of 1939.

² Deficit.

Note.—In the case of certain companies, provision for excess-profits taxes on 9 months' earnings was charged wholly against the third quarter to avoid downward revision of previously pub.ished earnings for earlier quarters o. 1940.

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield briefly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman know of any Member of Congress who objects to any law which would limit the profit of corporations when such profits

were exorbitant or unjust?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not know. I may say to the gentleman that what I do know is that we repealed the profit limitations in the law we passed last year, and that the reason we did it was that it was represented to us that with profit limitations on certain corporations, that is, those producing directly for defense, they were at a disadvantage as compared with other corporations.

We read in the daily press that the Navy Department's program for the construction of a fleet of fast auxiliary vessels is 19 ships short but that all of the funds made available for the construction of these auxiliary vessels have been exhausted. It is to be hoped that the Naval Affairs Committee in conducting its investigation of the progress of our naval program will inquire into the exact reasons for what appears to be a great increase in cost of these vessels over the

original estimates.

We were advised last year that the way to get at that problem was through excess-profits taxation, and I voted for the bill though with a protest, vigorously voiced, since I do not believe it was an adequate bill or a very fair one. I do not want to throw any obstacles in the way of the defense program, but I do believe it is very, very important for Congress to see to it that this thing is handled on an even and a fair basis all the way around. The main thing, I believe, that could be done now would be to give the American people all the facts about all these contracts and the profits made.

There is tragic short-sightedness in those who see in the present emergency only a chance to carry on business as usual and to restore to power those powerful interests that once ruled the American people. How badly they misread the signs of the times. For a new world is going to be born. Unemployment is going to be solved-yes; by our democracy, because it must be and by cooperative action, too. And because this cause that America represents is one in which the common people have the greatest stake, therefore they are going to be partners in the enterprise, and not pawns, and along with defense will go an attack on unemployment, on undernourishment, on farm tenancy, on agricultural distress, on monopoly, and on parasitic finance—therefore, all these are going to be part of our defense program. This is why labor is represented, why the President and others have stressed that we must not lay down the battle for true social security while we are building airplanes. It is all part of the effort for democracy, for free government, for the basic institutions of our country which we are now called upon to make.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following any previous special order I may address the House for 7 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rich] seems to have entirely missed the import of the President's recent speech to the combined House and Senate in this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, I realize that that speech carried no consolation to the disciples of a program of appeasement or isolation. I submit to this body, Mr. Speaker, that that speech was not made in furtherance or advancement of a good-neighbor policy to the war-mad dictators of the world, who are bent on subjecting the world to their dictatorial will and reducing the peoples of the world, except the favored peoples under their dominion at the present time, to a status of peonage or slavery. That speech, Mr. Speaker, was made as a speech to the American people. It was made to them to bring to their attention, not only the state of the affairs of the Union but also the state of the affairs of the world and the manner in which the affairs of the world in general pertain to the state of the Union.

Whether or not those on the left side of the aisle care to applaud this speech or not is immaterial. That has nothing to do with the virtue, or otherwise, of this speech, but the fact that anyone seems to have sat throughout that great message and failed to grasp the import, failed to recognize the necessity for a speech of that kind at this time in our history, is,

indeed, deplorable.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rich] went ahead and lectured the House to the effect that they should take such and such attitude or they should resign. I think it is a well-recognized fact among the membership of this House that one of the primary duties of a Member of this House is to pay attention to, and to be informed regarding, what is going on, and certainly it is one of the rules of good usage in this body, as well as in other bodies, not to attempt deliberately to distort facts or deliberately present a misrepresentation of the facts in any case. So hereafter I hope that my colleague from Pennsylvania, before he takes the floor of the House, will attempt to analyze what has been said in any speech that has been made in this body, and that he will not again attempt to present to the House his misconceived ideas about what may have been said. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the scheduled special orders I may be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of the address of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] I may be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Bul-WINKLE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to criticize the membership of the House and seldom do I ever do it, but when a Member, on his responsibility, after listening to the great speech of the President of the United States, makes the statement that he failed to see how he could applaud something he did not agree with I wish information. Surely the gentleman from Pennsylvania is for national defense and does he mean to say that in the light of circumstances in the world today he does not believe that America or the United States should have adequate defense. Surely the gentleman, if he did not believe that, could have applauded when the President said:

In the future days which we seek to make secure we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.

Then the President stated them. And the gentleman could have applauded either one or all of them.

Oh, yes; the whole speech the gentleman could have applauded. I do not want to attribute partisanship to him or to the others who have offered these alibis with respect to why they have not applauded. I do not care whether they have applauded or not. That is a matter for their own conscience, but, I say to you, sir, that we, as Members of this House, as Members of the greatest legislative assembly in the world, when the leader speaks, recognize him and recognize the fundamental truths which he gave us. That applause is not out of place.

I think sometimes, when I am in this Chamber, of the men of the past who were in the House and in the Senate: that they would not have remained silent on an occasion such as the other day. Many times in the past they have arisen on the floor of the House and the Senate to express their views favorable to the oppressed peoples of other countries. They were for freedom and liberty. And we could have applauded these sentiments in the President's speech. May I not caution you, for I know that the Republicans are patriotic, not to let blind partisanship carry you to an extreme in this national emergency. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. Rogers] for 4 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on April 2, 1917, I sat in the gallery just beyond the clock over there. My husband, who was a Member of Congress, sat on the floor. There are men on the floor at this moment who were on the floor on that never-to-be-forgotten occasion. As President Wilson strode to the rostrum to make the speech, which he did not wish to make and which was a declaration of war, the silence was so

great you could almost hear your own heart beat.

As President Roosevelt approached the rostrum last Monday, January 6, to make the speech which was so far reaching in its effect that later it may involve us in the present World War, my mind was shadowed by the picture of that scene in 1917 and scenes of the tragedy and courage of the days that followed. Pictures of both the past and present and the possible future were before me.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose that no human being who heard President Wilson deliver his war address in 1917 will ever forget it. That is something deep inside of all of us that we cannot tear out, that we do not want to tear out. It is much to remember. Declaration of war followed that speech. Mr. Speaker, there are Members today who went into that war. Men who will bear the marks and scars of that war to the end of their lives, men who proudly wear the Distinguished Service Cross.

Those Members of Congress who voted for war did not vote for war as Democrats or Republicans. Those Americans who entered the war did not do so as Democrats or Republicans. Today there should be no partisanship, no dividing line in the House, but freedom of thought must be maintained if we are to make America secure.

I know that every real American in the country wants to maintain our democratic form of government, that every real American in the United States wants to maintain the bulwark of democracy, freedom of speech and action. Of course, every Member of Congress must want to preserve that freedom.

I shall read to the House statements made by your President regarding freedom of speech and action. I shall begin by reading the one made by your President-he is my President, also-Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Mrs. Roosevelt and he are both friends of long standing for whom I have an affectionate regard. The President was a classmate of my husband, John Jacob Rogers. He was Assistant Secretary of the Navy. My husband was a Member of Congress during those grim days of the World War.

President Franklin Roosevelt said Monday:

In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.

The first is freedom of speech and expression-everywhere in the world.

The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way-everywhere in the world.

The third is freedom from want-which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants-everywhere in the world.

The fourth is freedom from fear-which. translated into world terms, means a worldwide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighboranywhere in the world.

I assume again, in view of the un-American doctrines which appear today to be threatening the fundamental freedoms of American citizens, that we might all do well to reflect upon the statements of President Andrew Jackson in a special message to the Senate on April 15, 1834:

The President is also accountable at the bar of public opinion for every act of his ad-ministration. Subject only to the restraints of truth and justice, the free people of the United States have the undoubted right, as individuals or collectively, orally or in writing, at such times and in such language and form as they may think proper, to discuss his official conduct and to express, and promulgate their opinions concerning it.

Then again, this whole-souled Americanism was reaffirmed by Theodore Roosevelt in a speech at Louisville, Ky., delivered October 18, 1916, a few months before the United States last declared war:

At the outset of my speech I wish to point out that the doctrine, now often advanced, as to the impropriety of criticizing the President, without regard as to whether the criticism is or is not just, has no warrant either in history or on grounds of public morality.

