

1059. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the State Lands Commission of the State of California, protesting against moves by certain people to get the sanction of the President of the United States for filing court proceedings on behalf of the United States against the State of California and those holding under and subservient to the State of California, with the object of taking from the State of California submerged lands in and on the coast of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1060. Also, resolution of the Downey Chamber of Commerce, relative to the location of free ways for the transportation of defense materials, along the Los Angeles River, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1061. Also, petition of the Tahoe-Pacific Highway 20 Association, California, wherein they request Congress to appropriate the millions necessary for strategic highway repair in the State of California because they feel that the people of California should not be required to pay the usual share percentage of such costs because of the fact that national-defense engineers have estimated that this great amount of work should be done, and that it should be considered strictly as a national-defense necessity; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1062. By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Petition of citizens of Rochester, N. Y., urging enactment of legislation to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1063. By Mr. PADDOCK: Petition of 25 citizens of the State of Illinois, protesting against the enactment of House bill 4000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1064. By Mr. RICH: Petition of sundry citizens of Bradford, Pa., opposing Senate bill 860 and House bill 4000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1065. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Petition of more than 5,000 citizens of the State of Ohio, opposing convoy of American ships or ships of foreign flags by the United States Navy, and opposing the entry of this country, with any part of the armed forces of the United States, into any foreign war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1066. By Mr. STEVENSON: Petition of Nellie Zeeh and 200 other voters of Wauzeka, Wis., registering unalterable opposition to any act by this Government leading to any war other than to repel an invasion of our country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1067. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Petition of 25 citizens of Hunterdon County, N. J., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860 and House bill 4000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1068. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Evangelical Lutheran New York Conference, Jamestown, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to foreign affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1069. Also, petition of the Industrial Union Council, of Tarentum, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 4139, known as the Vinson bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1070. Also, petition of the Lions Club, of Austin, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to foreign affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1071. Also, petition of the Texas Cotton Ginners' Association, Dallas, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Russell amendment and the cotton-marketing program for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1072. Also, petition of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Kansas City, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to antistrike legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1073. Also, petition of the State land commission of Sacramento, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to submerged lands of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 15, 1941

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 8, 1941)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O merciful God, Father of mankind, Lord of all things in heaven and earth, the land, the sea and all that therein is: Give us the strength to live this day in accordance with Thy will for us, in soundness of heart, integrity of purpose, and with faith in our fellowmen.

Help us to live so honestly and fearlessly that nothing shall be able to deprive us of the joy of conscious integrity, or cause us to prove recreant to the trust imposed by our high calling. Grant to each one of us some new vision of Thy truth, that, in obedience to the teachings of Thy blessed Son, we may help to build a new life of love in which the ills of our social order and the anguish of our war-torn world shall disappear, looking to the dawn of brotherhood and mutual service. Reveal to us Thy will, O God, and teach us how to do it, that, in striving for the highest good, we may grow nearer each day to the fullness of the stature of Him, in whom all things are perfected, Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Wednesday, May 14, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McGill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4590) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Brooks	Connally
Aiken	Brown	Danaher
Andrews	Bulow	Davis
Austin	Bunker	Downey
Bailey	Burton	Ellender
Ball	Butler	George
Bankhead	Byrd	Gerry
Barbour	Byrnes	Gillette
Barkley	Capper	Glass
Bilbo	Chandler	Green
Brewster	Clark, Idaho	Guffey
Bridges	Clark, Mo.	Gurney

Hatch	Maloney	Stewart
Hayden	Mead	Taft
Herring	Murdock	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Holman	Norris	Tobey
Hughes	O'Mahoney	Truman
Johnson, Calif.	Overton	Tunnell
Johnson, Colo.	Pepper	Tydings
Kilgore	Radcliffe	Vandenberg
La Follette	Reynolds	Van Nuys
Langer	Rosier	Wallgren
Lee	Russell	Walsh
Lodge	Schwartz	Wheeler
Lucas	Shipstead	White
McCarran	Smathers	Wiley
McFarland	Smith	Willis
McNary	Spencer	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is absent from the Senate because of a death in her family.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is detained on important public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is attending the commissioning of the battleship U. S. S. *Washington* and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, LEGISLATIVE ESTABLISHMENT (S. Doc. No. 53)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, under the Architect of the Capitol, for maintenance of Senate Office Building, in the amount of \$27,900 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ARMY MAIL CLERKS AND ASSISTANTS

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the designation of Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AWARDS OF CONTRACTS FOR THE NAVY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to divisions of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Frieda Lohse, of Holmdel, N. J., remonstrating against involvement in war and the use of United States armed ships to convoy vessels through war zones; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter from the secretary of the New York Conference of the Lutheran Augustana Synod in convention assembled at Erie, Pa., embodying a resolution adopted by the conference protesting against the use of United States warships as convoys and also against involvement in foreign war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter from the executive officer of the State Lands Commission of California, Sacramento, Calif., transmitting a resolution adopted by the commission protesting against the United States attempting to assume jurisdiction over State-owned tide and submerged lands in California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Phillips County, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A memorial of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against the conveying of vessels by United States armed ships through war zones, or any involvement in war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of the Congressional Districts Modification League (national headquarters, Washington, D. C.), praying for the enactment of legislation legalizing lotteries under Federal control; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AID TO THE BLIND—RESOLUTION OF THE ILLINOIS LEGISLATURE

Mr. BROOKS. I present for printing in the Record and appropriate reference House Joint Resolution No. 29, adopted by the Sixty-second General Assembly of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress to amend the Social Security Act in such manner as to prohibit the Social Security Board from disapproving any State plan for aid to the blind on the ground that such plan permits and encourages the blind to contribute to their own support, by earnings and income in addition to the State grant, without suffering a corresponding reduction in the amount of the State grant, or on the ground that the property, income, or other requirements in the State plan are too liberal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution presented by the Senator from Illinois will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and printed in the Record, under the rule.

The resolution is as follows:

House Joint Resolution 29

Whereas the Federal Social Security Board has construed section 1002 (a) and other sections of the Social Security Act as authorizing such Board to veto any State plan for aid to the blind which such Board regards as treating the blind too generously; and

Whereas such Board in construing such sections has insisted that the States do not retain the power under the Social Security Act to determine, by statutory standards,

what blind persons are in need and shall be eligible for assistance under any State plan for aid to the blind; and

Whereas the Board has insisted that State plans be so administered that blind recipients will be constantly under the dictation and domination of social workers in the management of their conduct and funds; and

Whereas such Board has insisted that recipients of blind aid under a State plan be not allowed to earn any money in addition to the amount of such aid; and

Whereas all of such positions taken by the Social Security Board are in patent abrogation of the stated purpose of the Social Security Act, namely, to enable the States to make adequate provision for their blind citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the senate concurring herein), That the President and Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend the Social Security Act in such manner as to prohibit the Social Security Board from disapproving any State plan for aid to the blind on the ground that such plan permits and encourages the blind to contribute to their own support, by earnings and income in addition to the State grant, without suffering a corresponding reduction in the amount of the State grant, or on the ground that the property, income, or other requirements in the State plan are too liberal; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States and to all of the Members of Congress from the State of Illinois.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 346. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to dispose of certain public vessels, and for other purposes, with amendments (Rept. No. 285);

S. 347. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to issue the Navy Expeditionary Medal to certain Army and civilian personnel, without amendment (Rept. No. 286);

S. 992. A bill to amend sections 4613 and 4614 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to include capture of aircraft as prizes of war, without amendment (Rept. No. 287);

S. 1074. A bill for the relief of Austin L. Tierney, without amendment (Rept. No. 288);

S. 1458. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a fuel depot at Middle and Orchard Points, Wash., without amendment (Rept. No. 289);

H. R. 2107. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell equipment and supplies to and perform work for the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, without amendment (Rept. No. 290); and

H. R. 4105. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange certain equipment in part payment for new equipment of the same or similar character, without amendment (Rept. No. 291).

By Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1438. A bill to extend the operations of the Disaster Loan Corporation and the Electric Home and Farm Authority, to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes, with amendments (Rept. No. 292).

By Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 179. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Nichols, without amendment (Rept. No. 293);

H. R. 250. An act for the relief of Otto Meyer and Leigh Kelly, without amendment (Rept. No. 294);

H. R. 816. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain members or former members of the United States Coast Guard (formerly the Bureau of Lighthouses) for the value of personal effects lost in the hurricane of September 21, 1938, at several light stations on the coast of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York, without amendment (Rept. No. 295);

H. R. 188. A bill for the relief of Maj. R. Lee, with an amendment (Rept. No. 296); and

H. R. 768. A bill for the relief of William E. Thomas, with an amendment (Rept. No. 297).

By Mr. SCHWARTZ, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 713. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Hessman; without amendment (Rept. No. 298); and

H. R. 4073. A bill for the relief of Marijo McMillan Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 299).

By Mr. BROOKS, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 851. A bill for the relief of Edson E. Downs; without amendment (Rept. No. 300);

H. R. 926. A bill for the relief of Hazen G. Chamberlain, M. D., and Cuba Memorial Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 301);

H. R. 1731. A bill for the relief of Beulah Bell Nolte and George C. Nolte; without amendment (Rept. No. 302); and

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; without amendment (Rept. No. 303).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1142. A bill for the relief of J. Mae Chambers and Retta E. Hultgren; without amendment (Rept. No. 304); and

S. 1156. A bill for the relief of Jess W. Harmon; with an amendment (Rept. No. 305).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 820. A bill for the relief of Emiliano Lopez and Eliza R. Lopez; without amendment (Rept. No. 306); and

H. R. 3309. A bill for the relief of Louis J. Banderet; without amendment (Rept. No. 307).

By Mr. AUSTIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution extending the application of section 6 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the strengthening of the national defense," approved July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), to all Territories, dependencies, and possessions of the United States, including the Philippine Islands, the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 308).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 4534. A bill to amend the act approved June 28, 1940, entitled "An act to expedite the national defense, and for other purposes," in order to extend the power to establish priorities and allocate material; with amendments (Rept. No. 309).

By Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 879. A bill relating to certain Carey Act lands in Wyoming; with an amendment (Rept. No. 310).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unani-

mous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1520. A bill relating to the appointment of clerks for United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 1521. A bill to provide that the Navy ration shall include canned or powdered or concentrated fruit juices; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1522. A bill to change the name of the Santa Rosa Island National Monument to Santa Rosa Island National Recreational Area; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 1523. A bill for the relief of the Portland Sportswear Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1524. A bill to authorize the deferment of men by age group or groups under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim October 9 as Leif Erikson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4590) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENTS TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WHEELER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$500,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, for the commencement of construction of transmission lines, substations, and other facilities for the Fort Peck reclamation project, Montana, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4590, the Interior Department appropriation bill, fiscal year 1942, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4590, the Interior Department appropriation bill, fiscal year 1942, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 65, after line 11, to insert the following:

"Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma:

"Dormitory facilities, Jones Academy, \$75,000."

On page 65, line 21, after the semicolon, to insert the following:

"Dormitory facilities (Fort Sill School), \$75,000."

"Dormitory (Riverside School), \$75,000."

PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC FARM COMMODITIES

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate completed action on Senate Joint Resolution 60, relating to certain phases of agricultural legislation. In that measure it was provided that loans might be made on certain farm commodities up to 85 percent of parity price. There is no law by which we can determine parity prices; so, in

order that we may have some official statement, I have prepared a resolution reciting certain facts in the preamble and then providing as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be authorized and requested to hold immediate hearings on the question of parity prices on necessary and essential farm commodities, and that at the earliest convenient date the said Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be requested to report to the Senate the result of its investigation.

Mr. President, all the resolution asks is that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be authorized to proceed at once to investigate how parity prices are determined, and then, after the investigation is made, to report its findings to the Senate. At this time I submit the resolution. If there is no objection, I ask that the resolution be agreed to at this time, so that the committee may act on it immediately.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think probably that resolution should go to the committee and let the committee report it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I have no objection to that procedure, if the request be made. The only reason I suggested the procedure I did is that the resolution seeks to authorize and request the committee to act immediately.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; but it is usual that resolutions of this sort go to the committee, and that the committee then report back to the Senate. I think that is the better practice.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I have no objection. The same purpose will be accomplished either way. I submit the resolution and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The resolution (S. Res. 117) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas the United States is now experiencing a major national emergency; and

Whereas in such emergency it is deemed absolutely necessary that all vital interests and necessary groups be protected, promoted, and placed on sound financial and economic basis; and

Whereas in this emergency agriculture is one if not the most important interest; and

Whereas our farmers are in a most deplorable financial and economic condition due to the existing low commodity prices, which are far below parity in relation to the things which farmers must of necessity purchase; and

Whereas taxes, interest, and debts cannot be paid and the Budget cannot be balanced until our farmers receive at least parity prices for the things they produce and the Nation must have; and

Whereas there has been recently a rise in the price of commodities, but still present prices are far below parity; and

Whereas there has just been held in Washington a conference of commissioners, secretaries, and directors of agriculture representing a majority of the States of the Nation; and

Whereas in such conference the following resolution was adopted:

"Believing that agriculture is entitled to equal protection as the foundation upon which our national defense must be sup-

ported, and that it should be assured complete equality with industry and with labor;

"And believing that those agricultural commodities which are traded in on the commodity exchange is the least number of agricultural products that should be assured parity prices in the domestic market;

"And believing that the domestic prices on these products should be protected by a tariff or excise tax on competing imports to the extent that the landed cost equals parity plus 10 percent;

"And believing that the surpluses of those products of which we produce more than our domestic requirements be sold in the world markets at world prices and thus put the American farmer in a position to vigorously compete in the world markets to regain their rightful position to share in the commerce of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urgently request the Congress to provide the means by which the farmers of the Nation be paid full parity prices on their products consumed in the domestic market.

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Senate and House"; and

Whereas the public press reports that the responsible officials of the Agriculture Department are opposed to full parity prices on agricultural products and are insisting that prices should be fixed and stabilized around the present price levels; and

Whereas official representatives of the farmers, recognizing the present high level of prices of the things which farmers must purchase, are of the opinion that the fixing and stabilizing of farm prices around the present levels would mean ruin and disaster for our farmers and the agricultural interests of our Nation; and

Whereas no satisfactory formula for the fixing of true parity prices for agricultural products has as yet been formulated, hence, true parity prices have not as yet been fixed; and

Whereas it is the conviction of farmers and the representatives of the farmers that under the present general system of prices farmers must have at least the minimum prices on basic farm commodities as follows: Cotton, 25 cents per pound; wheat, \$1.50 per bushel; corn, \$1 per bushel; oats, 50 cents per bushel; hogs, \$12 per hundredweight; and cattle, \$13 per hundredweight; and comparable prices on other necessary farm products; and

Whereas in this emergency it is deemed necessary that a formula for the fixing of parity prices should be developed and announced; and

Whereas the public national interest demands that no agency of the Government should assume or undertake the task of fixing maximum prices on necessary agricultural products below the parity prices for such products; and

Whereas both Democratic and Republican Parties have repeatedly resolved:

(a) That farmers should have prices in excess of costs on basic farm products;

(b) That farmers should have full benefits of domestic markets; and

(c) That farmers should be placed on the basis of economic equality with other basic industries: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be authorized and requested to hold immediate hearings on the question of parity prices on necessary and essential farm commodities, and that at the earliest convenient date the said Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be requested to report to the Senate the result of its investigation; be it further

Resolved, That pending such investigation and report no agency of the Government

should assume to exercise power in undertaking to fix maximum prices on any essential farm commodity.

ANNIVERSARIES OF PAPAL ENCYCLICALS ON THE RIGHTS OF LABOR

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, next week is the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the issuance of one of the most remarkable papers of modern times. I have prepared a brief statement with reference to it. In order to conserve time, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be published at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

Catholics throughout the Nation are celebrating this month the anniversaries of two famous papal encyclicals on the rights of labor.

One of these celebrations will be held in my home State at Saint Ambrose College, Davenport, Iowa, next Thursday, May 22. This is the fiftieth anniversary of the famous encyclical of Pope Leo XIII on the condition of the working classes. A half century ago Pope Leo gave to the civilized world the most important, the most far-reaching, and the most helpful declaration ever written on the subject. Nearly 3 years ago in a public address I tried to emphasize the need for those outside the Catholic Church to give careful study to this vital document and the particular need of study and of adherence to its wise recommendations and provisions.