Again, history records that when Woodrow Wilson delivered his historic war message to Congress in April 1917, he was bewildered by the applause accorded him in the House. Upon returning to the White House, President Wilson seated himself wearily, with his head resting in cupped hands, and said to his secretary, Joseph Tumulty:

How strange that they should have applauded my message today! It was a message of death to young men.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that everyone of us here today realizes the terrible seriousness of world conditions and the conditions in our own country today. I, too, plead for unity so far as possible but in order to achieve that unity we must have freedom of thought and action. We must have knowledge of national and international affairs for without knowledge we cannot have understanding. It seems to me we need the opinions and help of one another freely expressed, freely given, if we are to save our own democracy. Election to office rests the gravest responsibility in every public servant. That is, of course, true of a Congressman; it is equally true of the President. The people of America hold the Congress to strict accountability just as the people of America hold the President to strict accountability. Election to office does not nullify your responsibility; it does not constitute a blanket approval of everything that an elected official may do. There have been men of great stature in the Congress. There are men of great stature in Congress today. May all of us measure up to that stature in the future days, come what may. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL] for 7 minutes.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, I do not want any applause. I have heard applause discussed quite a bit in the last few minutes. In America it has long been a manifestation of approval or disapproval. It is true that some people never applaud, whether they are for or against.

which is a matter of individuality. I never applaud anybody for anything that I do not approve. I do not blame anyone else for not playing a hypocritical role and applauding if their heart is not with the sentiments expressed, but in the matter referred to, in which the First Lady of the land is mentioned and her criticism of the minority side. I diagnosed the case precisely and exactly and could produce the witness. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER], who succeeded Mr. Mur-DOCK, introduced himself to me and we sat together before the entrance into this door of the President. I called his attention to the fact, because he was a new Member, and told him to watch the righthand side stand up spontaneously and those on the left-hand side get up in groups and bunches until they all got up.

I called his attention to the fact, when they refused to applaud certain things, that they were for those things and would vote for some of the things which they did not applaud. As the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Bulwinkle] has pointed out, they are for some of the strong sentiments in that address for which they will vote.

Now, you have heard a great deal said about the fact that he did not make it clear enough that we were not going into war. What could be plainer than the remark that they did not need man-power? As many things as they do need, why remotely think of sending something they do not need, which is in perfect accord with all the expressions made along that line for 2 years-"all methods short of war."

Now, if the gentlemen on the left did not approve of the aid to England proposed, if they did not approve of the defense program, then I do not blame them for not applauding. Neither do I say it was incumbent upon them to applaud if they did approve.

Now, I know that a very large number do approve of those two different features of that address; then, seeing one side applauding the remarks because they were for them, seeing the other side refuse because of partisan bias, I must brand it as partisanship of the lowest degree. There is no escape from that.

I want to pass one other thing to you, my Republican friends. If Wendell Willkie had said the same identical words, without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i," you would have torn the seats down on your side of the Housewith the same identical words.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman

Mr. CREAL. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, does not the gentleman know that a majority of the Republicans on this side voted against conscription in spite of the fact that Willkie was for it?

Mr. CREAL. Yes; I am aware of that fact.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They were not rubber stamps.

Mr. CREAL. You people who have also been doing a great deal of talking about this delay in military preparedness likewise voted against lifting the embargo, which left England 4 or 5 months

behind and caused the President to call a special session, and England lost that valuable time. She could have been as far ahead as she will be in the next 4 or 5 months, when you went away and had to be called back by the President to "lick the calf" over, so to speak, and undo your vote to give that authority. Some of those who voted against that authority are the very ones who are so perturbed about the delay of preparations. If I had been a Member of the House and voted against lifting the embargo, the longer they delayed preparation the more it would be in accord with my opinion. Any man who yelps about the point of being frightened over the speed of this program is absolutely inconsistent if he voted against lifting the embargo.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the

gentleman yield?

Mr. CREAL. I yield for a question;

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the gentleman explain why, after England had the legal right to make purchases in this country, she delayed for 8 months, and was the subject of severe criticism by her own leaders about making purchases in this country?

Mr. CREAL. No; I am not explaining any part about England's busines . I know England had sense enough to know that she could not buy without a permit. I know that when the permit was issued she commenced buying and is buying today, and just as many months as you had delayed lifting that embargo, they would have been that many months on the road to preparedness.

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

Mr. CREAL. I yield for a question. Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman knows that I voted for every national-defense measure that has ever come before the Congress and I happen to have voted for a number of the President's suggestions, and also 'o have applauded certain sections of his

Mr. CREAL. Now, I did not yield for the lady to tell me all the good things she has voted for. I yielded for a question.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to ask a question. I imagine, perhaps, the "applause" matter will be embalmed today, and I should like to ask one question before it is embalmed. Can the gentleman explain why all of the Democrats did not applaud the Presi-dent's suggestions? Was it not because they believed in freedom of thought and action?

Mr. CREAL. It is because these few Democrats were like the almost solic Republican minority. They were against it. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for one-half minute additional to make one other remark.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.
Mr. CREAL. Yes. It was a partisan matter and I would never have dreamed of it or thought of it except for the dangerous situation we are in. I pointed out to my new friend, the Member from Utah, exactly what you did do, and what

you would do before you did it, and we sat there watching just what the first lady of the land said happened-scantily courteous, with the accent on the "scant." [Applause,]

A representative of the dictator governments, if in the gallery, would have raced to the wires to say that there appeared to be much coolness on one side of Congress to the suggestion of greater national defense and speeding up the filling of English contracts.

But I want to be generous. I believe the majority of those on the left aisle, like the majority of the American people, believe that hurrying up of sales to England looks like our best chance for our own safety. But I think the echoes of November caused them to leave the wrong impression on those hoping and looking for unity in this anxious hour and I believe there is more unity of purpose than might have appeared to a gallery visitor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the observations that have been made on this floor today and the indication of testiness in those observations is probably rather prophetic of what is going to happen in this Congress in the very near future.

Gentlemen on both sides of the aisle, let me admonish you today. We had better be rather temperate in our remarks. [Applause.] Let there be some restraint in our expression from now on, and let there be a fine degree of courtesy and generosity exemplified here at all times. [Applause.] Because the time is not so far distant when we shall have to take counsel one with another, with no cen-tral aisle in between, as the welfare of the whole Nation hangs in jeopardy. If nothing else today, let me make an appeal to you-

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentle-

man from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I heartily agree with the gentleman; and if he feels that anything I said today was not in accord with what he said, I am sorry. My most earnest effort will be to observe the thing he suggested.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know out of a long experience the intensity and the vigor with which the gentleman from California addresses himself to every subject matter, and I entertain for him the highest regard and a deep affection and admiration.

But let me point out to you that the subject matter that has been discussed here today, namely, the applause or lack of applause of the speech delivered here on the 6th of January, in my considered judgment, has not been adequately diagnosed. I think too much attention has been given to the superficial aspects of applause, Mr. Speaker, but it goes deeper than that. It is one of those moments when excitement and exhilaration and intensity and devotion to an objective catch a person off guard, and then there comes an expression that probably was not intended but that is an indication of exactly what is ahead.

The fact that the lack of applause over on this side was characterized as saddening and astonishing is indicative of a certain psychosis, or a mental state; and in a little while there will be thousands of people in the Nation who will be putting the tarred stick and the tory brand upon anybody who fails to agree. That is the significance of that matter.

If in the interest of the Nation's welfare we cannot reserve or withhold our approval or our disagreement, then what happens to fundamental freedom? What happens to our basic right and necessary right in a rather anxious and troublous hour of discussing things freely and fully, and of reserving our approval until such time as we see a little more clearly? It is the thing that I am afraid of. I should like to read for a moment what Mark Twain, that great and gracious humorist and philosopher from Hannibal, Mo., wrote about war in the book called the Mysterious Stranger. Oh, how appropriate it is today.

Here is what said:

[From the Mysterious Stranger] MARK TWAIN'S FORMULA FOR WAR

I can see a million years ahead, and this rule will never change in so many as half a dozen instances. The loud little handful as usual-will shout for the war. will warily object—at first; the great, big, dull bulk of the Nation will rub its sleepy eyes and try to make out why there should be a war, and will say, earnestly and indignantly, "It is unjust and dishonorable, and there is no necessity for it." Then the hand-ful will shout louder. A few fair men on the other side will argue and reason against the war with speech and pen, and at first will have a hearing and be applauded; but it will not last long; those others will outshout them, and presently the antiwar audiences will thin out and lose popularity. Before long you will see this curious thing: The speakers stoned from the platform, and free speech strangled by hordes of furious men who in their secret hearts are still at one with those stoned speakers, as earlier, but do not dare to say so. And now the whole Nation— pulpit and all—will take up the war cry, and shout itself hoarse, and mob any honest man who ventures to open his mouth; and presently such mouths will cease to open. the statesmen will invent cheap lies, putting the blame upon the Nation that is attacked, and every man will be glad of those conscience-soothing falsities, and will diligently study them, and refuse to examine any ref-utations of them; and thus he will by and by convince himself that the war is just, and will thank God for the better sleep he enjoys after this process of grotesque self-deception.

We have had the lesson in the life of our Nation before. We had it in 1917. There are Members like our good friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] who can testify and who know what it is to be against the war resolution, as he was in 1917, only to find himself villified in the public forum. It is going to happen again, make no mistake about it; and for God's sake, gentlemen, let us not now start splitting hairs and displaying short tempers because in a little while hand will be against hand in this very Chamber. And then we appeal to God Almighty to protect this Nation and its great future. I am sorry that those things have to happen, that they are going to happen. This body can go on

as a great stabilizing power and see that it does not happen.

The word "appeaser" was used in this well today. I wish that that word had never been taken upon the tongues of men in this anxious hour. The President used it in his speech. I was sorry that he used it. Let us not classify each other now as appeasers and pacifists, and that sort of thing. Everybody in this Chamber is anxious about the welfare of America, the welfare of young men who if war ever comes, must go forth, many of whom will never return to the greensward of America. No, let us not throw names at this time; we cannot afford to.

While I am on this subject let me supplement the remarks of the minority leader this afternoon. Men from our side were not invited to the conference at the White House. I expect it is quite all right. I refuse to fulminate about those things, but I do say this, that if it is your emergency then it is our emergency. [Applause.] If it is a national emergency there is no center line, there cannot be; you cannot get along without us. We are here speaking for constituencies back home and it is no high presumption on our part that we are an integral part of the life of America. So, there must be no center aisle, and there should not have been in the White House conference and in the preparation of the bill.

The President stood here on the 6th day of January and implored us to spiritual unity in the country. On the 29th of December I listened to a little radio out in Illinois and heard the mellifluous voice of the President give indication first of the precariousness of the present situation, and, secondly, indicate the course of action which was gradually crystallizing in his mind; and then once more make a plea for unity. Well, gentlemen, if it is an hour for unity you cannot have it if we are to be ignored from the very outset and if we are not to sit in at the counsel table and speak for 22,000,000 people who sent us here even though we are in the minority.

The President cannot laugh off that sentiment. So I join with my minority leader today in the hope that from here on there will be unity of spirit, there will be unity of purpose, and at the same time a religious preservation of freedom of speech and action, because in an hour of jeopardy is when you need freedom of expression if you are to explore every aspect of the situation and give adequate attention to the Nation as it walks down what may be the tortuous and twisted road that leads into a bloody Armageddon.

I subscribe to those four fundamental freedoms. May they never depart from the soil of America. But can we not have unity and still speak our piece here in the people's forum and religiously guard against every outside external onslaught on freedom of speech? Here we have sought to preserve a certain constitutional integrity. When freedom goes out of this Hall it vanishes from the face of America. God grant that this be the last place from whence freedom shall depart.

So this afternoon I say to you in all humility, I did not applaud the President's speech. I applauded his entrance into the Chamber. He is my President just like he is your President. I do not demean him, but I disagree with him. I respect the President of the United States, so I gave him my applause as he entered and departed. Perhaps it was a certain solemnity, perhaps it was a spiritual disturbance. I do not know, but I felt rather deeply on this whole subject, particularly with a background that goes back more than 20 years ago when, like the gentleman from West Virginia, ANDY EDMISTON, sitting here, who holds the Distinguished Service Cross, I marched down the old bloody path. We do not want that to happen to young America in 1941.

Mr. Speaker, there is so much desperation and despair in the world today. have said often that the conflict in the Old World is a social revolution rather than a war. It is the great wellspring of despair, the seeds of which were planted back in the last struggle that really disturbs me today, and I am wondering now about my country and whether or not we are, in a certain zeal to help save what has been referred to as a free and expressive democracy over on the other side, going to send those young conscript feet to be set in a pathway that leads down to despair, destruction, and disaster. If and when war comes to us, the Nation will go with it. Do not delude yourselves. We will have a national debt of \$59,000,000,000 on June 30, 1942. That will be but a circumstance, Mr. Speaker, to our future debt, because it will go to over \$100,000,000,000 and there will come bankruptcy, disaster, inflationary forces, despair, and incapacity to meet the great domestic problems that will have been reposed upon the doorstep of the Nation. Then shall we find the answer to our modern dilemma. The dilemma today is seemingly to go over there and rescue some of those countries and people, and in so doing to embrace over on this side the very concepts, the very plans, the very programs that are in effect over there today. Is that not it?

I am afraid there is too much of that. So I shall in all humility, as carefully as I can, with every degree of regard for anybody who disagrees from me, seek by God's help and aid and in a prayerful attitude to do that which in my humble judgment I believe will be my best contribution to this Nation and the welfare of its 132,000,000. In that spirit, if we approach it, disagreeing as we go upon one thing or another, but holding intact earnestly and constantly the necessity for freedom of speech, even as we seek spiritual unity, I shall have no apprehension as to the ultimate destiny of this our own great country. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Patrick].

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech of Sir Walter Citrine, secretary, British Trade Union Congress.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro temopre. Under a special order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Patrick] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am not interested at all in how a man uses the decision that is his as to applauding at any given time. Whether he applauds what he believes or disbelieves, whether or not the sentiments expressed are his is a matter for his own taste. If minority Members who have gone through the recent campaign want to sit quietly, it is a right they have the privilege to exercise. So I am not going to have any fight with anybody there. De Gustibus non est disputandum.

Mr. Speaker, this is a time of mighty strong import in the affairs of this Nation, and it is a time when unity is called for. It is time for us to reorient ourselves and think about whether or not we have been a little thoughtless of public needs.

O wad some power the giftie gie us To see oursel's as ithers see us!

Perhaps we Democrats should examine ourselves and not lay all blame for partisanship at the door of Republicans.

May I, in this regard, call the Republicans' attention to the fact that the leader of our party has not been entirely partisan? He did not withhold welcome to Republicans to fill out the Cabinet and took in Messrs. Knox and Stimson at a time when he was criticized rather severely by certain Democratic leaders.

If there has now been an oversight in inviting them into the councils at a time when they should be taken in, we should make a change—I concede to the gentleman from Illinois as to our national troubles; they are troubles for Republicans the same as for Democrats, and that we should get as much breadth and wisdom of counsel as can be had.

There is one thing I am impressed by when I hear the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Case] and others pursue a lead of what I believe is unfinished thinking in this land. The gentleman from South Dakota seems concerned for fear that we may become the foolish party to blundering statesmanship on the other side of the Atlantic, which may lead us to take steps that will get us into a war and cause unnecessarily the death and destruction that lie in the wake of war. That is such a short view of what is confronting this Nation today. Any man who goes that far and stopsnot necessarily charge the gentleman from South Dakota with having stopped there, but I do say that from the addresses of some of the lawmakers in this land, and I am thinking now more of two or three Democrats in both Houses than I am Republicans when I think of names in this respect—there are those who seem

to think that there is a means whereby we can circumscribe this Nation, and that the breadth of an ocean is a moat wide enough to keep the things that happen across the ocean from assailing us. Do they understand this war?