Never in our national history has it been more important than it is today for us to review carefully this subject and to consider its implications. Pope Leo a half century ago brilliantly foresaw the conditions which we face in our own generation. While the document, when issued, was primarily concerned with the condition of the working classes and emphasized an appeal to leaders of industry, controlling the destinies of millions of working families, to give most generous consideration to the rights and working conditions for laboring people, yet Pope Leo also foresaw the tremendous power and influence which would probably develop in the hands of leaders of labor and strongly directed attention to the wise and proper use of this power.

Pope Leo's was by far the strongest voice that had been raised to insist on the fundamental basic rights of the workman—the right to organize and bargain collectively through his own chosen representatives for these basic principles, for proper living conditions, and for the living wage. But he at the same time admonished labor leaders as to the tremendous responsibility which they owed to the great mass of workers whom they represented, to the industrial leaders with whom they were to deal, and to the general public whose interest must always be a factor in negotiations. He expressly cautioned that, with the acquisition of just rights, labor also must assume the added responsibilities.

It is fitting that the Congress of a great democracy should pay tribute and again should direct the attention of our people to this great instrument which now, a half century later, has become even more potentially a guide and an admonition for our conduct. Today, as never before, when the welfare and security of our Nation is dependent upon unselfish cooperation between and among governmental agencies, labor, capital, agriculture, and the general public, and with the need for the elimination of industrial strife and destructive methods of conflict, we should join wholeheartedly in the fiftieth anniversary of the events to which I have referred.

Pope Leo addressed his appeal to all of the world. It was not particularly directed to those of his own religious faith or alone to the adherents of the Roman Catholic Church. It

was a truly democratic appeal in every implication of the word. He envisioned a greater world by the adoption of the Golden Rule philosophy spoken by the Master and its use in our human relationships, especially in making secure the full rights of the workman in industry and the concomitant acceptance by labor and its leaders of their full share of responsibility for the public welfare.

ADDRESS BY BROOKS L. VINCENT ON HOSPITALS AND THEIR PLACE IN OUR SOCIAL SCHEME

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on Hospitals and Their Place in Our Social Scheme, delivered by Brooks L. Vincent on May 12, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TIME HAS COME—EDITORIAL FROM SHREVEPORT TIMES

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Times of Sunday, May 11, 1941, entitled "The Time Has Come," which appears in the Appendix.]

ACQUISITION AND USE OF MERCHANT VESSELS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4466) to authorize the acquisition by the United States of title to or the use of domestic or foreign merchant vessels for urgent needs of commerce and national defense, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I rise to make a statement to the Senate with reference to my interest in the matter of convoys, and my strong opposition thereto.

I am convinced that the overwhelming sentiment in this country is strongly opposed to our becoming involved in war, and to convoys, which the President says mean war.

In order to insure a decisive victory in this fight against convoys, I shall present the issue for a Senate roll-call vote under a procedure which will not confuse it with the issues involved in the pending ship-seizure bill.

A substantial number of Senators who are opposed to the ship-seizure bill and also opposed to convoys have urged me not to offer the anticonvoy resolution as an amendment to this particular bill, because then their votes against the bill as a whole would necessarily be votes against the convoy prohibition, it having become a part of the bill by amendment.

Another substantial group of Senators who supported the lend-lease bill, and who intend to vote in favor of the ship-seizure bill, are nevertheless opposed to convoys. They have advised me that they would prefer to have the convoy resolution acted upon separately, so as not to delay consideration of the ship-seizure bill for many days.

Of even greater importance is the decision of the President to postpone last night's talk for 2 weeks. This scheduled talk of the President had been played up for days in advance announcements by those close to the President, and it was stated that the President would take a strong and definite stand in favor of con-

voys. The abrupt cancelation of the talk, with the announcement that the President would speak 2 weeks hence, indicates that the letters in tremendous and increasing volume from the people to the White House and to Senators are acting as a definite check on the President.

If the postponement of his speech means that in his talk of May 27 the President will make a clear-cut statement in opposition to convoys, we shall be satisfied. If, on the other hand, the President comes out for convoys in this talk 2 weeks hence, or in the interim makes any move in favor of convoys, I shall forthwith introduce my anticonvoy resolution under a procedure which will afford full debate and a roll-call vote on the sole issue of convoys or no convoys.

The anticonvoy sentiment has already demonstrated its strength. It is ever-increasing; and by the time the President makes his postponed speech it will have reached a peak of overwhelming opposition.

Mr. President, I read an article published in this morning's Washington Times-Herald:

CONVOYS, A. E. F. SWAMPED IN POLL—92 PERCENT AGAINST GUARDING CARGOES

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., May 14.—Overwhelming opposition to convoys and to sending American troops overseas is expressed by readers of the Indianapolis News in response to a ballot published in last Saturday's editions. Returns from the poll were tabulated today.

The tabulation shows that 92 percent of those who responded are against the use of the United States Navy to convoy ships carrying war supplies to Great Britain and 8 percent are in favor.

In answering the second question, "Do you favor the United States entering the war and the sending of our troops abroad?", 95 percent of the votes were in the negative and 5 percent in the affirmative.

The replies came from a cross-section of central Indiana, including Indianapolis and surrounding cities, towns, and suburban areas.

The ballot was published at the suggestion of readers of a discussion carried on in parallel columns by the Indiana Committee for National Defense and the America First Committee. Neither committee had anything to do with the printing of the ballots.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Concord Monitor and New Hampshire Patriot of May 12, 1941, written by the editor, James M. Langley. In my judgment, it is a remarkable editorial. It is entitled "Is There No Honesty?"

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

IS THERE NO HONESTY?

When the President, at the press conference at which he announced inauguration of the naval patrol system, said that "convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war," he only said what the majority of the American people believe. For that reason many an American views with alarm the activities of the administration since, for immediately following the President's patrol announcement members of the Cabinet and others close to the President began a deliberate speaking campaign, with the President's knowledge, designed to work up public opinion to the point of approving convoys. Actually, if

what the President himself said was true, the agitation led by Secretaries Knox, Stimson, Hull, and Wickard is for immediate entrance of the United States into war.

Once more, as so often in the past 2 years, the real issue is beclouded by administration resort to devious methods. The administration spokesmen do not use the word "convoy." They do not use the word "war." They talk instead of delivering the goods, of aid to Britain, of loss of ships carrying American cargoes to England. In not coming clean the administration leaders are aided and abetted by various civil groups and opposed by others. The great body of American citizens, however, remain unrepresented in this controversy except by their President, and their Congress, and so it is to the administration that they should and do look for guidance.

What are the people of the United States to believe about the good faith of the President and his administration leaders? Only last fall, when he wanted so badly to be re-elected as President, he broadcast this statement of his position:

"I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again, your boys are not going to be sent to any foreign war."

This Nation can, of course, be taken into an undeclared war without action by Congress, as the Constitution provides. Do the American people wish to go to war without a formal declaration of their purposes? Congress can even participate in such an informal entrance into war, though in the past its actions on the whole, with the exception of the lease-lend bill, have been designed to avoid "incidents" which would precipitate war without declaration. To project this country into war without a congressional vote upon actual declaration of war would be a betrayal of both the President's promises to the American people both before and since his most recent election and of the rights of the people as contained in the constitutional provision that only Congress can declare war.

Suppose the American people had reached the point of supporting a declaration of war. Against whom would it be made? Would we declare war against Germany alone? Or would we declare war against Japan, too, and Italy, and Russia, her open ally, and all the 14 nations subjugated by Hitler conquests? How would we fight this war, whether it be against Germany alone, or against Germany and all her allies?

If the administration felt that Congress, supported by the American people, would support a declaration of war, its spokesmen would not now be trying so earnestly to convince the Nation that we have reached the moment when we must change our minds. The President, in that situation, would probably ask for a formal declaration of war by Congress. Lacking assurances that such a declaration is forthcoming if requested, the administration is obviously trying to create a situation in which the Congress and the people have no choice in the matter. In doing so the administration is creating distrust among the American people in their own Government, at the very moment when, if the administration has its way and war is to be actively invited, the people should be united in their convictions and solidly supporting the administration's course. Successful wars cannot be fought by a disunited people who feel their leaders have betrayed them.

It is not pleasant to say all these things, but too many Americans feel as we do to let these facts go unstated. The time may come when this Nation must become involved in the war, even when it still is unprepared as to equipment, but that time is not yet. When it arrives, if it does, we shall have no regrets and what we can do we will do to make the American cause victorious. That is the spirit of most Americans. But these same Americans dislike a leadership which avows non-aggression and then secretly prods its hired men into efforts to stir the people to a frenzy in favor of intervention.

All Americans ask is common honesty by their leaders.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point certain data and communications bearing on the matter of convoys.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SAN MATEO, CALIF., May 11, 1941.

Senator TOBEY,

Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As World War veteran with 22 months' service, congratulate you on speech. We must keep out of this war at all costs.

FRANK F. WALKER.

NASHUA, N. H., May 7, 1941.

Senator TOBEY,

DEAR SIR: I know you will not crucify the mothers. We are depending on you.

Respectfully,

Mrs. E. PEDERZANI.

MANCHESTER NICKEL PLATING CO.,

Manchester, N. H.

Hon. CHARLES TOBEY,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: May God bless you and give you strength and health to carry on in this great and noble effort you so courageously are fighting.

I know and feel that the majority of the people are on your side of the convoy issue; we in this country need more men like you, that will not be swayed by the pressure group to love Europe before our own country. The peace or war of Europe is not the concern of our Congress.

Sincerely yours,

TIMOTHY D. SULLIVAN.

SANBORN SEMINARY,

Kingston, N. H., May 8, 1941.

The Honorable CHARLES W. TOBEY,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: My congratulations for your outstanding work in opposition to convoys and war. Keep it up. One hundred million true Americans are behind you. We must not let an organized minority lead us into war.

Please do not take the time to answer this letter. You have more important work to do.

Let's keep this country out of war!

Very truly yours,

JESSE B. FLANSBURG.

WINCHESTER, N. H., May 8, 1941.

The Honorable CHARLES W. TOBEY,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: We are grateful for your courageous efforts to keep us out of the European war. There are thousands of us, whose families have fought in every war in which our country has ever engaged, who are praying that we may not be forced into this one.

A small articulate group might try to make it appear otherwise. I belong to many women's organizations and I am convinced that most women do not approve our participation in the present war.

Yours truly,

GRACE W. PITCHER.

MANCHESTER, N. H., May 8, 1941.

Hon. CHAS. W. TOBEY,

Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Please oppose the use of our ships as convoy for war supplies to Britain or other belligerent nations.

Keep the United States out of war.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. CLARA G. BETTEY.

NASHUA, N. H., May 10, 1941.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Statistics show that you are firmly against convoys.

I believe that your stand is the only way to avert war.

We all know that convoying will lead us to war, and no loyal American wants war.

We can thank God that we in New Hampshire have a Representative who thinks more of the welfare of America than he does of England.

So keep up the good work, Senator.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH DUMONT.

ST. PAUL'S METHODIST CHURCH,
Manchester, N. H., April 21, 1941.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: It does us good to see you in the Senate and to have you as our representative.

You do not wait to see the possible trend of opinion before making up your mind. Would that there were more like you in the Congress of the United States.

Stand firm. Even though you should be continually voted down, you can safely leave the judgment to be passed on your stand to a few years in the future.

We are very much afraid that men, presumably strong men, at Washington are becoming hysterical. And that is not a good kind of men to have at the head of affairs. And we have a right to be afraid. But we are less afraid when we see you standing in the midst of them like an oak in the midst of lesser trees in the forest.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. LOWTHER.

CLAREMONT, N. H., May 12, 1941.

SENATOR CHARLES W. TOBEY: A vote to support you on anticonvoy roll call. Hoping there are enough high-minded, courageous Americans to stand by you in this hour of subterfuge, hypocrisy, and lies in our own Halls of Congress.

C. R. HUDSON.

DERRY, N. H., May 8, 1941.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,

United States Senator, New Hampshire,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I do not think that it is to this country's best interests to convoy ships, and I desire that you do everything in your power to keep the United States out of war by voting against this measure.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. WM. MACDONALD.

MARY MACDONALD.

W. H. MACDONALD.

HANOVER, N. H., May 7, 1941.

Senator TOBEY,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I want to congratulate you on your antiwar stand. I was very much impressed by your speech here. I hope you continue to do your best to beat that willful but powerful minority that is intent on sending America to war.

Respectfully,

GEORGE BENZ.

DERRY, N. H., May 8, 1941.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,

United States Senator, New Hampshire,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I do not think that it is to this country's best interests to convoy ships, and I desire that you do everything in your power to keep the United States out of war by voting against this measure.

Very truly yours,

RUTH M. GOODCHILD.

More power to you, Honorable and Dear Sir, in your difficult and courageous efforts to keep our country from plunging into the

abyss of war. May your stalwart Americanism know no weakening. The vociferous small minority clamors for war and chaos, but the inarticulate millions are with you and the other patriots.

More power to you, and God bless you.
Rev. J. G. LECLERC.
MANCHESTER, N. H., May 9, 1941.

FRANKLIN, N. H., May 9, 1941.
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As a citizen of the State of New Hampshire I desire to express my admiration in your stand regarding convoys. I feel that we should give all aid to Great Britain in their fight against Hitler, but I am not in favor of this country getting into war. It would seem that the administration in Washington is doing its best to get us into the war by their actions. What we heard before election seems to have now been forgotten at this time.

I hope your efforts will not be in vain and I wish you success in this matter.

FRANK T. RIPLEY.

PLYMOUTH, N. H., May 8, 1941.
Senator TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I, as thousands of other fathers of our country, have been watching the events of the world very closely. We thought, surely, after the President promised very strenuously that no American boy should be sent into any foreign war that our boys were safe. But what are we going to do? We criticize some other countries for being faithless with their boys and misrepresenting things to the common people. This very thing makes us lose confidence in the leaders of our country. If our leaders, with Mr. Churchill, thought it wise for Poland and Finland to fight and, above all, thought it wise to encourage Yugoslavia to resist an army they knew would ruin them, then whom do we want our boys to be led by?

It makes our hearts sink to raise up boys and get them into college and ready for life, to be a real help to the world, then have them forcibly torn from their homeland and sent into foreign waters and foreign lands to die for they hardly know what. In fact, how many Americans know what the whole war is being fought for? They say it is to save democracy. But every country they pretend to fight for goes down in ruin. Do we have to send our boys into war under men who cannot state clearly what we are fighting for? If an enemy comes to our shores we would be willing to resist; but to help a country hundreds of miles away, which has repudiated her honest debts and has blamed us for prolonging the last war to her disadvantage, this seems the height of shortsightedness.

We appreciate most heartily your stand for our boys, as we do also that of Lindbergh, Wheeler, and others. Can you suggest anything we can do to save our boys? If you can, we shall appreciate it and be glad to cooperate.

Sincerely,

LEON W. WORTHEN.

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME,
EDWARD N. HURLEY COLLEGE OF
FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE,
Notre Dame, Ind., May 8, 1941.

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I am extremely apprehensive regarding the war movement that is currently being manifested in Washington. It seems to me that American interests, which are paramount in importance to all Americans, have become subordinate to the interests of others. In my estimation, our

secure future is irrevocably associated with, and can only be guaranteed through, strict subscription to a national policy of adequate defense, promotion of our internal economy, and definite rejection of emotional and righteous pleas (and pressure) that we again save the world for democracy.

May I hope that we may continue to share the privileges of Americanism without fear of involvement in the quarrels of others.

Very respectfully,

JAMES E. MCCARTHY,
Dean, College of Commerce.

SEATTLE, WASH., May 11, 1941.
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Would that we could take your hand and say "God bless you" for your splendid message to the American people just heard over our local radio station KJR this day.

I am one of those old enough to remember the days and arguments leading up to the last war. These days are following the same pattern. God forbid that the United States should so quickly forget the futility and the awful days of that last great conflict. We want no more such blunders.

We pray, today and from now on, that God may grant you strength to carry on in this fight. We are with you heart and soul—our hands in yours.

Yours for our own country.

Mr. and Mrs. CHARLES E. RICHARDS
and Miss JENNIE ALLEN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., May 11, 1941.
HON. CHAS. W. TOBEY,
Republican Senator from New
Hampshire, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I listened to your address this afternoon and wish to thank you for that defense of America. I could wish that a copy of that speech might reach every American home.