What has happened? Let us not forget the facts. Let us not fall into the error of the French when they thought that the Maginot line and the security of patriotism and faithfulness to purpose were sufficient to give them an eternal safeguard against an ancient enemy.

The gentleman from Illinois deplores the use of the word "appeasement." regret as much as anybody that the term "appeasement" has to be hauled in, but it must. There is no other term that can be used unless it or a synonymous term is employed to denote the doctrine implied by the word. This is what has hap-pened. War has been declared on democracy. When the men who are at the head of totalitarian affairs in Europe declare that democracy is outmoded and unworkable, it means democracy here just as much as it does there. The only reason it is being forced upon England today is because geographically England is a neighbor. It may not be the only reason, but it is the chief reason. It means this, and can only mean thisthat if the Axis Powers were to win, if they were to come out ahead in this war, there would be an immediate siezure of the control of the commerce of this earth by the Axis Powers. We are a "have" nation. It would not necessarily mean the extension of warfare to this country as we know it in this day; it would mean only the conducting of the affairs of the world so as to throttle us at every seaport; it would convert and suffocate the commerce upon which America survives: not on that, but it would be a successful step forward with the axis toward suppressing the liberty we love and assailing our way of life here that is dearer to us than life itself for the individual.

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

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. On this question of appeasement, I wonder if the gentleman would pause and review the situation a little bit in the light of a fact that one of the outstanding appeasers, one of the leading Munich men, is now to be the spokesman for the gang that is supposed to be waging the battle for democracy, Lord Halifax.

Mr. PATRICK. I should like to discuss that, but that is a spur track I am not on, and I do not wish to get on it now

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

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman speaks of international trade and the dangerous position we would be worked into in such an eventuality.

Mr. PATRICK. We would be thrown into it; we would not be worked into it. A win by the Axis Powers and we would be in it that minute.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the large indus-

trialists of Germany and England met in Dusseldorf in 1939 and apportioned the trade of Latin America among themselves?

Mr. PATRICK. Of course, that may be true; but does it throw light across the behavior that is to be ours? Is that any reason why we should not do our very most and in the quickest way we can to support and protect the things that are American? Everything we can legally do, everything we can physically do to speed up our means of turning out munitions of war, should be done, because, after all, it is a matter of production. The very things we turn out today may be outmoded by the time we should need them.

The best preparedness for war if it should come to this Nation would not be piling up airplanes but speeding up our means of manufacture so that when the time comes we may then turn out in adequate volume the most modern and most effective airplanes and other means of defense and warfare. It also means providing everything we can to conclude the war on the other side of the Atlantic and keep this side of the Atlantic-the Pacific side of it-free from war. Our safety and security lies there. We would be at a tremendous disadvantage if there should be an overwhelming of England and her allies today, if the Axis Powers should land on top. Then we would be not only in trouble commercially but in trouble in our every phase of activity. Hitler would be in a position to, and certainly would, dictate commerce and how much we should ship and where we should ship it. He would have entire control of the high seas and the commerce of the world. He would commence immediately a throttling process, as he has wherever his power has thus far reached. Then we would be entirely unable to go forward, and that would be the day when our liberties would begin to dry up.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has the gentleman given any consideration to the fact that possibly this war is largely a war over raw materials, that the so-called democracies control the raw-material markets of the world, and that the "have not" nations must either have free and equal access to that market or they will perish?

cess to that market or they will perish?
Mr. PATRICK. This war is the war it purports to be. It is a war for what they call the new order. It is an effort by the totalitarian powers to get world control by bludgeoning, whipping, starving, or winning others to their way of doing things and streamlining government in a way that does not admit democracy. It is far removed from democracy. It has nothing for the common man. It only plays that in to destroy the sight of people so that they will blindly and fanatically follow a leader. Fundamentally, it is not new. It is as old as the desires of ruthless and ambitious men. It is the same old appeal that Charlemagne made and Genghis Kahn had a lot of it in his gizzard, too, when he stepped forth.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Would the gentleman call a country a democracy that holds, possibly, 40 percent of the earth's surface and some 300,000,000 or 400,000,000 people in bondage?

Mr. PATRICK. Why, certainly not.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, there is India and there is black Africa being held within the British Empire against their will. There has not been a year in the past 50 years or in the last 100 years when England has not been at war with the various peoples of India, who were trying to become independent.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman is trying to argue that the Nazi form of government is superior to the English form of government; that is the only thing that that means.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not think we should kid ourselves.

Mr. PATRICK. I cannot follow or stay with the gentleman in that view, and that is the only thing that that argument could lead to, and that is the purport of it in the end.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, it is.

Mr. PATRICK. At least the gentleman speaks frankly.

Mr. NICHOLS. Would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman has 5 minutes himself. Take it up then, please.

All I want to conclude with is this. The time has come when we have got to forget that we are Democrats or Republicans on this floor. We have got to forget politics for 4 years. Whether the right side won out or not, one side has won the election. The destiny of a nation is greater than any political party, and it is greater than any man or any applause or what one may think or not think of that sort of thing. The time has come in this Nation when we must all studiously and without partisanship get at what is the best way to develop the Nation, what is the best way to get unity, what is the best way to get the forces of labor and capital to go through and provide in peace and harmony and confidence and stand by our form of government. I believe in our democratic form of government, and so do you. I believe in it with all there is in me to believe in anything. I would die for it, and as long as we can keep together the fires of this Nation we must stand behind the program and develop it throughout the Nation, so that it will give us the strength and unity to bring forth the best and strongest there is in this land. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a short editorial on British loans from the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette,

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Nichols] for 5 minutes.

NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, since this day seems to have been given over to partisan discussion, and since it was my pleasuure to sit here and listen to the very eloquent words of my distinguished friend from Illinois-a man, incidentally, who seldom takes this floor without giving generously of his wisdom to the Members of the House-I ask your indulgence that I may make reply to certain of those statements. I may say that I quite agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that there should be no center aisle in national-defense matters. I wonder how we are going to cause that center aisle to vanish. You know for months and months and months, starting before the general elections, I sat on this floor and listened to Members of the minority. I am frank to admit that most of the talking was done by a small group from the minority, who almost every day broke a long silence and made another speech against the President; and in the light of that fact I was a little bit shocked this morning that the minority floor leader would think it strange that the Republicans were not called to the counsel table in the White House yesterday when certain plans were being discussed. Why, my friends, I doubt that there is a man within the sound of my voice who, if he had any important problem confronting him, would call to his counsel table a man with his pockets full of rocks.

Certainly there has got to be unity in this House, and when there is unity of purpose in this House insofar as the national defense is concerned, probably then Members of the minority will be called to the counsel table of the Chief Executive; but as long as every day some member of the minority takes this floor and condemns—oh, not with constructive criticism, but with vitriol in his heart—every action of the President, that long, in my judgment, you are not entitled to counsel at the Chief Executive's table.

Only a couple of days ago a distinguished Member of the minority took the floor and said that it was his opinion the President's defense program which he was going to call for in his message was only a means to cover up the President's laxity in pushing forward the defense program. Is there any of you who will seriously state that the President has some deep, sinister, ulterior motive, that he wants to tell you that he is doing one thing to aid the people of the United States and Great Britain, while on the other hand he is deliberately holding back progress in the machinery with the other? Oh, no. Do let us forget partisanship.

Mr. MOTT. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the gentleman from Oklahoma has heard any Member of the minority say that.

Mr. NICHOLS. I heard the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Taber] say that.

Mr. MOTT. Oh, no; I do not believe the gentleman did say that. The gentleman has heard, no doubt, Members of the minority express a lack of confidence in the President's ability to carry this out. I think he has heard no such thing as he says; that he is trying deliberately not to carry it out.

Mr. NICHOLS. I say that they say on the floor of this House that he has deliberately held back this program. I have heard it from this very well in which I now stand.

Mr. MOTT. All right. The gentleman cannot show that in the RECORD.

Mr. NICHOLS. The gentleman can show it.

Mr. MOTT. Then I ask the gentleman to show it.

Mr. KNUTSON. When can the gentleman show it?

Mr. NICHOLS. Any time. I do not want to take the time now to show it.

Mr. MOTT. Oh, extend your remarks and put it in the RECORD.

Mr. NICHOLS. Let me say this. I was in hope that I might be helpful in this matter. I have heard Members from the minority side, day after day, one after another, stand in the well of this House and condemn the President for practically everything that he has done, and I have seen the Democratic side of the House, to my amazement, sit here day after day and not answer those statements. I know why they did not. It was because they were in hopes that some time you would wear yourselves out. Your own folks do not like it, your constituents do not think it is either cute or smart. I do not know of anyone who does like it. On domestic things, all right, go your limit; but I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that there has to be cooperation; but listen, it cannot be a one-sided cooperation. Do not expect the President to cooperate with you, when you continue day after day to throw rocks at him from every quarter and give him no cooperation. [Applause]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Domengeaux (at the request of Mr. Sanders), for 10 days, on account of personal business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who is now on the floor, a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, is it the intention of the chairman of the committee to permit adequate hearing on the bill which was introduced by the majority leader this morning and to afford Members of the House opportunity to appear pro and con on that bill?

Mr. BLOOM. If any Member of the House or of the Senate wants to appear and will kindly let the chairman know, the chairman will be glad to arrange a time for hearing.

Mr. MICHENER. When does the gentleman expect to take the bill up for hearing?

Mr. BLOOM. The committee is not yet fully organized. We expect to have it organized by tomorrow or Monday, and then the committee, I hope, will meet on Tuesday morning.

Mr. MICHENER. Then about Tuesday we can contemplate the committee will be organized and ready for hearing?

Mr. BLOOM. The committee will be organized, we hope, so that it will give us time to have hearings on Tuesday.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand that the chairman plans to have very full and complete hearings on the bill?

Mr. BLOOM. Well, I do not know what the gentlewoman from Massachusetts means by "full hearings." We are going to give everyone an opportunity to be heard. There will not be any effort to rush the hearings or to close the hearings at all.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. With information from the Department of State and other officials?

Mr. BLOOM. Well, I am not saying anything about who the witnesses are going to be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute in order to ask the gentleman a question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has a tentative date been fixed for bringing that legislation to the floor?

Mr. BLOOM. Not yet. The committee is not organized. Until it is organized, I could not say just when it will be presented.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, Mr. Dirksen was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks. Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of today.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Wednesday, after the legislative business of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement by Leo D. Cline, president of the Michi-

gan Bean Shippers Association, on the subject of what is the matter with beans?

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until Monday, January 13. 1941, at 12 o'clock noon,

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

58. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940 (H. Doc. No. 5); to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

59. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the report of the Attorney General's committee on bankruptcy administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

60. A letter from the Comptroller General,

transmitting the report of the work of the General Accounting Office for the fiscal year 1940: to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

61. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of awards made under the authority of the provisions of the act of March 5, 1940 (Public, No. 426, 76th Cong.); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

62. A letter from the Attorney General,

transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in cases of certain aliens whose deportations have been suspended for more than 6 months; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 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. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1765. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to conduct a preliminary examination and survey of Pillar Point at Half Moon Bay, San Mateo County, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 1766. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on

the Judiciary.

H. R. 1767. A bill to reimburse the city of Springfield, Mass., for expenditures made for the construction and equipment of pumping stations in connection with Public Works projects for flood control in the Connecticut River; to the Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 1768. A bill authorizing a survey of

the rates of compensation paid to certain civilian employees of the Army for the purpose of establishing uniform and equitable rates; to the Committee on Military Affairs. By Mr. ENGEL:

H. R. 1769. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1941, General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT:

H.R. 1770. A bill to authorize the establishment and maintenance of an experimental range in California for conducting research in the management of lands for sheep grazing; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 1771. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property to Washington County, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands. By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 1772. A bill for the relief of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1773. A bill to prohibit the importation of flags of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1774. A bill to extend the privilege of retirement to the judges of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. TABER:

H.R. 1775. A bill to provide for the more expeditious and efficient procurement of the national-defense needs of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK

H.R. 1776. A bill to further promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 1777. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to purchase refuge lands within the State of South Carolina for the perpetuation of the eastern wild turkey and provide pure-blood brood stock for restocking within its native range, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1778. A bill for the erection of a public building at Lake City, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 1779. A bill for the erection of a public building at Myrtle Beach, S. C., and appro-priating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds

H. R. 1780. A bill for the erection of a public building at Florence, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 1781. A bill for the erection of a public building at Loris, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 1782. A bill to provide Spanish War

veterans wartime pension rates for serviceconnected disability or death of certain vet-erans of the Spanish-American War recognized by veterans regulations as "veteran of any war," and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Pensions. H. R. 1783. A bill to amend section 36 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act with respect to loans to refinance the indebtedness of drainage, levee, and irrigation districts, and other similar organizations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1784. A bill providing for the examination and survey of the channel at Murrells Inlet, S. C.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 1785. A bill providing for the examination and survey of the Little Pee Dee River in South Carolina; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 1786. A bill to amend an act amending the old-age security law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1787. A bill granting a pension to widows and dependent children of World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H.R. 1788. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Department of South Carolina to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pee Dee River at or near Cashua Ferry, S. C.; to the Committee on Interstate and Fereign Commerce.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 1789. A bill authorizing an emergency appropriation for the protection of property

on Bayocean Peninsula and in Tillamook, Oreg.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H.R. 1790. A bill to safeguard the homing pigeon; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1791. A bill to establish a Department of Health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. ROMJUE:

H.R. 1792. A bill to provide for automatic promotions of special clerks in first-class post offices from the first to the second grades; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post

H. R. 1793. A bill to authorize mailing of small firearms to officers and employees of enforcement agencies of the United States: to the Committee on the Post Office and Post

By Mr. SCRUGHAM:

H.R. 1794. A bill relating to mining and providing for small loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to facilitate the development and production of metals and minerals; to the Committee on Banking and Currency

H.R. 1795. A bill to grant pensions and increase of pensions to certain veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUTPHIN:

H. R. 1796. A bill designating Good Friday in each year a legal holiday; to the Committee

on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1797. A bill to provide a minimum disability rating for soldiers, sailors, marines, and Coast Guard men discharged upon medical survey; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1798. A bill for a complete survey of the physical-education resources existing within the United States now in use as outdoor recreative and competitive areas, gymnasia, stadia, swimming pools, parks, etc., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education

H.R. 1799. A bill for the relief of the city of Perth Amboy, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims

H. R. 1800. A bill to provide for the preservation of the birthplace of Joyce Kilmer, New Brunswick, Middlesex County, N. J.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 1801. A bill amending the act of February 27, 1936 (49 Stat. 1144); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky:

H. R. 1802. A bill for the erection of a memorial to the memory of Corp. James Bethel Gresham in McLean County, Ky.; to the Committee on the Library.

H.R. 1803. A bill for the relief of certain members of local or district boards, of legal advisory boards, and of medical advisory boards appointed under the provisions of the Selective Service Act of May 18, 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: H. R. 1804. A bill to restrict the exporta-

tion of certain Douglas fir peeler logs and Port Orford cedar logs, and for other pur-poses; to the Committee on Ways and Means. By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H.R. 1805. A bill to authorize a inary examination and survey of the inlets and outlets to Lake Hendricks, S. Dak., and Minn., for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

H. R. 1806. A bill providing a time limit for collection of feed and seed loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: H.R. 1807. A bill authorizing the Wisconsin Band of Potawatomi Indians to file suit in the Court of Claims of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 1808. A bill to repeal and reenact section 83 of the Judicial Code, as amended, relating to Federal court districts in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on the Judi-

By Mr. CLAYPOOL:

H. R. 1809. A bill to amend section 3 of Public Law No. 304, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved August 16, 1937; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CULLEN:

H.R. 1810 (by request). A bill to amend paragraph 1529 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. R. 1811. A bill to direct deportation for any person who, while in the United States, is, or has been, by his words or acts, sympathetic with, associated with, or affiliated with, or sought the support of, Communists, Fas-cists, or Nazis in the United States or elsewhere: to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 1812. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to provide for the financing of industrial, manufacturing, and commercial enterprises in rural areas in order to provide for national de-fense and to promote the economic stability of agriculture; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 1813. A bill to amend the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to provide compensation for loss, or permanent loss of use, of members of the body; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: H. R. 1814. A bill to render effective the right to work and to provide for the common defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary. By Mr. LUDLOW: H. R. 1815. A bill to amend Public Law No.

718, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved June 25, 1938; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MAAS: H.R. 1816. A bill allowing promotion for officers on the retired list; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

H. R. 1817. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue oil and gas leases on certain lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H.R. 1818. A bill to provide for the disposition of certain moneys received by the United States in connection with proceedings against the Standard Oil Co. of California and others, pursuant to the joint resolution of February 21, 1924 (43 Stat. 15); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 1819. A bill granting pensions and increases of pensions to needy war veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 1820. A bill to provide a more equitable program of old-age assistance by amend-ing section 3 of the Social Security Act; to Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1821. A bill to provide a more equitable program of old-age assistance by amending section 2 of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1822. A bill to stimulate research in the use of anthracite and bituminous coal and the byproducts thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H.R. 1823. A bill to provide for the improvement of navigation and control of floods on the Arkansas, St. Francis, Red, and White Rivers, for the promotion of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BOEHNE: H.R. 1824. A bill to authorize the con-struction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Perry County, Ind.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 1825. A bill to provide for the education of all types of physically handicapped children, to make an appropriation of money therefor, and to regulate its expenditure; to the Committee on Education.

H. R. 1826. A bill to diminish un-American activities by deporting aliens guilty of them; to the Committee on Immigration and

Naturalization.

H. R. 1827. A bill authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1828. A bill to extend further time for naturalization to alien veterans of the World War under the act approved May 25. 1932; to the Committee on Immigration and

Naturalization.

H.R. 1829. A bill to provide for the subscription by Reconstruction Finance Corporation of the stock of a corporation which is hereby created to finance selfliquidating express highways which will create additional facilities for national defense, relieve highway traffic congestion in intermetropolitan regions, aid air navigation, aid the States, municipalities, and other public authorities thereof, furnish employment for citizens now on relief, decrease unemployment, stimulate business recovery, and promote public safety; to define the powers and limitations of such corporation; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency. By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota:

H.R. 1830. A bill for the relief of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians of Minnssota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1831. A bill to amend section 7 of the act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 326; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 753f), relating to places of confinement and transfers of persons convicted of an offense against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1832. A bill relating to the traveling and subsistence expenses on judges of the Court of Claims, the Court of Custom and Patent Appeals, and the United States Customs Court; to the Committee on the Judic-

H. R. 1833. A bill to extend the terms of judges of the district court in Alaska, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands to 8 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1834. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees killed or injured while performing work of a hazardous nature incident to law-enforcement activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1835. A bill to provide adequate compensation for dependents of agents and inspectors of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1836. A bill to amend section 2 of the act approved June 30, 1879, so as to permit women to esrve on juries in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary

H.R. 1837. A bill to amend certain laws governing Federal prisoners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1838. A bill to amend the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1839. A bill to provide for the appointment of public defenders in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL:

H R. 1840. A bill to increase the maximum monthly payment by States to individuals for old-age assistance to \$60, and to change the age requirements from 65 to 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. R. 1841. A bill to amend the Alien Registration Act; to the Committee on the Ju-

H. R. 1842. A bill to amend the Criminal Code to make certain activities by aliens unlawful; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 1843. A bill granting retirement benefits to certain employees of the United States transferred from a classified position to an unclassified position in the civil service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H.R. 1844. A bill to authorize the naturalization of Filipinos who are permanent residents of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1845. A bill to compensate certain native Puerto Ricans for services rendered in the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1846. A bill to amend sections 1 and 2 of the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended: to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 1847. A bill relative to certain annuities; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Mr. MAAS:

H.R. 1848. A bill to authorize percentage increases in computing the retired pay of cer-tain retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps for active duty performed subsequent to retirement; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 1849. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 1850. A bill to provide for the rank and title of lieutenant general of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHELCHEL: H. R. 1851. A bill limiting working hours of custodial service employees to 8 in 10 hours a day; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BOLAND: H. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution for the relief of the anguished, stricken, and starving pop-ulation of war-torn and martyred Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARE: H. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution providing for the right to sue the United States by certain States; to the Committee on the Judiciary. By Mr. SCHWERT:

H. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1941, General Pulas-ki's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski: to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution to establish a National Unemployment Commission; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BOLAND: H. Res. 55. Resolution requesting information relating to railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. By Mr. STEFAN:

H. Res. 56. Resolution requesting a reprint of House Document No. 416, Sixty-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDERSON of California: H. R. 1852. A bill for the relief of Fred Weybret, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1853. A bill for the relief of Fred Weybret, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1854. A bill for the relief of Walter M. Ziegler; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1855. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Laura McStay; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARRY: H. R. 1856. A bill for the relief of Francesco Antonio Pataca; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H.R. 1857. A bill for the relief of Abilio Pataca; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 1858. A bill for the relief of Gus Spano; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOEHNE: H. R. 1859. A bill for the relief of John E. Sandage; to the Committee on Claims.

H.R. 1860. A bill granting a pension to Lola Frances Sumner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions

H.R. 1861. A bill granting an increase of pension to Maggie Crist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1862. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Beard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1863. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Carlisle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1864. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah Conrad; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1865. A bill granting an increase of pension to Kate Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1866. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1867. A bill granting an increase of pension to Helen N. Peckinpaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1868. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ida I. Goldman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1869. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary P. Oliphant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1870. A bill granting an increase of pension to Lyda Powell; to the Committee

on Invalid Pensions. H.R. 1871. A bill granting a pension to Charles E. Curl; to the Committee on In-

valid Pensions.

H.R. 1872. A bill granting an increase of pension to John S. Nixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1873. A bill granting a pension to Josie Siessly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1874. A bill granting a pension to Ethel K. Massie; to the Committee on Pen-

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 1875. A bill to provide for the issuance of a license to practice the healing art in the District of Columbia to Dr. Peter Florey; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1876. A bill for the relief of Patrick James Durkin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H.R. 1877. A bill for the relief of Richard Matthew Hallinan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H.R. 1878. A bill for the relief of David A. Gould; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1879. A bill for the relief of Ambrose J. Murray; to the Committee on Military Affairs

H.R. 1880. A bill for the relief of Teresa Coyne, wido wof Michael Coyne; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H.R. 1881. A bill for the relief of Charles Werwinski: to the Committee on Naval Af-

H. R. 1882. A bill for the relief of Katharine W. Murray trust; to the Committee on Claims.

H.R. 1883. A bill for the relief of Llewella J. Welsh; to the Committee on Claims. H. R. 1884. A bill for the relief of James

E. Clark; to the Committee on Military Af-

H. R. 1885. A bill for the relief of Henry Bowden; to the Committee on Military Affairs

H.R. 1886. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Adamus; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1887. A bill for the relief of Joseph Kenney; to the Committee on Military Af-

H. R. 1888. A bill for the relief of Michael Walsh; to the Committee on Military Affairs

H. R. 1889. A bill for the relief of Anna Ferris; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1890. A bill for the relief of Mary Frost and Joseph F. Frost; to the Committee on Claims.

H.R. 1891. A bill granting a pension to Cuthbert W. Chesterfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1892. A bill granting a pension to Joseph L. Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions

H. R. 1893. A bill granting World War veterans' compensation to John Paszczuk; to the Committee on Pensions. H.R. 1894. A bill for the relief of John P.