We must help those who are in distress, and I feel that if in our strength we prepare materials of war and place them on our shores ready for shipment, we shall have done our duty. If, with adequate defense weapons, the present population of democracy-loving countries abroad cannot stem the tide, why should more men be sent? In your next address, for which I shall be listening, please tell the American people the number of population of these countries—that is, the allied countries, both free and conquered—that the lay mind may grasp the idea that it is not people they need but materials and stamina and cooperation.

The intrigues of European countries are beyond our comprehension, so what we would fight for one day might be what we should have to fight against the next.

If convoying has to be done, let it be done by seamen from the other side who understand their neighbors and their neighbors' way of doing things.

I am an American citizen whose forefathers wrought farms from the wilderness; my father fought with Grant on April 7, 1862—he was 18 then; so it is with a feeling that we must hold fast our heritage of freedom that I take the liberty of addressing you.

Most sincerely,

ANNA G. CHAPMAN.

PORT WASHINGTON, N. Y., May 11, 1941.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I have just listened to your masterful radio address To Keep America Out of the European War, and say more power to you in your wonderful endeavor. Gen. George Washington gave us similar advice some 150 years ago. It was good advice then and is still good advice. At the present time I have a son serving in

the United States Army as a lieutenant in the Twenty-sixth Infantry, and I am proud to think that he is wearing the uniform of the United States in defense of his country, which I will do again if this country is attacked, but I am unalterably opposed to our entering any war on foreign soil. Keep up the good fight you are now waging, and I am sure that the majority of the American people will see the true light.

I am doing everything to further the fight you are now waging and will continue to do so.

Good luck and more power to you.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT S. BROWN.

THE NATIONAL SOCIETY
MAGNA CHARTA DAMES,
New York, May 11, 1941.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: How I wish that I might have been able to team up again with you in our beloved national anthem after your magnificent, soul-stirring address today on the Boston Common, which thrilled and inspired us as it came in so wonderfully over the radio into our home. God bless you in your work to save America.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERTA KEENE TREBMAN.
(Mrs. Edward L. Hunt.)

NEW YORK CITY, May 11, 1941.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: As I write this letter I am listening to your speech from Boston Common.

The answer to your question is emphatically "No," and 90 percent of my classmates at Fordham University will back me up.

Keep up the fight for us.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL COLLINS JACOBS.

BELLEROSE, N. Y., May 11, 1941.
Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I just heard your radio address on Convoys and War, in which you voiced the sentiments of millions of fellow Americans.

I, too, believe that we should defend our own country to the utmost, but also preserve our democracy at home. I am opposed to sending convoys to deliver war supplies to Europe, because it will bring us into war.

I sincerely hope that you and other Senators who consider the welfare of their own country will be successful in your fight to keep us out of war.

Respectfully yours,

HELEN A. WILLIAMS.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY,
Stanford University, Calif., May 10, 1941.
Senator CHARLES TOBEY.

Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: My sincere admiration for your resolute fight against convoys. You are making a good impression on the people because of your consistent efforts to keep faith and to work against the duplicity of the warmongers who keep "inching" us along into active participation in this foreign war.

Keep in mind the idea that the Navy is people.

Let's not have Englishmen whipping up too much froth in emotional America. Englishmen are for themselves first, as has been obvious all along in our lifetimes.

Do all you can to combat circulation of false propaganda both by Axis and Allies.

Out here the people want to know that Congress is still functioning. We do not want an emasculated Congress, subservient to the will of one man in the United States.

Most sincerely yours,

CALVIN P. STONE,
Professor of Psychology.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. Mex., May 13, 1941.
 Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I want to pay tribute to a real American. Your address Sunday inspired me with new hope and courage. Please don't give up the fight.

C. F. HARNOIS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., May 12, 1941.
 Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
 Fight Roosevelt. Make him keep his third-term promises not to send our boys to any foreign wars. The mothers are always with you.

GERTRUDE BROOKS.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., May 12, 1941.
 Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
 The Miscellaneous Employees Union Local No. 110, A. F. L. assembled in regular meeting went on record supporting Tobey no-convoys resolution urges your honors favorable action.

LEO PRODRIMOU, *President.*
 A. T. GABRIEL, *Secretary.*

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., May 13, 1941.
 Hon. CHARLES TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Following message, 300 signatures, just sent President Roosevelt. People of America unilaterally opposed to foreign-war convoys; mean war. We urge you to solemnly rebuke those in Cabinet and Congress who would sacrifice America to foreign interests. You can silence warmongers and we urge you in this solemn hour to fulfill wholeheartedly your pledge to keep America out of war.

Mrs. J. HENRY ORME.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 11, 1941.
 Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR: Have just heard your talk over the radio and it is the very best we have ever heard since the war. Congratulations and a thousand thanks.

Just recently, Knox stated, as nearly as I can recollect, "We have promised England all aid to England until they win, and we must keep our promise."

I wish you had, or will if you can, publicly or in the Senate, ask the President which would be more honorable—to keep his promise to America or to England.

As to promises, you remember he publicly stated, "why trust Hitler? He has never kept his word." Did England keep her word with Poland, Norway, Finland, and many others? When Roosevelt was elected in 1932, did he keep his word? And has he, since his last election?

As a Senator, do you know one single act, directly or indirectly, that England has ever done for America since this Republic was established? I am afraid not.

This appears the only way you can beat that small bunch of intellectually constipated jackasses at Washington.

I am 77 years old, and served nearly 30 years in the military service. Was born here of far-back English ancestry, of which I am not proud. Have always been for America only, am now, and always will be.

Very truly yours,

W. J. SANDERSON,
Major, retired,
One Hundred and Thirty-first Infantry.

LAMBETH COLLEGE,
Jackson, Tenn., May 10, 1941.
 DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I am heartily wishing you success against convoys. I shall be glad

if you and other Senators will bring out the truth in the Senate.

With best wishes, I am
 Yours sincerely,

J. R. WALKER.

BROOKLYN HEIGHTS, N. Y., May 11, 1941.
 Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR: I have just listened to your impassioned plea for the preservation of our sons and our America.

To me your words and your voice seemed inspired by God himself, and I thank Him for so courageous and militant a champion against those powers of evil that are seeking our destruction.

On the exact spot where I am now living, my forefathers fought to free us from Britain's tyranny. My great-grandfather was killed by the British in the War of 1812. And now I am asked to give my two sons in her defense, and to bring ruin upon the country for which they died.

I say, "Millions for defense, but not one boy for tribute."

As in the last war, mothers are helpless. We appear to be in the hands of the Philistines. It is only through men like you that we may be saved.

Gratefully yours,

Mrs. NAN INGRAM SMITH.

BROOKLYN HEIGHTS, N. Y., May 6, 1941.
 To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.:

Mr. PRESIDENT: Having completed an exhaustive canvass of my election district, I find an almost unanimous, and somewhat rabid, sentiment against our being involved in Europe's war, and therefore against the use of convoys.

Mothers of sons, many of whom cast their first Democratic ballot, voted for you because of your pledge to them that "No American boy shall fight and die on foreign soil." They prayerfully believe that you are going to keep that promise. You, Mr. President, are the arbiter of our destiny.

We are sorry for Britain's plight, but not sorry enough to give our sons to rectify her mistakes.

Invasion of our country would be a different matter. But we believe that if we build up an impregnable defense for our own shores, no enemy will dare attack us.

To paraphrase Hamlet, we prefer to bear those ills we might have (and can avoid) than fly to those we know so well.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. NAN INGRAM SMITH.

ST. LOUIS, MO., May 11, 1941.
 Senator CHAS. W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I have just listened to your magnificent address from Boston.

I have been a student of foreign affairs for over 30 years. I have spent most of the past 11 years in Europe lecturing and trying to help the conservatives of Europe and Great Britain prevent this dreadful war. You can see the result. The warmongers lied, stole, cheated, and beat us at every turn, just as they are doing in the United States today. We must not enter this war.

Russia has planned for our entry into this war for years, and when our Army and Navy leave our shores a Communist government will be set up behind them to rule over the ones left at home.

I have my facts from Russia, secured when I was in Russia; they are authentic.

How may I help?

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) LELAH H. STOKER.

CAMDEN, N. J., May 11, 1941.
 Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Can you mail me a copy of your talk today? It was the greatest

talk you or any other Senator ever made. I am an ex-service man, was an Infantry sergeant in France, served on three fronts, and saw several of my buddies killed and wounded. For 14 years I was chairman of veterans' relief in Camden, and I saw plenty of sad cases from the last war. I feel the same as you do about this war. I have a 19-year-old boy, and I can't see what he will fight for if our country goes to war.

Yours truly,

PERRY J. WARK,
Member of Veterans of Foreign Wars
and American Legion.

JERSEY CITY, N. J., May 10, 1941.
 DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: First I want to express my deep appreciation of all your splendid efforts in behalf of American democracy. You are a really great American.

As one who has observed the complete collapse of democracy in Jersey City, whose people are now terrorized by the nihilistic Frank Hague gang, I wonder if it is possible for even a United States Senator to ascertain why the United States Attorney General's office fails to prosecute the Frank Hague gang on the abundant evidence its agents collected in their several months' investigation of Hague in 1939. I spoke to the agents and they seemed optimistic that action would be taken. Why is Hague, who hates American civil rights, being protected?

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT A. AMERY, JR.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., May 11, 1941.
 DEAR SIR: My sincere thanks and appreciation to you for your splendid and untiring efforts to keep our great and beloved country at peace.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. MARSHALL,
Ex-Twenty-seventh Division, A. E. F.

MAY 11, 1941.
 DEAR SIR: I am a disabled veteran of the last war, unemployed since then. We have one son 18 years old. We want to thank you for your radio speech of today and urge you to continue the fight against convoys and for a referendum before further steps into Britain's war.

Gratefully yours,

A. J. HARTHE and wife,
 LILLY PAYNE HARTHE.

FRANK H. CORBETT POST, No. 1144,
 AMERICAN LEGION,
 Bronx, N. Y., May 11, 1941.
 Senator CHARLES TOBEY,

Senate Building, Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: May God bless you and give you the strength to carry on. You will go down in history for your great fight to keep America free.

As an overseas veteran, I am opposed to convoys.

I remain,

Yours in Christian comradeship,
 WILLIAM J. McGRATH.

PHILADELPHIA, May 11, 1941.
 Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: May God give you the health to continue your courageous fight against our boys being sent to fight in Europe. I proudly gave a 17-year-old boy to save democracy in the first World War. "Ha ha." After all said, done, and happened since, the whole British Empire is not worth one American boy.

OUR ORGANIZATION

The Crusading Mothers of Pennsylvania are working doing all we possibly can, giving these circulars out by the thousand. Know the mothers of America are united today in our prayers for peace.

Sincerely,

Mrs. L. PARKS.

NEW YORK CITY.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: As an American citizen and as a young man of 22, soon to be drafted, I want to express to you my deep appreciation and admiration for your eloquent speech in defense of democracy which I have just listened to over the radio. I say "in defense of democracy" because I recognize with many of my fellow citizens that non-intervention in this terrible conflict and the maintenance of our cherished way of life are mutually dependent on each other. It is indeed most gratifying to hear the case for nonintervention stated so lucidly and logically as you have just done and to know that intelligent leadership in this country is still able to put up a good fight against the forces of blindness and hysteria. If through your efforts and those of others this country is able to remain at peace and at the same time build up an impregnable defense, a service of incalculable value to the human race will have been rendered.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM OWEN.

MAY 11, 1941.

MAY 7, 1941.

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is not intended as a pressure letter, and yet, I hope that it may give you an indication of support for your stand on the convoy question and other momentous questions relative to the involvement of the United States into the present European war.

Truthfully, among my acquaintances, I know of no person who wants participation in this war, and I have yet to meet a rabid interventionist. Perhaps they are simply above my status in life; however, I must admit my acquaintances despair of keeping out unless men of your caliber exert your utmost in and out of our National Congress.

Although I am not one of your constituents, I trust this letter will be an encouragement to you from the country at large. I do this knowing the present concerted efforts of influential groups to plunge our Nation into active participation into this war.

Congratulation for your courageous stand.

Respectfully,

JAMES B. DOTSON.

COCOA, FLA., May 6, 1941.

Senator TOBEY,

New Hampshire.

DEAR SENATOR: My wife and I are strongly against the use of convoys. It does no good to write ——. Everyone knows —— is out for —— and has an eye on the Presidency.

Yours respectfully,

W. A. FULLER,

Ex-Captain, Engineers Corps, A. E. F.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., May 8, 1941.

Senator TOBEY.

DEAR SIR: For one, I want to agree with you—someone is playing us for suckers. As an ex-soldier that was wounded in the last war, I am for no part in Europe's wars, and rate Charles Lindbergh No. 1 American, and am sure time will prove him right.

Thanking you for the fight you have put up to keep us out of war, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

FRANK P. FRAWLEY.

DOVER, N. H., May 7, 1941.

New Hampshire had a great man in Plummer in the early days, but your equal isn't in New Hampshire history. Last night High got his deserts, and you shouldn't have interfered. He was flippant and pathetic. Your type can't quit; it isn't expected. Good luck.

Dr. J. L. SWEENEY.

NEW IPSWICH, N. H., May 6, 1941.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY:

I am convinced that only a miracle can prevent us from being plunged into another suicidal foreign war. I am praying that this miracle will happen. In the meantime, you have my heart-felt thanks and unlimited support in the course which you are taking. I take a great deal of pride in the courage with which you are maintaining your convictions in the face of ever-increasing propaganda pressure.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER E. SMITH,

Headmaster, Appleton Academy.

MAY 6, 1941.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES,

Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: This is to acknowledge with deep gratitude your telegram of March 8 announcing your vote in favor of the Ellender amendment offered by Senator TAFT to the lend-lease bill. The purpose of this amendment, as I recall, was to emphasize to President Roosevelt that the passage of the lend-lease bill was not to be interpreted as a mandate for taking the United States into an undeclared war.

It occurs to me that Senator TOBEY's anti-convoy amendment to the ship-seizure bill is designed to serve the same purpose, and that it ought to be supported enthusiastically by those who are opposed to condemning this generation of youth to another futile foreign war.

I know that my neighbors are overwhelmingly opposed to our fighting another war over issues which are not clearly and conclusively American. They believe that such a war is imminent and they will undoubtedly support it, but certainly there is none of that fervor and enthusiasm which characterized the late winter and spring of 1917 when we believed that we were about to save the world for democracy and to end war forever.

I assure you that once it should become clear that America is being threatened by military aggression in this hemisphere, I would urge and participate in armed resistance to the limit of my ability. However, like millions of others I am unwilling to accept the proposition that a nation of 120,000,000 people, with unlimited natural and technical resources, cannot make itself strong enough to remain at peace against a nation which is faced with the task of organizing and uniting a continent of hostile neighbors.

Back home we feel that the next few weeks, perhaps days, will determine the issue of war and peace, of life and death for those boys who, since last fall, have joined the Army or Navy with the assurance of their Congress and President that they would not be sent to fight in any foreign war. They have a right to expect that this pledge will be kept.

Gratefully yours,

EXETER, N. H., May 7, 1941.

The Honorable CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As the British loyalists drive the country from one insincerity to another I wonder whether this people is the only one to whom pledges are not to be kept. The amazing cynicism—a product of the past 8 years of broken promises—which greets every flouting of solemn assurances and pledges is certainly not an earnest of a high crusading

spirit. There is one point on which national enthusiasm can center—a genuine national defense. Wherein is America even as decent as Germany if, without provocation, it should seize the Azores and other territory of friendly nations as outposts? A war must be entered on by a united people. A regular army goes where it is sent, a volunteer army goes where it has willed to go, but in a democracy the only justified use of a conscript army is the defense of its own soil. Lend England every justified material thing and tax us for it all the traffic can bear (but hand back relief to the communities that can handle it realistically) but let us not spill one drop of American blood for any cause but our own.

If the idea of intervention were morally justified, would a roll call of England's allies in this war justify our exposing the United States to a position which up to date shows a record of 100 percent fatalities? If Britain is fighting for all democracies she is doing a very futile job of it. The persistent question "What if England were defeated without our aid?" may well be countered by "What if England were defeated with our aid?" We would be committed of a war on the enemy's ground, the absolute aggressor, with forces depleted in a losing fight.

It may well be that we will have to fight Germany, or all the totalitarian powers, for the United States and Canada. We can do it, if, as Germany does, we operate on inside lines, without long, easily broken lines of communication. The Philippines, a third of the way across the world, are our great weakness, and I hope we may soon be rid of them.