Poluke; to the Committee on Military Af-

H. R. 1895. A bill for the relief of Thomas Coyne; to the Committee on Military

H.R. 1896. A bill for the relief of Ella F.

Guliek; to the Committee on War Claims.

H.R. 1897. A bill granting a renewal of patent. No. 1,327,755, relating to drawer or shelf lining; to the Committee on Patents. By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota:

H.R. 1898. A bill granting a pension to Marion L. Sargent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H. R. 1899. A bill for the relief of Nelv Keller: to the Committee on Invalid Pensions H.R. 1900. A bill for the relief of Reasor

Reed; to the Committee on Claims. H.R. 1901. A bill for the relief of Floyd Odom: to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1902. A bill for the relief of Albert D. Castleberry; to the Committee on Military

H. R. 1903. A bill for the relief of Reuben Owen; to the Committee on Claims.

H.R. 1904. A bill for the relief of Floyd Jones; to the Committee on Claims. By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 1905. A bill for the relief of Michael Lewenczuk; to the Committee on Claims.

H.R. 1906. A bill for the relief of Michael Lewenczuk and Stella Lewenczuk; to the Committee on War Claims.

H.R. 1907. A bill granting a pension to Clara E. Deane; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 1908. A bill for the relief of Clara E. Deane; to the Committee on War Claims. H. R. 1909. A bill for the relief of Clara E.

Deane; to the Committee on War Claims. H.R. 1910. A bill for the relief of George S.

Chapman; to the Committee on Military Affairs

H.R. 1911. A bill to provide for placing William H. Armstrong on the retired list of the United States Army as a captain, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs

H.R. 1912. A bill for the relief of Evan T. Elia; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CARLSON:

H. R. 1913. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Carrie Chouteau; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL:

H.R. 1914. A bill for the relief of the Coppel Coal Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H.R. 1915. A bill for the relief of James E. Butcher; to the Committee on Claims.

H.R. 1916. A bill granting an increase of pension to W. H. Robinson; to the Com-mittee on Pensions.

H. R. 1917. A bill for the relief of the survivors of Allan W. Macbeth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1918. A bill for the relief of Gilbert Dey; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1919. A bill granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Foughty; to the Com-

mittee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1920. A bill granting a pension to Debbie Klingler; to the Committee on In-

valid Pensions.

H. R. 1921. A bill granting an increase of pension to Eliza Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1922. A bill granting an increase of pension to Bertie L. Santee; to the Com-mittee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1923. A bill granting an increase of pension to Augusta Lambert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1924. A bill granting a pension to Emma Blosser; to the Committee on Invalid

H.R. 1925. A bill granting a pension to Amanda Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1926. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1927. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Shelton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1928. A bill granting an increase of pension to Eliza Noble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1929. A bill granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth B. Orndurf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1930. A bill granting a pension to Mary Emma Bussard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1931. A bill granting a pension to Edith Pyle; to the Committee on Invalid

H.R. 1932. A bill granting a pension to Willard Fulk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions

H. R. 1933. A bill for the relief of Bert and Marie Freeman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: H.R. 1934. A bill granting an increase of pension to Josephine Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1935. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Cline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1936. A bill granting an increase of pension to Maggie A. Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1937. A bill granting an increase of pension to Flora Gifford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1938. A bill granting an increase of pension to Adaline Loftus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1939. A bill granting an increase of pension to Matilda E. Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1940. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ida Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1941. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Westlake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1942. A bill granting an increase of pension to Belle C. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1943. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H.R. 1944. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 1945. A bill for the relief of Preston Lodge, No. 47, Ancient Free and Accepted Mason, of Jonesville, Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 1946. A bill for the relief of Jesse A. Lott; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOUSTON:

H. R. 1947. A bill for the relief of Merle (Mearl) Arthur Lewis; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia:

H. R. 1948. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah Roush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1949. A bill for the relief of Sherman W. White; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1950. A bill granting a pension to William W. Parsons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1951. A bill granting back pay to Auguste C. Loiseau; to the Committee on Claims. H.R. 1952. A bill for the relief of E. W. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

H.R. 1953. A bill for the relief of Robert C. Chaney; to the Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1954. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Bryant; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1955. A bill for the relief of James L. Barnett; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H.R. 1956. A bill granting a pension to Henry B. Lyons; to the Committee on Pen-

H.R. 1957. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Stagg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1958. A bill granting a pension to J. E. Barrows; to the Committee on Pensions.

H.R. 1959. A bill granting a pension to Clara L. Dolman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1960. A bill granting a pension to Josie Sebrell Rayburn; to the Committee on Pensions.

H.R. 1961. A bill for the relief of Rudolph Farcher; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1962. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1963. A bill to amend the military record of James Ledsome, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H.R. 1954. A bill for the relief of James Monroe Caplinger; to the Committee on Claims.

H.R. 1965. A bill granting a pension to Robert Melvin Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1966. A bill granting an increase of pension to Eddie L. Fetty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1967. A bill granting a pension to Hosea F. Dearth; to the Committee on Pen-

H.R. 1968. A bill granting a pension to Luther R. Drum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1969. A bill granting a pension to John E. Shepherd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1970. A bill granting a pension to Herman Meikle; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H.R. 1971. A bill granting a pension to Mary Pauline Payne; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1972. A bill granting a pension to Minnie L. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1973. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1974. A bill for the relief of William A. Wheeler; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1975. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nellie E. Dallas; to the Committee on Pensions.

H.R. 1976. A bill for the relief of J. W. and Robert W. Gillespie; to the Committee on Claims.

H.R. 1977. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. T. Earl Rodgers; to the Committee on Claims

H.R. 1978. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Lowe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1979. A bill granting a pension to Mary Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1980. A bill granting a pension to Mamie Cartmell; to the Committee on Invalid

H.R. 1981. A bill granting a pension to Charles Lycans; to the Committee on Pensions.

H.R. 1982. A bill granting a pension to Ruby McIntosh; to the Committee on Invalid

H.R. 1983. A bill granting a pension to Harold A. Staats; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 1984. A bill granting a pension to James C. Neff; to the Committee on Pensions. H. R. 1985. A bill for the relief of Robert R.

Trosper; to the Committee on Naval Affairs. H.R. 1986. A bill granting a pension to James R. Gibbs; to the Committee on Invalid

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 1987. A bill for the relief of Frank K. Manokoski; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY:

H.R. 1988. A bill for the relief of Albert Barrett; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1989. A bill for the relief of Garabed Meghrigian; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1990. A bill for the relief of Hemayak Meghrigian; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LESINSKI: H. R. 1991. A bill for the relief of Ludwig Baur; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1992. A bill for the relief of Rudolfo Kaufmann and his wife, Ellinor T. Kaufmann; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1993. A bill for the relief of Gertrud Selma Feuerring and sons Rafael and Joseph; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McGRANERY:
H. R. 1994. A bill granting a pension to Capt. Victor Gondos, Jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

H. R. 1995. A bill for the relief of Lyle L. Bressler; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1996. A bill for the relief of Frank Ernzen and Mary Ernzen; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1997. A bill for the relief of William T. J. Ryan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1998. A bill for the relief of Samuel M. Lipton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 1999. A bill for the relief of Roberta Muldrow Brow; to the Committee on Claims. H. R. 2000. A bill for the relief of Clarence W. Flowers; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2001. A bill granting an increase of pension to William E. McIntosh; to the Committee on Pensions.

H.R. 2002. A bill granting a pension to Samuel W. Mabrey; to the Committee on

Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 2003. A bill for the relief of Ellis Duke, also known as Elias Duke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H.R. 2004. A bill for the relief of Presly Holliday, quartermaster sergeant, Quartermaster Corps, on the retired list, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2005. A bill for the relief of Frank H. Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas:

H.R. 2006. A bill for the relief of Ben Torian; to the Committee on Claims.

H.R. 2007. A bill for the relief of William Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

H.R. 2008. A bill for the relief of Joe J. McDonald; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2009. A bill for the relief of J. N. Sutherland, Lula E. Lucus, W. E. Cooper, J. D. Wallace, and J. F. Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2010. A bill for the relief of Wade H. Erwin and Vonnie Erwin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 2011. A bill for the relief of Dan A. Tarpley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2012. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jemima Bason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan!