We need, however, enormous holding forces. It is probably true that a compact highly organized force is best for attack. Let's have such a Regular Army, and a two-ocean Navy.

Let me thank you for and congratulate you on the defense of our liberties. It is not we who are the defeatists. I hope, if the home guard takes shape, to be an early applicant. I enclose a clipping showing that half my contemporaries of pre-1910 are willing to fight to their last grandnephew, while 1931-40, faced with participation, are 3 to 1 against. I hope you will continue your resolute fight in the face of all attacks and innuendos.

Very truly yours,

HOWARD S. STUCKEY.

[From the Princeton Alumni Weekly of May 5, 1941]

4. ON GOING TO WAR

If you were asked to vote on the question of the United States entering the war against Germany and Italy, how would you vote—to go into the war or to stay out of the war?

	Percent
To go in.....	42
To stay out.....	58

This question, which is similar to one asked by the American Institute of Public Opinion of a national cross section, shows that Princeton alumni, at the present time anyway, are considerably ahead of the country in the feeling that the United States should go to war against the Axis Powers. The last Gallup poll of the country on the same question returned: To go in, 15 percent; to stay out, 85 percent. When it was tabulated for men's opinions only, however, the result was: To go in, 20 percent; to stay out, 80 percent.

One factor that doubtless accounts in large measure for the difference in sentiment on this question among Princeton alumni and the country as a whole is that the Gallup figure was released some time ago, was based on surveys made in November and February. The Weekly's survey, on the other hand, was made during the past month—a period when dislike of the Axis reached a considerably higher peak than previously.

Both the institute survey and the Weekly survey show again the wide difference of opinion between those who are being trained to fight and those who are beyond draft age.

The institute's national poll:

Ages:	Percent go in	Percent stay out
50 and over.....	23	77
30 to 40.....	20	80
21 to 29.....	13	87
Princeton alumni:		
Princeton class—		
Up to 1910.....	54	46
1911 to 1920.....	50	50
1921 to 1930.....	41	59
1931 to 1940.....	25	75

TILTON & TILTON,
Laconia, N. H., May 7, 1941.

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Perhaps in these trying times, and when you are being so bitterly assailed for your stand on the convoy question, you may like to know that there are some at least who cordially endorse your position.

I am one of those and I heartily commend your attitude and your work upon this very important question.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK P. TILTON.

NEW YORK, MAY 6, 1941.

The Honorable CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: It begins to look as though the President will give up the steps-short-of-war policy for a policy of active intervention. The vast majority of the people are doubtless opposed to such a move, but I suspect that Mr. Roosevelt now feels that public opinion can be swung to its support. That this is coming to be his view seems particularly likely since the press, radio, and other means of public expression are in the main subject to the control of those favoring intervention. Add Mr. Roosevelt's dramatic ability to these forces and we shall have a campaign which will be difficult to resist. Whether or not it can be resisted will depend to a considerable extent upon your efforts and the efforts of your colleagues in Congress.

In the coming fight you will, more than ever, be the object of attacks designed to attribute to you cowardice, lack of patriotism, and motives of self-interest. So powerful are the publicity methods of those who will be against you that you may feel that you have lost the support of the public or of that portion of the public which is composed of patriotic Americans interested solely in the welfare of our country. But I do not believe that you will have lost such support.

Here in New York it is true that groups in favor of intervention are able to make a greater noise and a greater show of strength than their opponents. This, I think, is due to the fact that no business is lost by being pro war, but there is a definite fear that business may be lost by being antiwar. Those favoring intervention have worked with some success to make people believe that to be antiwar is to be pro-Hitler. In view of this employers are afraid to speak out against war for fear of losing their customers and employees are afraid to do so for fear of losing their jobs. For the same reason many persons are deterred from joining antiwar organizations, although there is no such deterrent against joining prowar groups. However, I find that in private conversation the sentiments expressed against participation in the war, and against convoys and other steps toward this result, are greatly in the majority. As time goes on and the war publicity campaign gets under way, it is likely that this antiwar sentiment will become even more timid and inarticulate; but this, to my mind,

will not indicate a change of the views of the majority, but a fear of the expression of such views.

The purpose of this letter is to point out that, in the heat of the conflict, the support of your position may not be loud but will continue to be strong and sincere. I earnestly hope that the realization of this fact will encourage you to carry on, with all the vigor at your command, the fight against American participation in the war.

Sincerely yours,

J. FRANK WOOD.

TROY, PA., May 5, 1941.

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Allow me to congratulate you on your courage in opposing all steps by the President and others which would most certainly plunge this country into war. I am 100 percent in agreement with you and hope that you will continue unceasingly your efforts to make the people see that this is not our war.

I have already written my Pennsylvania Representative and Senators but also wanted to let you know that there are millions of people all over the country who applaud your stand.

I am a Dartmouth graduate (1928) and an admirer of Dr. Ernest Martin Hopkins, but I think he and Dr. Conant, of Harvard, and others are absolutely wrong in wishing to rush us into a war which we cannot win.

Very truly yours,

OSMUN SKINNER.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

DEAR SENATOR: I have read the published letter of Dr. Stearns and have answered him in kind.

God bless you, Senator, and keep up your good work.

WM. R. WALLACE.

HOPKINSVILLE, KY., May 9, 1941.

Senator TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.:

Conservation of national defenses by your conservative party precludes invasion but sabotaging national defense by extremist party for aid to Britain is dangerous domestic policy.

FRANCES FAIRLEIGH.

MIAMI BEACH, FLA., April 30, 1941.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Your courageous fight against further embroiling this country into the foreign war is being noted by many people—even down here in the darkest South.

The working people, especially, know that the war in Europe is another struggle that does not concern them. They remember what Wilson said after the last one, "Who does not know this was a commercial war?"

As proof of this they see increasing attacks against labor rights, free speech, and civil liberties.

By voicing their sentiments, you, with a small number of other elected Representatives, prove that America can still keep out of war if enough people can voice their sentiments.

We hope that you will safeguard all of our hard-won democratic rights in this crisis. The convoy measure is another step toward total war. We must defeat this and all other measures to kill our youth.

I hope that thousands of these letters reach you daily, encouraging you to keep on the path of peace, despite the selling out of rubber-stamp legislators who have betrayed their pledges.

I will gladly aid distributing any of your speeches on this vital issue.

Very truly yours,

LOUIS GREEN.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA., May 7, 1941.

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Ninety percent of the people I contact are opposed to our entrance into European-Asiatic wars. Many of them are confused by repeated statements of people in high positions that England is our first line of defense. People I talk with are largely pro-British, but they do not think we can give all people everywhere our ideas of freedom and impose it upon them by force. Propaganda is confusing the issues. Trick questions by Gallup polls are not bringing correct sentiment.

If we become involved in a 5- to 10-year war with uncertain results, we can lose our liberty at home as well as in China, Russia, or Germany.

Let us prepare a strong defense for America. Let us get everyone down to work with a united program for defending ourselves and our way of life. Let us not overaccentuate the importance or certainty of losing foreign trade. Let us protect America and pay for it as we go. I am willing to increase my already large tax bill; I am willing to add to my hours of work; but I don't believe our way of life is suitable for Russia, China, or the Indias for generations to come. I doubt if it is suitable for Germany or France or even parts of South America. The responsibility is on the Members of our Congress to protect America only and make it strong.

Yours very truly,

JAMES D. FRANCIS.

MONDAY, MAY 12, 1941.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TOBEY: I desire to express my appreciation of your untiring efforts to keep America out of war. I am in perfect accordance with your belief regarding America conveying material to Britain. It will be the eighth wonder of the world if this American convoy system does not entangle us in foreign discord.

Your speech from Boston Common Sunday was a very fine one—the best that has been delivered against American convoy to Britain up to now. I hope and pray that your words will be heeded and that American citizens will wake up.

Good luck to you, and may God bless you for your stand. Congratulations for your courage.

Very truly yours,

(Miss) MARY E. FORD.

DORCHESTER, MASS.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, May 12, 1941.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I want to commend you very highly for the splendid, patriotic, American message you gave the public in your radio address of last evening.

We must not become involved deeper in this European war. As you said last night, the President has stated, "Convoy means shooting, and shooting means war." The American people should demand his living up to his campaign promises, "That no American boy will be sent to any European war."

More and more people all the time are objecting to convoying.

I trust you will give many more radio addresses and do everything in your power to keep us out of this terrible holocaust.

Very sincerely yours,

M. L. GREGG.

PARK RIDGE, ILL., May 11, 1941.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for the patriotism of your great address in Boston this afternoon. It came into our home with great clearness and power.

Although a descendant of noble English ancestry, and a sympathizer with England in her peril, I view the British invasion of the United States with consternation and alarm. British officials have been bombarding Chicago, Kansas City, and Minneapolis with word bombs in their facinorous efforts to involve our country in their foreign war. Words are more dangerous than air raids, for they disrupt and destroy our national unity.

The British invaders have taken advantage of our afflicted President to secure his connivance in their nefarious scheme to seize foreign ships to turn over to them, and the employment of convoys "which means war." Instead of meeting the exigencies of today with far-sighted provisions for a future security for the English-speaking peoples by negotiating peace terms, they seem bent on the ultimate destruction of the only sanctuary left to our civilization.

In making a traitor of our Chief Executive, they force upon Congress the onerous duty of instituting proceedings for his impeachment. Their peaceful invasion is proving more disastrous than warfare with air raids, for it forebodes the end of our constitutional government. Nothing short of impeachment proceedings can give to our citizens open knowledge of facts that have been carefully concealed from our people by a foreign-minded administration. The British have assumed a usurpation of privileges to which they have neither moral nor legal right.

We appeal to Congress to prove to these invaders and their sympathizers that this is a democracy, and the voice of the people rules our land. Prove this to the President by institution of impeachment proceedings; that will serve to bring to light facts which the public is entitled to know. The vote may not carry, but the Nation will be saved and returned to unity and sanity by a revelation of secret intrigue. The people who do the fighting and the dying, and the people who sacrifice to pay for warfare, when entered into, have the right to rule according to constitutional provisions.

We honor all who are loyally striving to keep our Nation free from war, and we pray for the passage of the anticonvoy measure.

Sincerely,

M. J. EVANS.

TULSA, OKLA., May 11, 1941.

Senator TOBEY,

Republican Senator from New Hampshire, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Fortunately, I heard your address Sunday over the radio. God grant that you had a huge audience.

You are the voice of the Middle West, whose inhabitants fervently abhor the thought of intervention in the European war, but are emphatic in their support of an invulnerable national defense.

May your able leadership and oratory help to disperse the impending wave of American intervention.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS D. JAMES.

JERSEY CITY, N. J., May 11, 1941.

Senator TOBEY,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The New York Times of Sunday, the 11th, carried an item saying that some other Senators, including —, intended to try and dissuade you from putting your anti-convoy measure to a Senate vote. I hope and pray God that you won't give up at the promptings of such men. Please, by all means, press the fight to ban convoys, even though it does seem like a losing battle.

They call us who favor no aid to Britain "defeatists." It seems to me that men (?) like — should be termed "American boy haters" if all they can do is admit that the

convoy system is inevitable. We must keep out of that war.

Yours respectfully,

GEORGE MAGEE.

RIVERSIDE, ILL., May 11, 1941.

Hon. CHAS. W. TOBEY,

Washington.

DEAR SENATOR: Just heard your radio address. Congratulations and thanks.

The President should be impeached; maybe the British would like him over there.

We parents will give our live to keep out of Britain's wars, but not our sons to fight there. I served in 1917-18 over there; never again for me or mine.

Sincerely,

PHILIP RANSOM.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., May 11, 1941.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,

The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Listened to your radio talk this morning, and you expressed my thoughts as well. Keep fighting the warmongers, those who would sacrifice our boys for England. We need more courageous Americans to come forward and speak for the defense of our own beloved country. How can England win? Why should we send our boys to die for another country other than their own?

I am unalterably opposed to convoys, which spell war. The last war should have taught us not to trust England. She only participates in a struggle when her own neck is to be saved. Build strong defense in this country and Hitler will stay on his own back yard. He will have trouble enough keeping his house in order, to trouble to come over here.

England is paying for her own shortsightedness in the Manchuria grab, and my sympathies are for the children and women who are being bombed for it right now.

I did not like the attitude of Lloyd George; one would think we were a colonial possession of theirs. They wouldn't involve themselves in a war for us.

I thank God every night my son is only nine, but I feel for those mothers who have sons who must go if we convoy.

I am a patriotic American and have been on the State board of a political organization that is educating women in the intelligent use of their franchise. A duty, not a right.

I am a descendant of an American President, my father has served in four wars and is a possessor of a Congressional Medal of Honor. From this you can gather I am of loyal American stock. I love my country and want to see it saved from destruction. No foreign wars for us. We were talked into it in 1917, and what happened?

Everyone I talk with in this city is opposed to the convoy, which means war for us. They aren't so gullible to the propaganda as in the last war.

Keep talking before free speech is denied to those who are real Americans, first.

Best wishes from an American.

Cordially,

FLORENCE MORROW
(Mrs. Weldon Morrow).

MAY 11, 1941.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I have just listened to your broadcast from Boston Commons concerning our position as to taking part in Europe's war, and want to commend you for stating the position of all those with whom I come in contact in this, the heart of America. We do not want to engage in this war, but all of us do want our own country prepared for a defense that will keep European countries from even considering attacking us.

Last night I listened to Col. Charles Lindbergh, who in years to come will be known as

one of the men who did everything he could to help keep American boys at home and to build up our own country to the type of democracy we should have, but do not have at present. As Colonel Lindbergh said, what we are doing in America is the important thing, and what is happening in other countries is secondary in importance. Let's make America a real democracy, with truth and honor the main points of government, before going out to attend to the business of every other country on earth.

We, as those who have not the ability to take the lead, but have the same ideas as such men as yourself, Colonel Lindbergh, and President Hutchins, of Chicago University, wish to express our high regard for you in your stand, and we hope and pray that your efforts may not be in vain.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. CORA M. JOHNSON.

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY UNIT,

NATIONAL LEGION OF THE

MOTHERS OF AMERICA,

San Francisco, May 11, 1941.

Senator C. W. TOBEY,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
Re Tobey resolution.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Your outspoken comments on the manner in which the American people are being talked, deceived, and propagandized into war were appreciated today as we listened to your outstanding speech via the radio from Boston. We consider this the kind of information and the exact message the American people should hear every day now until the war danger is over. It could easily mean the end of a war crisis if only we had more sincere speakers like yourself who are not afraid to be an American nor to tell Americans just what they should know.

We thank you from the very depths of our souls for your heroic efforts to avert destruction of our beloved country. May you have the health and strength to carry on your outstanding work. This is the wish of thousands of our members and thousands of other mothers on the Pacific coast.

Our members in San Francisco particularly are working to help you to have your resolution passed in the Senate. It is a good one, and we are behind you and it 100 percent.

Gratefully,

Mrs. HENRY C. MORRIS,
Northwestern Regional Director,
Mothers of America.

HARTFORD, CONN., May 12, 1941.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Yesterday afternoon I drove my wife into the country and while she was making a call I turned on the radio of the car at haphazard. It proved to be a Boston station, which was broadcasting your address on why this country should keep out of war. I heard something more than half the address and I liked it. I am glad there are men in public life who have the moral courage to express themselves on what seems to be the unpopular and unemotional side of a controversy.

To my mind the big argument, which you expressed fully, is that war means in the end bankruptcy, destruction, and despair, and out of these comes revolution. What the aftermath would be if we went to war is anybody's guess. It might not be communism or nazi-ism or fascism, but it would probably be some type of authoritarian regime which would be kindred to those ugly forms and would be a long way from constitutional government as we have known it in the past.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS A. STORRS.

May I mention that my oldest son served overseas in the World War for 2 years and 3

months; that he was in France when he would normally have graduated from Dartmouth, and his mother and I received his degree diploma in absentia for him. I always thought that was a fine thing for Dartmouth to do.

MELROSE HIGHLANDS, MASS.,
Monday Morning.

DEAR SENATOR: After hearing your most inspiring talk, or really I should call it a sermon, for no minister could give a better one, I must write and give you my most heartfelt thanks. It did my soul good to listen to you. We common people, who love our country, are terribly maligned by the warmongers. We surely need someone to uphold our position. The Government at Washington certainly intend to railroad us into a war if they can. It sure is a laugh to hear Roosevelt talk about bringing freedom to the rest of the world and in the meantime take it away from his own countrymen.

May God bless you in your valiant stand, and I am sure you have the good wishes and constant prayers of all Americans who love their country's welfare.

Gratefully yours,

Mrs. M. E. BURKE.

NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY,
BELLEVUE STATION,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We heard your fine speech Sunday. You have the range. Keep firing! Keep firing! Keep firing!

We four have a total of 44 years' naval service. Our only regret is that we can't serve that same amount of loyal service to a cause as just as yours.

Very respectfully yours,

SCOTTY,
Fleet Air Base, Honolulu, 12 years' service.
ED,
Fleet Air Base, Honolulu, 8 years' service.
EARL,
U. S. S. Medusa, 17 years.
TOMMY,
U. S. S. Boise, 7 years.

PITTSBURGH, PA., May 11, 1941.
The Honorable CHARLES W. TOBEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I was extremely thrilled at your Mother's Day radio address and I want to assure you that I will do all in my power to assist in the great cause you are so nobly championing. Would to God that every mother in these United States could have heard your words. It is most reassuring to know that there are still a few real Americans who are willing to make any sacrifice in order to preserve to us the security for which our forefathers gave their lives.

As one who served in the A. E. F. during the last World War and who knows how fruitless our efforts were then, I pray God that there are enough right-thinking people in this country to turn the tide that seems to be so rapidly engulfing us in that terrible tragedy being enacted abroad.

Please carry on, brave sir.

Sincerely,

W. R. McKRELL.

NEW YORK CITY, May 11, 1941.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Your speech today was magnificent. I hope the whole country heard it.

With you in our Senate, I feel safer now. You had the courage to say things today that we had hoped—more or less in vain—that the other leaders on our side would have said long ago. In everyday language, "you hit the nail on the head."

Can't we drive the British from our Capital and from the White House, including the "country squire"?

My daughter and I are active members of America First. Yesterday my daughter—a senior at Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart—distributed America First literature on Forty-second Street and attracted big crowds and secured hundreds and hundreds of petitions to the President for no convoys and no foreign war. We are doing our bit.

If you have copies made of your wonderful speech, may I have several to send to camps, etc.?

God bless you, and my humble thanks.

Sincerely,

Mrs. C. H. GRAMLING.

BRONX, NEW YORK CITY, May 11, 1941.
Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: You deserve great praise for your splendid efforts in keeping this country out of war. May your anti-convoy amendment pass in the Senate.

Respectfully,

RAYMOND TRACEY.

DORCHESTER, MASS., May 12, 1941.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Please keep up your grand fight for the American people. We are all behind you 100 percent.

Your speech on Boston Common May 11 was the best I ever expect to hear anywhere. Here's to your anticonvoy bill; may it be passed with flying colors.

Sincerely yours,

MARY G. MURPHY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., May 7, 1941.
Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TOBEY: Congratulations and more power to you. Please keep up your fight against this war to the bitter end. Your relentless fight inspires me to send another donation to the America First Committee.

Respectfully yours,

J. R. JOHNSON.

THE MUTUAL BENEFIT LIFE INSURANCE CO. OF NEWARK, N. J.,
Manchester, N. H., May 12, 1941.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I heartily approve of your attitude toward convoys and our participation in the European war.

At the age of 30, with my life ahead of me, I am not willing to fight in Europe to help England. I am willing to fight in the United States to defend America. I approve of giving materials to England for her use. Let her convoy them.

Yours sincerely,

LEROY W. DAVIS.

RAYMOND, N. H., May 12, 1941.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senator from New Hampshire, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Congratulations on your address given at Boston of this date. I believe that you, Senator WHEELER, Lindbergh, and a few other real Americans are fighting for the people; please keep it up; you do, and will in the days to come, have the gratitude and respect of the boys that do the fighting and their parents. Unfortunately this group do not have the funds for propaganda that the war party has access to.

I note in the papers that the Government has taken over many large boats to be made over into troop ships. The question is, Where are our troops going? Certainly not to some camp down south.

Do not acknowledge receipt of this letter; conserve your time and energy to carry on the fight for America.

Sincerely yours,

WM. B. HURD.

SHELburne, N. H.
New Hampshire's Minuteman, Hon. Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY:

Your State is proud of the fight you are making for our country, and God knows we need that fight. We do not want F. D. to put on the small mustache. The only thing to do is to try and keep that upper lip shaved. And you are doing it. When you go before your State or Nation in the future, put me in your book as one who will spend 6 months at my own expense to keep you in Washington.

Good luck and may God bless you.

FRANK McLAUGHLIN.

NEWPORT, N. H., May 12, 1941.
Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The writer heard your Sunday speech over his radio, and I do wish to congratulate you on what you are doing and the limitless effort and energy you are putting into the fight. I do heartily agree with you, and I know that we should not be drawn into the hell of Europe.

I could write and write along these lines, but we are in accord on the subject, and I do want to say, "Carry on."

Sincerely,

JESS ROWELL.

DOVER, N. H., May 11, 1941.

DEAR SENATOR: After hearing your address over the radio today, I wish to let you know that I agree with everything you said and am against convoys and any other measures that will get us into war.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. HENRY LANDRY.

NASHUA, N. H., May 12, 1941.
Hon. CHARLES TOBEY,
Senator, New Hampshire.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you again to repeat my assurances of my support to your noble efforts to keep this country out of war. It seems that you are our only representative in the Senate. I sincerely hope that your convoy amendment is passed and I wish that I could be there to cast a hearty vote for you. There is no need for me to repeat that Mr. Roosevelt's promises to keep our country out of this world's European turmoil is not in accordance with the conduct of a gentleman and our President. I remain

Yours respectfully,

Mrs. K. BOYAJIAN.

MANCHESTER, N. H., May 12, 1941.
Senator TOBEY.

DEAR SIR: The President has promised the people of the United States that we will never convoy the Atlantic and we demand he keep his promises.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. G. BOETTCHER and Family.

CHARLESTOWN, N. H., May 12, 1941.
Senator TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Let me express my approval of your address of yesterday as reported in the papers. Bravo for a brave man who is unafraid to express his opinions against strong opposition.

America first! Not in a spirit of craven selfishness, but that she may lead the world to an era of genuine brotherhood that cannot be won by our entry into this war as an active and full participant.

Yours for democracy which we seem to be squandering for what I am afraid will turn out to be of little more relative value than the proverbial and scriptural mess of pottage.

RICHARD F. MANWELL,
Congregational Church.

GOVER, N. H., May 12, 1941.
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As one of your constituents I should like to take this opportunity to thank you for your loyal efforts in behalf of the people of New Hampshire. Your recent fighting speeches do you credit. Of your loyalty to your country there can never be any question. When all the results are in, your record as a United States Senator from our beloved State will become a standard by which we may judge those to follow; and Senator, I want you to know that there are thousands and thousands of New Hampshire people like myself that truly appreciate what you are doing.

In times like these it takes courage and fortitude to withstand the unethical and cowardly insults hurled by those in high places, by those who should know better. Thank God, Senator, you have that courage, that fighting heart, and we are proud of you.

We like fighting men, especially when the fight is a good fight. I think the time has arrived, Senator, when you should receive more substantial support from people like myself. I am ready to do more; and if the time ever comes when I can become more active, I should be very happy to do anything in my power to help preserve America and guard her from those who would betray her.

Does it not strike you as strange, Senator, that these warmongers are—so they say—perfectly willing to die for democracy, but when they encounter any real opposition, they start to whine and state that they are living in cold terror? If their cause is so just, why are they afraid? Surely you are not afraid. I am not afraid. I ask you, Senator, who is it that fears the wrath of 100,000,000 people if this administration dare take us into this war?

The President states that we must keep our pledges to certain nations under the terms of the lease-lend bill. I say to him that there were pledges made to the American people that are much more important than those made to foreign nations. If he dare break faith with us, I go on record as saying he should be impeached. His duty to the American people is clear—the people have made known their wishes. He must be made to respect those wishes if we are to continue as a free, democratic people.

Forgive me, Senator, for taking up so much of your valuable time. I admire your courage and what you are doing for us; and if the time ever comes when we can be of assistance in any way, I, for one, am ready and willing to do my part in this crusade to save America.

Yours truly,

RAYMOND C. ALLARD.

MASSACHUSETTS BONDING &
INSURANCE CO.,
Nashua, N. H., May 12, 1941.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: "I hate war," said the President. The Bible indicates that God hates war. Everybody I contact in New Hampshire say they do not want war.

The President is quoted as saying: "Convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war."

One hundred and twenty-nine million nine hundred and ninety-nine thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine Americans probably don't want war; therefore they don't want convoys.

Millions of us feel as you do, Mr. TOBEY. We haven't the ability or opportunity to spread our feelings from the rostrums or through the press; but please keep up your fight for us against convoys, and to enable us to build up our American defenses, both of which will keep us out of war.

Yours truly,

R. E. RUSSELL.

THE WOODLAND FARM,
Center Sandwich, N. H., May 12, 1941.
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senator from New Hampshire,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: We heard your speech yesterday, the 11th, via radio. We are 100 percent with you.

You can figure this letter as if you received seven individual letters.

I have five boys. One is in the service and has been for some time at Panama Coast Guard.

Three more are eligible for cannon fodder when needed but God knows they or I do not want to go on record as starting a fight which at present seems none of our business and if we did have to defend ourselves later we need all our resources then.

Mrs. Davis is slowly improving. She went through considerable.

Myself—they say I am improving; perhaps in weight, but suffering all the time which is not much now as I have for the past few years.

We certainly admire your courage.

With kind regards and best wishes, I am as ever,

CHARLES J. DAVIS.

Figure as seven letters?

REEDS FERRY, N. H., May 12, 1941.
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My husband and I tuned in on our radio and heard you give your talk to the mothers and you spoke our sentiments and we are 100 percent with you.

Do keep us out of the war. My husband is too old to go, but I am thinking of the younger people.

Yours sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. FRED FLETCHER.

DOVER, N. H., May 11, 1941.
Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Undoubtedly every mother today blessed you in her heart as she heard the concluding words of your talk.

May God bless the work you are doing in endeavoring to keep America at peace.

Every day I pray to the Prince of Peace that America will not convoy.

Cordially yours,

MISS MARY KING.

CRANSTON, R. I., May 11, 1941.
DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Bravo to you on your wonderful speech of today. I enlisted in the war of 1917 and many of my old comrades died on the fields of France. They probably would still be alive today if, at that time, we had enough men of your caliber who were brave enough to stand up for their rights as American citizens and express themselves openly as you did this day over the radio.

God grant that we keep at peace and in so doing preserve our strength and our own democracy. I believe as you and Colonel Lindbergh do, and that we Americans can at all times protect ourselves against any aggressor or aggressors.

Sincerely yours,

C. L. ALTHAUS.

THE ENTERPRISE-RECORDER,
Madison, Fla., May 10, 1941.
Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I want to thank you and wish you Godspeed in your efforts to keep this country at peace. There are millions of Americans with you in this. Keep up the good fight.

With all best wishes,
Sincerely,

T. C. MERCHANT.

WEST ORANGE, N. J.
DEAR SENATOR: This is just a line to let you know that I heard your speech from Boston Common, and I want to congratulate you on your fine message and the stand you are taking at this time.

A college man myself, and two sons, ages 21 and 23, both college men, the younger receiving his degree from Syracuse next month, your message coincides with our ideas perfectly. We all will gladly sacrifice everything to preserve democracy in the United States, but we will not go to foreign countries to fight to preserve the British Empire.

The facts you mentioned were excellent, and thinking people can appreciate them and understand them.

May you have the strength and courage to continue the good work and speak the truth so that this great democracy will be prepared to defend itself against any and all forces which are enemies of our democratic life.

Best personal regards to you and yours.

Very truly yours,

J. W. HOFSTED.

NEW YORK, N. Y., May 11, 1941.
DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Ex-service men and women thank God we have a man such as you.

Unafraid of any official, you are doing the honest thing to save this Nation from becoming another Commonwealth of Great Britain. That is in the offing, as you must know.

Organizations are going on record for convoy. It is dishonest, since they are under pressure and only a minority are present. My advice to them has been: Let those who urge convoy and the "big shots" using the pressure—let these, this era type of capitalist, do the convoying. Many of them have sinecures in Washington. They have never met a pay roll; they have been and are birds of prey.

The old-fashioned capitalists are almost hounded out of business by the dollar-a-year man, Government regulations, taxes, and encouraged strikes.

God give you strength to carry on for God and our own country. In His name we ask it.

JULIA WHEELLOCK,
C. P. O., United States Navy.

St. Louis, Mo., May 11, 1941.
Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: This morning I wrote a letter to President Roosevelt requesting him to live up to his promise to keep us out of Europe's war. This afternoon I listened to your talk in Boston. I feel it my duty to write you and give you all the encouragement within my power.

If it were not for such men as you, Senator BENNETT CLARK (of this State), NYE, WHEELER, and others, we would all be slaves in the years to come. But I have faith in the majority of the people unless the warmongers get a foothold.

It is not because I am afraid that I do not want us to get in this war, because I served several years in the United States Army, and the records show that I have offered my service to the War Department during the past year. My offer was refused because I am 60 years old.

In the creation of things the Supreme Intelligence of the universe did not intend for man to hunt for war. If he had intended for us to hunt for destruction, it would not have been creation. If war should come to these shores I am sure we could hold our own unless we give everything we have away to a country that has always been looking out for their own interest against us.

Keep up the good fight and the thinking people will not let you down.

Yours very truly,

A. T. LAWSON.

IDAHO STATE GRANGE,
Nampa, Idaho, May 10, 1941.

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I do not pretend to represent the sentiment of all the farmers of Idaho but believe I do know the sentiment of most of them and am sure we are not in favor of using our ships as convoys or other ways that will eventually get us into that terrible conflict on the other side. We are not in favor of any measure that will eventually get us into the catastrophe of other nations while we believe we can be of the greater benefit to Britain by staying out and helping all that is humanly possible in materials and supplies.

Yours very truly,

W. W. DEAL,
Former Master, Idaho State Grange.

BALTIMORE, MD., May 9, 1941.

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Please accept my sincere congratulations on the wonderful fight which you have and are making against the conveying of British war materials by American ships and American men.

As a matter of possible interest, I am enclosing a copy of a letter from our good Senator RADCLIFFE, together with a copy of my reply.

I am convinced that the great majority of the American people, especially those who will have to sacrifice their lives and those who will have to pay the bill of the war, are very strongly opposed to our entry into this war.

The prowar papers, the New York Times and the Baltimore Sun papers, give much space to anything favorable to our entrance into this war, but give little space and little publicity to favorable information against our entrance into this war, probably for fear of losing some large advertising contracts, knowing that the middle class and little fellows do not control such contracts.

How any sane person can favor convoys or doing anything that will force us into this war, especially after the miserable experience the United States had with the World War, is beyond me.

I pray you godspeed in the great fight which you and others are making to keep this country out of war.

Very sincerely yours,

C. W. BODIE.

BALTIMORE, MD., May 8, 1941.

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR RADCLIFFE: I am grateful for your letter of April 19, but I regret that I am unable to agree with you, as I do feel that we should not enter the war unless or until some foreign nation takes hostile action against the United States, and then only if such action could not be settled by arbitration. Certainly we cannot compare fairly Norway, Denmark, and Holland with the United States, as conditions are so entirely different; furthermore, if the United States is properly prepared with naval, air, and land forces there is not a nation or nations on earth that could conquer us.

As previously stated, while my sympathies are with England, I have not forgotten the last war—the horrors, loss of life, illness, insanity, blindness, tuberculosis, widows, and orphans, etc., resulting from that war, and of the utter futility of the whole thing. The Allies were victorious, and how did they use that victory and the great sacrifices that the

American people made to gain that victory? By starting another war. I can vision one making a mistake, but to deliberately make that same error again is unpardonable and borders on insanity.

The President was reelected on a no-for-foreign-war platform, and the papers have quoted him from time to time as saying that he would keep us out of this war. October 30, 1940, at Boston, he was reported to have said: "I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars; they are going into training to form a force so strong that by its very existence it will keep the threat of war away from our shores." When the so-called lease-lend bill was debated in the Congress and the matter of convoys was under discussion the President was quoted as having stated that "Convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war." Furthermore, 80 percent of the people of the United States are reported to be against war, and this is why I am so strongly opposed to conveying ships with war materials for Britain with American ships and with American men, for if we do I feel certain that it will mean war.