H. R. 2013. A bill for the relief of Michael Francis Spillane; to the Committee on Naval Affairs

By Mr. OLIVER:

H. R. 2014. A bill for the relief of Carl L. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

H.R. 2015. A bill for the relief of Joseph Petrin, Joseph A. Petrin, Rudolph Petrin, Angus LeBlanc, William J. Demelle, Samuel Fishman, and Hector LaPointe; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2016. A bill for the relief of Vincent and Gladys Gowen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PADDOCK:

H. R. 2017. A bill for the relief of Margaret Perry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2018. A bill granting a pension to Lu M. Linscott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2019. A bill granting a pension to Elsie M. Lum; to the Committee on Invalid Pen-

H.R. 2020. A bill granting a pension to Irene C. Flack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2021. A bill granting a pension to Margaret Haskin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 2022. A bill granting a pension to Kathryn E. Fraley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2023. A bill granting a pension to Ella E. Huffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2024. A bill granting a pension to Ida Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 2025. A bill granting a pension to

Clara L. Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 2026. A bill granting a pension to Olivia Stebbins; to the Committee on Invalid

Pensions. H. R. 2027. A bill granting a pension to May Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pen-

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 2028. A bill for the relief of William H. Gotschall; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICH:

H. R. 2029. A bill granting a pension to Elizabeth Ann Wertz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 2030. A bill granting a pension to Grace V. Newman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2031. A bill granting a pension to Thomas J. McWilliams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions

H. R. 2032. A bill granting a pension to Lily C. Kearn; to the Committee on Invalid Pen-

H.R. 2033. A bill granting a pension to Laura McBride; to the Committee on Invalid

H.R. 2034. A bill granting a pension to Mary J. Miracle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2035. A bill granting a pension to Cora Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pen-

H.R. 2036. A bill granting a pension to Louisa J. Humphrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2037. A bill granting a pension to Elizabeth Walker; to the Committee on Pen-

H. R. 2038. A bill granting a pension to Orla T. Pletcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2039. A bill granting a pension to Margaret O. Hoffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2040. A bill granting a pension to Mary V. Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2041. A bill granting a pension to Harriett Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2042. A bill granting a pension to Maretta Anna Booher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 2043. A bill granting a pension to Marion Gregory; to the Committee on Invalid

H. R. 2044. A bill granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Kent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 2045. A bill granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2046. A bill granting an increase of pension to Lydia J. Allard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2047. A bill granting an increase of pension to Blanche S. Keyes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions

H.R. 2048. A bill granting a pension to Narcissa Walter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 2049. A bill granting a pension to Nancy Jane Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 2050. A bill granting a pension to Florence Bonnell; to the Committee on Invalid "ensions.

H.R.2051. A bill granting a pension to orinda V. Smith; to the Committee on Dorinda V. Invalid pensions.

H.R. 2052. A bill granting a pension to William Frederick Kildow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 2053. A bill granting a pension to Georgia Hupp Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 2054. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Ben White, Arch Robinson, Lee Wells, W. S. Wells, A. J. McLaren, A. D. Barkelew, Oscar Clayton, R. L. Culpepper, W. B. Edwards, the estate of John McLaren, the estate of C. E. Wells, and the estate of Theodore Bowen; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2055. A bill for the relief of Genevieve Travis: to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 2056. A bill for the relief of the L. J. Houze Convex Glass Co.; to the Committee

H. R. 2057. A bill granting an increase of pension to Amand J. Keslar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 2058. A bill granting an increase of pension to Frances K. Knoblock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2059. A bill granting a pension to Ida Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. H.R. 2060. A bill granting an increase of Pension to Sarah Vantuyl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 2061. A bill granting a pension to Lydia E. Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky: H. R. 2062. A bill granting an increase of pension to Burley L. Van Fleet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 2063. A bill granting an increase of pension to William H. Shanklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 2064. A bill granting a pension to Jamaica Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid

H. R. 2065. A bill granting a pension to Laura C. Clarke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 2066. A bill granting a pension to Luther Skaggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H.R. 2067. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Hancock, administratrix of the estate of Arch F. Hancock: to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2068. A bill for the relief of Charles Arrington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2069. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Edmund P. Lee: to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 2070. A bill for the relief of William W. Addis; to the Committee on Claims.

H.R. 2071. A bill for the relief of W. H. Rabold, Sr., administrator of the estate of Raphael Fred Rabold; to the Committee on

H. R. 2072. A bill to authorize the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor for dis-tinguished service to Pleas Sanders; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHELCHEL:

H. R. 2073. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clifford D. Barber; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

19. By Mr. FLAHERTY: Petition of the Painters Local Union, No. 11, Boston, Mass., requesting that all possible effort be made to oppose and defeat the Smith bill now pending before the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Labor.

20. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the City Council of the City of Cranston, opposing legislation subjecting municipal bonds to Federal taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

21. By Mr. HOOK: Petition of Taino Kaugau and 90 others for Work Projects Administration road project for Houghton and Ontonagon Counties in the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Appropriations.

22. By Mr. LEAVY: Resolution of the Okanogan Grange, No. 1103, on December 18, 1940, urging that embargo be placed on the further importation of apples and pears into this country, pointing out that surpluses are being very considerably increased by reason of the importation of these products, and reciting that complete demoralization of the specialized fruit areas, orchards, and irrigation projects, as well as general business in these districts, will result if action is not taken promptly; to the Committee on Agriculture.

23. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petitions submitted by Mrs. Ocie R. Brown, of New Philadelphia, Ohio, president of the Tuscarawas County (Ohio) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, signed by members of said organization, urging the continuation of the Dies investigating committee and an appropriation of \$1,000,000 to carry on its work; to the Committee on Rules.

24. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the board of trustees of the village of Mineola, N. Y., stating that the village of Mineola does vigorously oppose any attempt by the Federal Government to remove the present exemp-tions now existing in favor of municipal securities, either of the State, county, or local government; to the Committee on Ways and

25. Also, resolution of the Woman's Club, of Larchmont, N. Y., stating that the Woman's Club of Larchmont, N. Y., goes on record as favoring the rescinding of the Johnson Act, the revision of the Neutrality Act, and the revision of the German-American Friendship Treaty of 1921 in order to combat subversive activities motivated by German propaganda; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

26. Also, resolution of the Hudson Falls Post, No. 574, American Legion, New York, stating that that post advocates immediate material aid to Great Britain and her allies and to the Republic of China; and urging that the Government of the United States take all necessary measures promptly to insure the utmost productivity of our factories for the furnishing of supplies to nations at war with the totalitarian powers and for the increase of our Navy and Army for the protection and defense of our own country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following

O gracious Father of mankind, let wisdom broaden with the day and reverence crown all earnest minds. By Thy presence disturb us with a most serious sense of our responsibility as we turn to Thee praying for deepening fellowship, uniting us in a common task. Let there prevail in the Congress a union of thought, a union of interest, a union of purpose, and a union of mutual respect. Blessed Lord, we pray that we may gather inspiration from the prophets of old; somewhere they found strength, for they were men with a message, with a purpose, and men with a spirit; thus they changed cruel hardship into redeeming power. They took the serpent, coiled and poisonous, and, becoming a rod, it lifted the world and rolled it in its course.

Almighty God, look upon our Republic; fill it with more trust and earnestness, less folly, and less feverish craving for place. Forbid that our cherished institutions should ever be crushed into the slave-made framework of political, social, and religious tyranny, and there shall come to the world's dark verge of life the light of a new day. Hold our parenthood to the firm realization that home in its origin is meant to preserve the finest elements and richness of Christian life, becoming the first sanctuary, the first altar, and the first schoolhouse. Again we pray: God bless America, leading her on, putting forth her hand until the serpent shall become a rod. Through self-assertion and selfsacrifice, oh, lead us on; and at the end of the road Thou wilt be there. In our Saviour's name. Amen.