Apparently some people of the United States want the United States to act as policeman for all the so-called democracies. In that event, if two of the South American democracies should start a war between themselves, just which democracy would the United States defend? In view of our World War experience, I still favor the advice of Washington and Jefferson—keep away from foreign entanglements.

Yours very truly,

C. W. BODIE.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1941.

Mr. C. W. BODIE,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. BODIE: Like you, I am 100 percent for preparedness and defense, and, like you, I want to do everything in reason to avoid war consistent with our safety and self-respect.

Should Hitler succeed in overcoming Great Britain, do you feel that the question as to whether or not he took hostile action against us would be dependent upon some special act which he might commit? Judging from what happened in Norway, Denmark, and Holland, the answer would have to be in the negative.

I was very glad to get your very thoughtful letter of the 11th.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE.

[From the Baltimore Sun of May 7, 1941]

MARITIME UNION OPPOSES CONVOYS

NEW YORK, May 7.—All branches of the National Maritime Union (C. I. O.), claiming to represent 65,000 seamen, have approved a resolution opposing American convoys of war supplies to England, Joseph Curran, N. M. U. president, announced today.

The resolution said an attack on a convoy would put the United States into the war, "against the strong desire of an overwhelming majority of the American people to stay out of it."

It further stated that convoys were used "to safeguard the interests and tremendous war profits of shipowners at the risk of seamen's lives."

BLOOMFIELD NURSES REGISTRY,
BLOOMFIELD BLOOD DONOR BUREAU,
Bloomfield, N. J., May 12, 1941.

Senator C. W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Our group on this date—Hospital Day—writes to ask that all be done which is possible to keep this country free of another war. We, as nurses, come in contact with one of the World War's after-

maths. The poor devils in hospitals, shell-shocked and all forms of mental conditions. Why fill more facilities in a few years which convoys will certainly do?

We have sent letters to our Representatives in Washington, also the President, hoping it may reach him. Knowing you are not in favor of convoys, we send these lines expressing our feelings.

Good luck to you and all who "see the light."

Sincerely,

L. C. GIRVAN.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, May 12, 1941.

Senator TOBEY.

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: We wish to thank you for your great efforts in trying to keep our country out of this war. We do so hope that your bill will pass. Then, and only then, can we stay out of the war.

This bill will be our last fight, I am sure. And thanks again for the fine work you are doing.

Very respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. J. E. TOBEY.

CHERRY VALLEY, MASS., May 11, 1941.

HONORABLE SENATOR TOBEY: Please keep up your good work. I am about to be inducted into the service of the United States Army. I'm willing to fight for my country, but only when I feel there is a just cause. At present I don't believe justice will be done to me and the thousands of others if we are made to fight an English war.

The majority feel the same as I do, but they need men like you, Walsh, and Lindbergh to make them realize their opinions should be given consideration.

Keep waking them up so they know that it's not useless for a little fellow to make himself heard and recognized.

Yours respectfully,

ROGER H. KANE.

MEARSFIELD,

Peterborough, N. H., May 14, 1941.

HON. CHARLES TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TOBEY: This is to assure you of the admiration felt by your constituents for your courageous stand on the subject of convoys, for your determination not to let the President forget that he has gone on solemn record before this country as opposed to convoys and foreign wars.

I speak as a representative voter and the mother of two sons who have enlisted in the Naval Reserve to defend this country.

Very truly yours,

LAURIE HILLYER ARMSTRONG.
(Mrs. E. B.)

GOFFE'S SAW & GRIST MILL,
Bedford, N. H.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: May I send you my hearty endorsement of your policy against convoys to England. I trust the moronic steps of those who are in opposition will not discourage the firm stand you have taken. I urge you to hold fast and earnestly hope that more may see the necessity of stopping this gradual slide toward war.

Very truly yours,

CONSTANCE T. WOODBURY.
(Mrs. George Woodbury.)

UNITARIAN PARSONAGE,
Walpole, N. H., May 13, 1941.

Senator CHARLES TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am very thankful that our New Hampshire Senators stand against further involvement in this war. I trust

that your convictions are so firmly grounded that nothing that may happen in the future will weaken or change them.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT M. L. HOLT.

EAST JAFFREY, N. H.,
May 13, 1941.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I have just read your magnificent speech given Sunday on Boston Common.

I could not say the words the way you did, but it is exactly the way I think, and am very thankful that New Hampshire has you to speak for us in this dreadful crisis. This European war is none of our business, and we must keep our boys at home. No convoys.

I am sorry not to have written you long ago to thank you for sending me the two red-hot speeches, re: the lend-lease bill. They were sent to me in Florida, where I spent the winter.

I am glad Hoover has spoken out at last; it ought to help; and I like Lindbergh and all he has to say. He is sincere and patriotic. Guess I am a "copperhead" too.

More power to you and the cause!

Sincerely,

MARIETTA ANNETT.

ST. PAUL'S SCHOOL,
May 13, 1941.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: With millions of Americans who voted for either Mr. Willkie or Mr. Roosevelt last November, I voted for "aid short of war for the democracies." When I asked you to support the lease-lend legislation I wanted aid short of war. I still want aid short of war. No words of mine could state my convictions better than Mr. Hoover did in his speech on Sunday evening.

Yours truly,

EDITH E. R. CONWELL.
(Mrs. George M. Conwell.)

CONCORD, N. H.

MANCHESTER, N. H.,
May 12, 1941.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I sincerely hope you will do all in your power to keep our boys on our own shores. To convoy ships across the ocean is asking for war. Please don't let this happen.

Mrs. ELLA LANGER.

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
Durham, N. H., May 12, 1941.

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to give you my unqualified approval of your stand upon the convoy question. Convoys mean war, and I am firmly convinced that it would be a tragic mistake for the United States to enter the European war. Please keep up the good work.

I have not been long at the University of New Hampshire; my position is a modest one. Today I was given the opportunity of signing a statement to be submitted to the president of the university condemning your position. I did not sign, because I could not honestly do so. But since this was a negative way of supporting you, I thought it behooved me to give you more positive support. Hence this letter.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT B. SEARS,
Assistant in charge,
Biological Institute Library.

BARTLETT, N. H., May 13, 1941.
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am very much against using our forces to man ships for convoy purposes.

I think it would be better to equip and furnish the vessels and let the English furnish the manpower.

Yours truly,

EVERETT W. TEBBETTS,
Veteran.

HAMPTON, N. H., May 12, 1941.

HON. CHARLES TOBEY,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I listened with great interest to your fine address on Boston Commons, Mother's Day. We are all proud of you and the great work you are doing to bring the truth before the people. We do not want our ships used as convoys and we don't want war.

I wish there were more men like you and Charles Lindbergh who had courage to speak their convictions.

Very truly,

Mrs. MARY B. WARBURTON.

EXETER, N. H., May 13, 1941.

HON. CHARLES TOBEY,
United States Senator
from New Hampshire,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As a very humble citizen of this old town I am writing you to tell you that I am mighty pleased with your attitude in the present deplorable international situation. I admire your stand in regard to convoys.

My father, the late Capt. George N. Julian, served 4 years in the Civil War which was, without doubt, prolonged by the assistance given the Confederacy by the English.

History will detail to you and anyone else who will read, instance after instance where the British have done all in their power against the United States, especially in the Revolution and the War of 18'2.

I do not believe a leopard can change its spots and therefore I see no change in the attitude of the British people toward the United States except to get all they can from us and then stab us in the back even while accepting our gifts.

I believe the advice of Washington to have no foreign entanglements is as applicable today as when it was given.

Therefore I am against any help we may give England except what it pays for in the way of cold cash.

I voted for you at your last election and I will gladly do the same again.

Please excuse this letter and consider me always your staunch supporter,

JOHN A. L. JULIAN.

DEERFIELD, N. H., May 13, 1941.

CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I was much pleased with your talk at Boston, Mass., Sunday afternoon. I agree with it 100 percent. The people of New Hampshire should be proud of you as their Senator. I am glad we have a man who has the mind and courage to tell the public he is for the interest of the United States and its people and is using his every effort to maintain the principle that was said by George Washington, "To keep out of foreign troubles."

May God help you to continue, if you win or lose in your effort to keep us out of this war.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE W. DANFORTH.

NATIONAL OLD AGE PENSIONS, INC.,
Nashua, N. H., May 14, 1941.

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my admiration of the courageous stand that you have taken

and the work that you are doing in your efforts to keep this country from becoming actually involved in the European war.

In these troubled times it takes the kind of courage that you possess to stand up and fight for what one believes in when those beliefs happen to be in conflict with those of the administration in Washington. I am proud that New Hampshire has a man of your type to represent it in the Senate of the United States.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. EFFIE T. RUSSELL.

GOFFSTOWN, N. H., May 13, 1941.
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TOBEY: I admire you for the stand you are taking on the question of convoys.

I wish to go on record as being opposed to the use of our United States Navy for convoying ships to Britain, believing that it would automatically involve the United States in this war.

I feel we can contribute more to the aid of Britain if we refrain from any act that would lay ourselves open to attack.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. FLORA L. BLAISDELL.

MANCHESTER, N. H., May 12, 1941.
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We appreciate your speech in Boston, Mass., on Sunday, May 11.

We thank you for your opposition to convoy and foreign wars.

Very truly yours,

THEODORE GRIMARD.

PORTSMOUTH, N. H., May 13, 1941.
HON. CHARLES TOBEY.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I was delighted to read in the Boston Post on Monday, the reaction your Sunday speech on the Boston Common made upon the public.

You did a good job, and I only wish you could do it in other places. Anyway, the President changed his program. I sent him my protest today about using convoys; I also sent Senator GEORGE my protest. In both letters, I asked that the people be allowed to vote on the question of war.

Now that the President has postponed his speech it will give the people more time to think it over, talk it over, and write more letters, now that you have got them aroused.

Boston was just the place to start from. I hope you will either repeat your speech in the same place, or select another equally good city.

I wish that I could help. What can one do now?

You are to be congratulated for your courage.

Of course, I am asking everyone I meet to write to the President and our Senators.

Is there anything else we can do? You have my support. Thanks for your letter and copy of speech on radio.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. LOUIS H. ALLEN.

BARTLETT, N. H., May 14, 1941.
Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY:

Drive the British out of Washington. Stop the convoys, also foreign wars. More power to you.

J. F. CHADBOURNE.

CONCORD, N. H., May 14, 1941.
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I know you are flooded with messages of congratulations from all parts of our great land for the position you have taken on the issue of convoy. May the faith we have in your righteousness make more

might in your fight for us against conveying ships in European waters. There is no doubt in my mind, as also in the minds of a great many others in this beautiful city of Concord, but we are heading for an undeclared war against the Axis Powers if this convoy which has partially started is continued.

The Neutrality Act was passed to keep our ships out of the war zone—let us see to it that we abide by this act.

Kindly accept my encouragement and gratitude for the good work you are doing and the firm stand you have taken on this question of convoy.

Sincerely yours,

AUSTIN B. PRESBY.

P. S.—Would it be possible to receive a copy of an extract from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of your speech of April 18, 1941.
A. B. P.

DERRY, N. H., May 12, 1941.

DEAR SIR: I, as a citizen of New Hampshire, want to urge you to keep up your fight against our conveying and getting into war.

While I do not approve of Hitler's policy, I feel that we are all partly responsible for making these conditions possible by the treatment Germany received after the last war.

I would also like to urge you that in the future our policy be one of cooperation with all nations, a policy of service instead of only thinking of our own interest. As long as we are fighting wars we will never have peace. I would like to see a union of world nations, where trade, etc., can be justly distributed to all nations.

In peacetime we claim we cannot have foreign entanglements, but yet in war we want foreign entanglements.

I congratulate you and others who are striving for peace, and I think as a supposedly Christian nation, we should try to be Christian in our actions.

Yours truly,

HERBERT CHASE.

HAMMOND, IND., May 11, 1941.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I was born in the hills of Kentucky, where we were taught America first during our cradle days. I have always stuck to that patriotism. When I was 17 years of age I enlisted in the United States Navy, and received my honorable discharge after 4 years' service. I stand ready to give my life for America, but refuse to give one drop of my blood because of a few personalities or over-night spring-ups of European "isms."

I am afraid for America's sake of an offensive, offending policy which makes enemies of the world except one power. If we go into this war, we go a divided people, unless we have more reason to fight than imperialism and the hate of a few personalities. All America would unite 100 percent if the cause were just and if it really meant America. But why tell you this; you understand.

I do offer a prayer that Almighty God continue to give you courage. Some day you shall be rewarded. The American people are not masses of fools. Thank Heaven, some still read and think instead of believing.

I would suggest that we have a warmonger in the crow's-nest of every convoy or troop-transport ship which sails for England, Africa, and other foreign lands. If they can so selfishly make the policies against the people's will, let them get a taste of a foolishly created hell instead of dwelling in our Capital's heaven.

WM. R. ADAMS.

This article written by me was published recently in our local paper:

THIS BEAUTIFUL FIGHT

Yes; we are about ready to begin, and what a build-up. We have been primed, misled, and betrayed. We first have cash and

carry; no ships to war zones; no loans; and build up this country's defenses from money received by selling our antiquated planes, ships, etc. Never, a thousand times never, an expeditionary force to be bombed from the heavens and torpedoed from hell while they helplessly do nothing but die.

On we went; a few more kings were driven from jewel-studded thrones built from sweating brows of half-starved, badly mistreated peasants; then we promised more aid.

Later, after ample propaganda and appeals from kings with red-headed female companions and gold-lined dance halls, we softened. Our policy became "Come and get it; pay later or never, as you have always done. Our newest public opinion is in our favor." How sweet the sound. What chance did public opinion have when the least dared opposition was muffled out with cries of "Traitor, coward, appeaser" and other condemning terms.

Now it's wide open. Convoys, war, anything, no more short-of-war phrases. We must preserve the lords, the kings, and queens against whose ancestors the stalwart pioneers of this country valiantly fought to protect a land where taxes would go for the betterment of common people rather than to fat, false politicians, nobles, and lords for champagne, 25-cent cigars, and corrupt parties.

Soon, my friends, it will be expeditionary forces, total war with nothing to gain but broken homes, more taxes for the continuation of the "ritzy" lives of nobles who spread coats for the ladies to walk upon while the poor go naked and starve.

What will we fight for? How silly. Yes; we real Americans would all fight for America, what America really stands for, but not for the upper crust who always push from behind but never pull when it comes to battle, who always give those who are sincere, patriotic, honest, and productive a new false deal instead of a new honest one.

Yes; we will fight, fight for this land for which our fathers bled and for those fundamental principles of a government by, for, and of the people. We must protest against a government by, for, and of the government. Let's fortify this hemisphere and deport on the next boat with a lend, lease, and please lose, shipping bill those who would betray the majority of the common, productive, honest, and brave Americans who really love America and who do not want America to fight because of a few personalities or because there might be a little trade competition for the millionaire exchangers and businessmen.

Yes; we are about there; but wait a minute. There is a low rumbling sound which our all-assuming politicians do not hear. America is still America and the people cannot be fooled all the time. Our fathers and we fought for this land time and time again, while a few gathered a bloody harvest after giving the fighters and producers a "forget-it pill." But this time we warn, we are not appeasers; therefore, we asked to be consulted, not driven by false propaganda. Our flag-waving, band-beating arteries are clogged until we know what we fight for and where. We agree to fight here only, and only for those principles for which we thought we had always fought—common, plain, old American principles of freedom, justice, equality, with no upper crust and interest fixers as our cowardly and selfish leaders. Give us those principles in this country, and the end of time will find us fighting. Otherwise, I suppose we might have to fight for awhile half-heartedly, but beware betrayers who would clip the principles which serve as the foundation of this country and cry "patriotism" to detract our attention from the scars.
WILLIAM R. ADAMS.

SCAPPOOSE, OREG., May 11, 1941.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I should be a very stupid American if I failed to write to you in

acknowledgment of your honest and healthy efforts to keep this Republic from being sent out by men who should be tested for their sanity to police the world. My views and those of dozens of my friends coincide exactly with your own in every way, and I urge you please to keep up the fight, for somehow those deceivers in high places must be kept from always getting their way, at the expense of our people, when an honest look on the inside of any base hospital in the land would give the answer to all the questions.

Please do not hesitate to let me know if there is anything, anything at all that I can do toward our keeping this Nation from falling to pieces, just to please England. I am tired of all the insults, the supersuperiority of the British over us, and the sell-out. It is decent and commonsense, dear Senator TOBEY, and I also speak with knowledge, since for 10 years I have lived in Europe and traveled in Asia, and I am in command of the facts as regards the attitudes of other nations toward our own, for our meddling. Let Britain handle her own affairs without dragging us to the level of peasants because of her jealousies.

Sincere and honest regards,

IONE DUNN.

MIDDLEBURY, VT., May 13, 1941.

Senator CHARLES TOBEY,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I want to thank you for carrying on the fight against war and dictatorship in the United States, and add my voice to that great chorus of voices which is being raised against the war policy of the Roosevelt government today. I want you to know that you have my support in your courageous battle. I know many other people who hold with you, but who, unfortunately, are so frightened by Roosevelt propaganda and the veiled threats of local dictators-in-embryo that they do not dare to express themselves openly.

Your speech over WQXR, at the Congress of the People in New York, was, I am convinced, a history-making episode in the course of American political events. I could not have been more thrilled if I had been listening to the voice of Patrick Henry, or some other great American patriot. Let us hope that there can be an ever-increasing number of such forums as that held in New York by the Congress of the People. Such forums put the fear of God into the warmongers, for when they listen to the radio they cannot help hearing the ominous roar of public wrath and indignation.

It is no attempt of mine to exaggerate when I say that people in Middlebury are dissatisfied and discontented, not to mention frightened, by the course of the Government. Men of my age—military age—are without exception disgruntled at the prospect of being pushed into a conflict which we all regard as an almost certain eventuality due to the corruption of the Roosevelt regime. A brilliant young medical doctor—one of the best in the town—a young master carpenter, mechanics, students, college professors (of military age), all of us are sullen about the conduct of the Government. I do not think I exaggerate when I say that if we get into the war in a big way, sending navies, men and equipment, that there will be created a situation favorable to revolution following or during the war. Thanks to yourself and a number of other prominent and patriotic American statesmen, and also men in private life, the public is not fooled about this war. Some are deceived, to be sure, but not the majority. The lies of President Roosevelt and his henchmen have been too numerous, and have been exposed too frequently, for the people to forget. If Roosevelt takes us into a war he will complete the chasm which is growing deeper every day between the Government and the people.

We read about a plan to present you with a yellow umbrella. We know that you can carry that off in your stride. However, my wife suggested something which might help you to lighten the burden a little. She proposed that you invite Lord Halifax to be at the reception party when the delegation of New Hampshire citizens arrives at Washington, Halifax having had plenty of experience in handling appeasement umbrellas.

More power to you.

Sincerely,

PAUL T. COLLINS.

SOUTH RIVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
South River, N. J., May 12, 1941.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Thank God for such men as you, who will fight to make the voice of the common American heard. I heard your address from Boston today, and you are voicing the will and feelings of millions of Americans who are by force of circumstances kept quiet on the side lines. I have a son in the United States Marine Corps whom his mother and I were happy and proud to see enlist in the service of his country for its defense. He is an honor graduate of Dartmouth College and prepared to enter a worthy professional career. He has foregone this for the moment, we hope, to serve his country; but if the President and his cohorts have their way, I am sure he will be one of millions struggling on foreign soil for another mythical prize. He is now sorry he joined the United States forces and feels he has been duped.

Please do all you can to prevent the passage of the convoy bill, which will inevitably plunge us into war. The President seems to have no hesitancy about throwing his promises to the wind. He has done it often before and we helpless Americans can do nothing about it. We must depend upon you Senators and Representatives to stop him in his determination to thrust us into this awful holocaust. Keep fighting; the common folks, the mothers and fathers of America, are with you.

I have contacted my own Senators and Congressman. What else can I do?

Sincerely and respectfully,

LESTER A. RODES.

CONCORD, N. H., May 12, 1941.

Senator CHARLES TOBEY,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I am very glad that you are doing all you can to keep the United States from convoying the supplies sent to Britain and hope that you will continue to keep up your activity in this direction.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH C. KELLEY.

THE LESSON OF THE YEARS

The years have taught me many things
But none so sure as this:
That shelter, solace, joy, and strength
Are always where God is.
So now when hope and courage fail,
And only fear is strong,
My heart will sing as in the past
An unforgotten song.

God is my refuge and my strength
I will not be afraid,
And though the night be wild and dark
I'll meet it undismayed.

BELMONT, MASS.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: May God bless you and your work, and it will be my continued prayer that you will be given the health to carry on and the grace of wisdom to see and speak the truth as you are now doing so nobly.

May God's blessing be yours.

Cordially in Christ,

Rev. ARTHUR B. KIMBALL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., May 9, 1941.

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am one of that vast majority of Americans who detest and abhor Hitler and nazi-ism; who are even sympathetic to Britain in her hour of retribution; but who cannot and will not swallow the lying definition of "defense for America" which a perfidious administration and government, in concert with other self-seeking warmongers, is attempting to ram down the throats of the American people.

When our double-talking President—promising to keep us out of war, all the while consciously leading us into it—says that we in America are ready to fight and to die to defend America, to defend our way of life, to defend democracy and the four freedoms—which, by the way, we are yet to achieve—he is right. But the word "defend" to us Americans means just that—defend. It does not mean the creation of an American empire out of the fragments of the crumbling empires of Britain, Holland, Belgium, and France. It does not mean policing the world. It does not mean lording over other nations and peoples and telling them what to do or how to live.

We Americans are no cowards; we are no weaklings; and we have the calm conviction that we are invincible in our own back yard, where we belong. There need be no contemplation of any regret if history shall prove us to be wrong in this conviction, for if that happens, then America and Americans will not have been worth saving.

We want no convoys, no naval action, no subterfuges, nothing—absolutely no part of this recurrent European slaughter.

Yours truly,

JAY H. BEST.

NEWBERG, OREG., May 12, 1941.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: It is encouraging that a Senator from the sovereign State of New Hampshire is opposed to the high-handed intrigue that prevails in Washington at this time. I am a direct descendant of the illustrious patriot that was a "signer" and also the first Governor of New Hampshire. If the patriots of that period were here and could see what is being done today, they would wonder whether we were deserving of independence from the British Crown.

From the information we receive via radio and news sources, our country is rapidly forging toward war. The average citizen does not want war. We do want adequate defense, but here. We are opposed to convoying British or any other vessels. We have no right to send our boys to foreign shores. When we do that we have surrendered to British plutocracy as surely as if Washington had been defeated at Yorktown. Our community is made up of thrifty people that are just barely getting by—good, honest, hard-working, devout people. War taxation, in any case, will cause the loss of many homes and farms to mortgage foreclosures. If, in addition to that, our manpower, our workers, are slaughtered needlessly, what can be ahead? Use your influence to vote against war.

Very truly,

MRS. S. A. BRISTOL, born Bartlett.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., May 12, 1941.

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I heard your thrilling, patriotic address over the radio yesterday afternoon. Frankly, I consider it one of the most patriotic utterances made in our day. I pronounce it equal to Patrick Henry's "Give me liberty or give me death" appeal. Alas "them" were the real American days.

Notwithstanding your undiluted 100-percent Americanism, however, attached is a mere 2-inch clipping taken from today's Philadelphia Inquirer, which, obviously, measures the patriotism of this newspaper compared to yours and all the real red-

blooded Americans in the United States who haven't a chance, pitted against such overwhelming handicap.

I am also attaching a clipping from the editorial page of the Norristown Times Herald. This is an obituary on my late father. I enclose this primarily to bring to your attention the Americanism and the Americanistic appeal of my dad, shortly before his death. If we must have unity—a united America—I believe my father's last appeal on earth is the one and only solution.

Please convey my regards to Senator JIM DAVIS, your colleague and my friend and favored Senator from Pennsylvania. Please also convey to Congressman BILL DITTER my fervent regards. I have had the honor of talking from the same platform with BILL, and I am sure he favors my ideals—and yours—on what is best for the safety and preservation of America.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. ALLEVA.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 10, 1941]

VOTING ON CONVOYS CALLED WAR DECISION

BOSTON, May 11.—Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY (Republican, New Hampshire) told a Mother's Day crowd of 3,000 today on Boston Common that he would introduce an anticonvoy resolution as an amendment to the ship-seizure bill in the Senate this week.

Asserting he would demand a roll call on the amendment, TOBEY said:

"I measure my words when I say that the vote on that anticonvoy amendment will be a war vote. It will be a vote to decide whether the United States shall enter the war or stay out."

[From the Norristown (Pa.) Times Herald of March 11, 1941]

TOWN TALK

Casimiro Alleva, who died last week at the age of 85, was one of the few remaining pioneer Italian emigrants from the Italy of the pre-Mussolinian era, who came over to and contributed his indelible part toward the development of the American community in which he lived and labored.

As a respected local merchant and private banker, Mr. Alleva enjoyed the confidence as well as the respect of his fellow men. His store, at 250 East Main Street, now the site of Chatlin's department store, became a sort of "oasis" for the immigrants of sunny Italy who came to America in great numbers after 1900.

Casimiro Alleva was one of the founders and president for the first 25 years of the Mutuo Soccorso Society, now the Mutual Benefit Association, the first Italo-American society in Norristown. Migrating to America in the late nineties, when Italians were pioneer—strangers in a friendly land of opportunity discovered by their immortal compatriot, Columbus—he strove to plant the germ of Americanism in the hearts of those of his fellow countrymen who followed him in migrating to this beloved land of democracy and promise.

As president of the first American society of Italian extraction aforesaid, he was the first emigrant to unfurl the tricolor of his native Italy alongside the beloved Stars and Stripes of his adopted America. The occasion was the first local commemorative Columbus Day parade—the Yankee Doodle march of the Italo-American fathers of their proud American sons of today.

Italian emigrant Casimiro Alleva's heart was truly Americanized, although his tongue was never completely Anglicized.

He was the first, if not perhaps the only, foreigner in Montgomery County ever admitted to full American citizenship by examination through an interpreter. At that time (1907) character was the chief qualification for admission to American citizenship, rather than ability to speak English; and

our county judges at that time (Judges Swartz, Wiend, and Miller) promptly welcomed Mr. Alleva as an American.

As evidence of his soulful Americanism, his son John quotes Casimiro Alleva as having expressed only recently the opinion that "the President of the United States should call a conference of tried and true outstanding Americans of every racial extraction comprising these United States for their collective opinion as to what should be our foreign policy." This, the elder Alleva believed, would produce in these troubled times the common-sense, practical, harmonious unity every American so soulfully hopes for and craves, "that 100-percent unity so vital for the safety and preservation of America."

Casimiro Alleva's pet expressions were: "Racial sentiment is not incompatible with 100-percent Americanism"; and, "Let our hearts be Americanized while time Anglicizes our foreign tongues." He breathed, loved, and preached Americanism until his last conscious day on earth.

NEW YORK, May 8, 1941.

The Honorable HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR HARRY: You and I have been friends for many years. And, though our ways have parted since the old days, I have always thought of you as an able, honorable, and patriotic man. Yet, as I listened to the measured sentences of your broadcast Tuesday night, I confess that I was shocked and deeply distressed. And I will tell you some of the reasons why.

1. Your broadcast began with a complaint against those who say you are trying to get America into war, who say you are a war-monger. Then you proceeded to call for convoying, which the President says will necessarily mean war. And you ended up with an exhortation to the youth of America to be ready to die in a war with Germany, which you virtually declared to be an accomplished fact—though Congress has never declared war.

2. You did not hesitate to base your plea for convoying on the incorrect allegation that American supplies cannot be delivered in sufficient quantity to Britain on account of the German U-boat blockade. On Wednesday, the day after your broadcast, Admiral Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, reported that, out of the hundreds of vessels that have cleared from American ports, only 8 have been sunk since the beginning of the year. He also reported that only 158 vessels, clearing from all ports of the world, have been sunk in 1941.

Harry, was that information available to you before your broadcast? If it was, you owe an explanation and, I think, an apology to every citizen of this country.

Why didn't you ask for convoying and war last summer, when Britain, as now, was calling on us for more planes and munitions, and when, according to your testimony before the House Military Affairs Committee, she was in such a desperate condition that her collapse and the seizure of her navy by Germany was possible at any moment?

On July 31, you appeared before that committee and, after stating that we could no longer rely on our Navy and the Atlantic and Pacific oceans for defense, you said:

"You, gentlemen, are the trustees of the security of the United States."

"A prudent trustee must take into consideration the possibility that in another 30 days Great Britain herself may be conquered and her shipyards pass under German control."

A few days later Secretary of the Navy Knox made a similar statement before the same committee, though he extended the period of possible collapse from 30 to 60 days.

Nevertheless, in the entire period between these prognostications and November 5, when the people went to the polls and reelected Mr. Roosevelt on his clear, categorical, and unconditional pledges of peace, neither you nor the President, nor any man in the administration said a mumbling word in favor of convoys or any act by our Government that might involve us in war. And invariably all proposals to help Britain were coupled with the promise that, whatever happened, you people in Washington would do nothing that might result in war.

On October 30, at Boston, President Roosevelt told 22,000 cheering men and women:

"And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again: Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

On many platforms he pledged no "intervention in foreign disputes," no "army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside the Americas except in case of attack."

Now, since on Tuesday night, as Secretary of War, you said the things the President has not dared to say for himself, I ask you this question: What are the hidden forces, who are the people with a vested interest in war, what are the mysterious, unspoken considerations that, after the ballots were counted, so suddenly switched Mr. Roosevelt from the path of peace to the highroad of war?

Sincerely yours,

AMOS PINCHOT.

[From the Huron News, Bad Axe, Mich.]

OPINION

(By C. C. S.)

Democracy is a noble word. It means a government that derives its powers from the consent of the governed.

The American Colonies went to war more than 150 years ago to achieve that kind of a government. About a quarter of a century ago the United States of America crossed 3,000 miles of ocean to make the world safe for democracy.

Again we are confronted with the probability of going to war to preserve democracy in the world. The last war for democracy cost our country 75,000 lives and more than \$25,000,000,000. The present struggle will cost much more money and many more lives—if we engage in the fighting.

Is democracy a precious thing only when we are called on to fight for it? The United States refused to join the League of Nations because it might involve us in foreign controversies, but every time a row breaks out in Europe our Government jumps in with both feet.

Is it true that our Government would much prefer to fight to preserve democracy than to work and mediate to make it safe? If this country had been as interested in keeping the world safe for democracy as it is to fight for it, the present war could have been avoided.

Let us not forget that Germany had a democracy after the World War. The Treaty of Versailles reduced Germany to a vassal state at the insistence of England and France, overruling President Wilson, who had promised Germany a peace with no annexations. Germany lost her colonies and one-seventh of her European territory.

It is the consensus of opinion among British statesmen and Woodrow Wilson that the treaty was unjust and should be revised. But what did these nations, who now prate about democracy, do to encourage and preserve the youthful democracy in Germany?

Germany was bankrupt; its middle class had been wiped out through inflation; unemployment and hunger were widespread, bringing suffering, discontent, revolution, and thousands of suicides.

Then was the time for England, France, and America to talk about saving democracy

when it would not have meant war. The German Government had at last been snatched from the war lords by the people of Germany. That was the real victory of the World War. The democracy of Germany should have meant a mutual bond of friendship between the people of Germany and the people of the other democracies.

But what happened? France, in particular, was as suspicious of the German people as they had been of the Prussian war leaders. England could not quite bring herself to recognize the German Republic as an equal in Europe, and the United States tossed them a few crumbs of bread and forgot the promise of the American President; forgot that the World War had accomplished more than they had expected—that Germany had really joined the family of the democracies.

These champions of democracy waited until distress and despair had destroyed democracy in Germany, until desperation had driven the German people to accept most any scheme that might lead them out of an apparently hopeless situation.

So a new democracy was born and died while England, France, and the United States looked on. Instead of extending the hand of friendship they turned their backs in distrust—waiting until it was time to fight another war for democracy.

A little faith and human kindness shown the people's government of Germany in 1923 and the years following; a little of this great love for democracy put in action then would have preserved the new democracy and made another friend for our form of government.

The democracies bungled an excellent opportunity then to establish friendship with a people who now are again seeking to gain by force what negotiation and peace failed to bring them—"a place in the sun."

Lord Lothian, England's Ambassador to the United States who recently died in Washington, said in 1937, "On the principle that any government that fails to remedy the serious grievances of its people in time must face revolution at home. I think it is true in international affairs that, unless a situation which causes a deep sense of injustice, resentment, and grievance can be remedied by agreement, it will inevitably be remedied by unilateral action, or in the last resort by power diplomacy or war. There is no use in talking about the sanctity of treaties unless they are just treaties."

"Is there any doubt that if we put ourselves in the position of the Germans, leaving entirely out of account the existence of the Nazi regime, we should feel bitterly that we had been unjustly and badly treated ever since 1918, that we had just claims against the rest of the world, and that if we could not get our just rights by agreement we were entitled to take them back by force if we could do so?"

"I think the present regime in Germany has been created by the policy of her neighbors, and mainly by the policy of keeping Germany down and 'encircled' which has been relentlessly pursued by France since 1920. But when I say French policy, I do not mean to hold France alone responsible for that policy, because I think the United States and Great Britain are equally responsible."

That, my gentle readers, is quite a mouthful for one of the leaders of England during recent years. And it gives us something to think about besides the propaganda that is being spread abroad in the land to the effect that the Allies are all right and the Axis all wrong.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 7, 1941]

IT MEANS WAR

President Roosevelt said convoys mean shooting and shooting means war.

His Secretary of War Stimson declares for convoys—now. The Constitution of the United States says, "The Congress shall have power to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water."

Obviously, therefore, since the issue of war has been laid down by the Secretary of War, it should go to Congress which, under the Constitution, has the final responsibility and is under constitutional mandate to say yes or no.

The decision will be the most important since the one made by Congress on April 6, 1917.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to make a simple observation in view of the statement made by the Senator from New Hampshire that it had "played up" in advance by the spokesmen of the President that last night he intended to take a definite stand in behalf of convoys.

I do not think the Senator from New Hampshire has a right to draw any such inference as that. I do not believe anybody who "played up" the fact that the President was going to speak last night had any authority either to speak for him as to what he was going to say or to conjecture as to what he was going to say; neither do I believe the President canceled his speech last night because of any letters he had received.

I simply wanted to state that I do not believe anybody had the right even to guess about what the President was going to say if he had spoken last night, and it is not fair to the President to intimate that he canceled his speech simply because he had received some letters.

I merely wished to make that statement for the RECORD.

Mr. TOBEY. In reply to the distinguished majority leader, my authority for that statement—and he who runs may read always—lies in the fact that the remarks and addresses made by the Cabinet members of the same President, notably, Secretary of the Navy Knox, Secretary of Agriculture Wickard—I think Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes is included in the lot—and, in addition to that, Secretary of War Stimson, if I am able to judge the English language, breathed the spirit of war and convoys, and culminated in the most terrible example exhibited today, in the statement of Secretary of the Navy Knox that American manhood is committed to carry on a war to save England. He never had authority for such a statement, and I challenge it now. Those statements, or a large part of them, breathed a spirit of getting into the war all over—convoys, men, and everything else—and the American people are opposed to it, beyond peradventure, by a tremendous majority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, when I concluded my statement yesterday afternoon regarding the pending amendment I left one phase of the matter open in contemplation of the receipt of official information from the Department of State. I refer to the fact that it has been generally understood that

the Government of Chile undertook a few months ago to seize certain alien ships interned in her harbors, and was prevented from their use under the Chilean flag by a British refusal to guarantee their safe conduct at sea under Chilean sovereignty. I stated last night that for 2 or 3 weeks I had sought authentic information on the subject without avail. I stated that I sought it from many witnesses before the Committee on Commerce without avail.

Day before yesterday the committee authorized a letter to be sent to the State Department with a request for authentic information. The reply has arrived this morning. It is addressed to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. I read it:

The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of May 12, 1941, concerning the bill to authorize the acquisition by the United States of foreign merchant vessels (H. R. 4466) and requesting information regarding the following two questions:

1. What was the basis of the British complaint against the transfer of German ships to the Chilean flag under the general formula which is contemplated by this bill?

2. In what respect does this formula collide with the pan-American agreement which was made here in the Pan American Union within the last 3 or 4 weeks on this specific subject?

With reference to the first question, insofar as the Department is advised, no German ships were taken over by the Chilean Government under the general formula which is contemplated by H. R. 4466.

Concerning the second question, the Department is of the view that the provisions of H. R. 4466 are not in conflict with the resolution adopted on April 26, 1941, by the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Mr. President, let me take the first question and the first answer. The distinguished Secretary of State is unquestionably literally correct in replying that "insofar as the Department is advised, no German ships were taken over by the Chilean Government." I finally discovered this morning that they were Danish ships, not German ships. But I very much regret that, in the spirit of comity under which the inquiry was sincerely addressed to the State Department, in an earnest effort to substitute authentic facts for mere conjecture, the Department has not seen fit to go beyond the text of the question and to accept the inquiry in the spirit in which it was submitted, and to give us the information which was obviously sought, and which ought to be available.

I have had only an hour or two since the receipt of the letter from the State Department. Manifestly I cannot speak by the book, because official sources of information seem to be entirely closed. They have been closed for 3 weeks, and they are still closed this morning. But I assert, first, on the basis of a news dispatch—

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before proceeding further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. LEE. Does the Senator imply a criticism of the State Department for not answering a question which was not asked? The Senator asked, as I under-

stood, how many German ships were taken, and the Senator is now unhappy because the State Department did not tell him something about certain Danish ships which were taken?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator can be as literal as he pleases in his effort to evade the point I am submitting. A representative of the State Department appeared before our committee for at least 2 hours, probably in the absence of the Senator, who is a member of the committee, and the representative of the State Department—

Mr. LEE. If the Senator will yield—the Senator from Oklahoma was present.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sorry. I assumed he was not, or he would have known what I am about to say, which bears upon the answer.

Mr. LEE. But the Senator seems disturbed because the State Department did not understand what he wanted.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will answer the question. The representative of the State Department was quizzed for a considerable period about this general information that there was some sort of a seizure in Chile concerning which we wanted information for whatever bearing it might have upon the general situation. The general information we had was that the seizure was of German ships. Apparently the seizure was of Danish ships. I am merely expressing my regret that the State Department, knowing the generally sincere purpose of the inquiry, knowing that it had to be a general quest for information concerning which we had no definite facts—I am merely expressing regret that the Department did not receive the inquiry in the obvious spirit in which it was submitted, and give us the information regarding ship seizures.

Mr. President, I now return to my statement. On the basis of dispatches carried in all of the regular news associations of the country, on February 16, three Danish vessels which were interned in Chilean harbors were seized by the Chilean Government, under a decree which took them over as public utilities for the duration of the war, for the purpose of operating them in the Chilean trade.

My next statement is based upon the best available information I can secure this morning from those in Washington who should know authentically what happens in Chile. In any event, the ships are still interned in Chilean harbors, and the best information I can procure, having failed to gain it officially, is that they are still interned, because the British Government checkmated the efforts of the Chilean Government to obtain insurance on the ships, and because the British Government declined to guarantee that the ships, when once at sea, would not be seized, because the British Government would not recognize the right of a neutral to immunize a confiscated ship against capture by the British Government at sea.

I hope that statement is correct. It is as nearly correct as I can make it. I repeat my regret that the facts are not specifically authenticated by the State Department's letter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. In this particular case, was title taken and compensation paid, or were the ships merely seized?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am unable to say.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, that would be a very important factor, because if the ships were merely seized, they would still be Danish property, whereas if they were taken over under condemnation and compensation paid, they would cease to be Danish property.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The statement in the newspapers was that there was to be full compensation in some form, but it was a generality, and I am unable to give the Senator an authentic reply.

The only reason why the matter seemed to be of moment to the commerce committee, Mr. President, was that it seemed to bear upon what has been, and probably still is, the general international understanding of the rights of a neutral in respect to the seizure of ships. It seems to me that if three Danish ships, which are neutral ships, and therefore the case is far more aggravated than it was under the hypothesis that I laid down, because I was presuming to inquire about German ships, which would have made the situation far more challenging—it seems to me that if the Danish ships cannot be transferred to the sovereignty of a neutral for the duration of the war, or the use of the neutral for its own trade, if they cannot be seized without a protest from Great Britain that that is a violation of the British understanding of their right to seize ships at sea of that character and status, then it seems to me it becomes of considerable importance in connection with the pending bill that we should know what the British attitude is to be toward this fleet of 84 ships which we are about either to purchase or charter or seize—requisition, excuse me; and that it bears distinctly upon the fundamental right which we are assuming to exercise. We are assuming to exercise it now, no doubt, in behalf of British advantage, so that as a practical proposition I assume the degree of hazard substantially disappears under the Chilean precedent, but still the Chilean precedent stands as an independent assertion of the British attitude respecting this general process, and it bears very definitely, it seems to me, upon the problem which confronts us.

Mr. President, I said everything I wanted to say upon this subject yesterday, and I am going to subside, with but one single concluding statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the Senator subsidizes I should like to ask him about his amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I admit that I am unfamiliar with nautical terms, but I had always understood that a flagship was a ship flying the flag of the commander of a fleet, or something of that kind.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; I think not.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's amendment provides—

That the flagships of nations now engaged in war requisitioned pursuant to the provisions of this act shall not be turned over—

And so forth. What does the term "flagship" mean technically in the amendment?

Mr. VANDENBERG. A flagship is a ship flying the flag of the nation under which it is registered.

Mr. BARKLEY. So they are all flagships?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. All ships fly some flag.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So there is no technical meaning attached to the word "flagship" as respects the ships of any country or any fleet; is that true? Of course, we speak usually in terms of a navy.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suppose there are limitations of tonnage in respect to registration which may have some technical bearing on the use of the word "flagship."

Mr. BARKLEY. At any rate the 30 ships involved in the Senator's amendment are all flagships?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Now, Mr. President, I sum up in one sentence everything I tried to say yesterday. There are 84 ships involved in this contemplated transfer. Fifty-four of these eighty-four ships are the ships of nonbelligerents. Therefore there is nothing in the pending amendment which will in any way restrict the use of these 54 ships when taken over by American authority. The amendment does not ever circumscribe the authority of the United States Government in taking over the other 30 belligerent ships, so long as those ships are used in our own trade and on our own trade routes. That is the precise purpose which Assistant Secretary of State Breckinridge Long specifically advised the Commerce Committee was the purpose of taking over the ships, namely, to put them on our own trade routes. Therefore there is nothing in this amendment which in any way prohibits or proscribes the full, free American use of not only the 54 ships in their entirety, including the right of transfer to Britain if desired, but there is nothing which interferes in any way with the use of the 30 ships in the manner which the State Department advised the Senate Commerce Committee is the intention to use them.

The only point at which the amendment becomes effective is if and when this neutral country undertakes to transfer the property, the ships of one belligerent, to an adverse belligerent. At that point the amendment says it cannot be done, and it says it cannot be done because that transfer is universally recognized as a violation of international law, and obviously it is a definite, provocative step in the direction of war.

I submit that if the Senate wants to turn the amendment down, all in the world it is doing is gratuitously insisting upon the injection of a provision in this law which does take a provocative step to-

ward war, and it is unnecessary to take the step in the purview of the legislation itself, because there is nothing in the amendment which will prevent the use of 54 of the ships in any way America wants to use them, and nothing to prevent the use of the other 30 in precisely the fashion that the State Department has officially notified us they intend to use them. In other words, here is a rare and unusual opportunity for Senators to record themselves in favor of keeping our foreign program short of war and yet to leave the legislation fully competent to meet every purpose assigned to its passage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan on behalf of himself and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words with respect to this amendment. The senior Senator from Michigan has made his amendment very clear, and it is—

That the flagships of nations now engaged in war requisitioned pursuant to the provisions of this act shall not be turned over to any nation now at war or used for the purpose of promoting their military and naval objectives.

As the amendment is drawn it is applicable only to such ships as may be requisitioned, and not otherwise acquired by purchase, as I understand it.

Mr. President, I think it is helpful to try to ascertain the reason for any rule of conduct, either in the domestic forum or in the international forum, because, after all, the letter of the law "killeth," and that statement is true and always will be true. It is the reason or the spirit of the law that sheds light upon the rule itself, and why the rule exists.

We are a neutral. We are not engaged in war. Hence the question arises, and naturally arises, what our right and authority may be to requisition ships, or to take over the ships lying idle in our ports? Certain examples have been given here by the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee as having been given by the Assistant Secretary of State, in hearings before the Commerce Committee, but very little can be found from these examples, I think, that would be helpful. They do illustrate how nations act under certain circumstances.

The distinguished chairman of the committee called attention to the fact that an ancient doctrine known as the right of angary has not been invoked at any time on behalf of a neutral. That is true. Why? Because ordinarily a neutral country is not under the pressing necessity to invoke it. When a country enters a war and becomes a belligerent, of course the necessity and the emergency are manifest. They are obvious, and it must act. But I think the reason for doctrine of angary is equally applicable if the emergency be great enough in any given situation to justify its exercise by a responsible nation asserting it.

Of course, it is perfectly well known that the United States, for instance, would have the right to requisition ships of its own nationals or private citizens; and that would be true whether those ships were registered under our flag or

not. It is perfectly well known, of course, that the United States would have the right to requisition or take over ships lying idle in our ports if the emergency should justify it, even though the ships were owned by nationals of other countries.

There is no analogy to be drawn from the power of any sovereign government to take over property located within the particular country. It has been suggested that certain of the belligerent powers have actually taken over the property of American citizens located within the territorial limits of the belligerent countries. That is true as a matter of fact, but it is also true that every nation has that sovereign right and power and may exercise it if it is engaged in war or if the emergency is of sufficient gravity to justify the action.

So when it is said that the doctrine of angary, which for nearly 2 centuries—the whole of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, in fact—was not exercised by any responsible nation, has never been invoked by a neutral, but has always been confined to belligerent nations, it is equivalent only to saying that no neutral nation had found an emergency which was the equivalent of belligerency, and which in its reasoned judgment justified the exercise of the power.

The reason lying back of the power of any nation to requisition ships of its private citizens, whether chartered under its own flag or a foreign flag, or the reason lying back of the power of any nation at war or during an emergency to requisition the ships of foreign countries or of the nationals of foreign countries is equally applicable under the pressure of great emergency and great necessity. That reason, of course, may be disputed by other nations; and on any occasion when any responsible nation exercises it it must necessarily take the consequences.

It is well known that Italy requisitioned certain German ships in Italian harbors a little while before Italy went into the first World War. No final issue was ever made up and determined upon that seizure, for the reason that in the Treaty of Versailles the claim of the German Government against Italy on account of the seizure was waived. It is also likely that Germany, still hoping at the time of the seizure that Italy would enter the war on the side of the Central Powers, refrained from the exertion of any pressure upon the Italian Government. But be that as it may, the exercise of that power was asserted and accomplished by the Italian Government before Italy entered the World War against the Central Powers.

Mr. President, the power to seize ships idle in our ports belonging to the nationals of other countries must depend upon the existence of a serious emergency, one equivalent to a state of actual belligerency—not necessarily immediately, because with nations, as with individuals, the only test is whether, under all the existing conditions, a reasonable person or nation would conclude, and would be justified in concluding, that an actual necessity existed for the action taken. In the final analysis, that is the question;

and when we consider the acts of nations that have taken over ships of their own nationals, ships belonging to their nationals but chartered under other flags, or ships flying other flags and belonging to the nationals of other governments—when we consider all those cases we find, of course, that generally they have arisen when the nation taking was at war. But the reason for the rule was the pressing necessity or emergency under which the nation acted. Without such necessity or emergency no such taking, of course, can be justified on the part of any nation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Do any of the cases or precedents to which the Senator refers involve the fundamental point at issue, namely, the right of a neutral to take the property of one belligerent and transfer it to another belligerent?

Mr. GEORGE. I know of no such case exactly in point. I was about to make that statement when the Senator rose to ask the question.

As I have already said, and as we know, we are not at war. We are not a belligerent within the meaning of international law, or as the term is generally understood. But we have acted in this emergency, which has been officially declared by the Executive, on the assumption that the country faces grave danger. There may be questions as to how grave or how imminent the danger is. I freely grant that there must be a danger, or a conclusion, based upon reason, that danger exists, and that the danger must have the quality of imminence. It cannot be remote. It cannot be a danger that may arise at some remote time and be invoked as justification for an extraordinary action such as is contemplated under the terms of the pending bill.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I was delighted a moment ago to hear the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee make the straight-forward and forthright assertion that we are not in war. With respect to that statement—which is true, in my judgment—he is at the opposite pole from a noted authority, who stated abroad, 24 hours ago, "We are already in the war." I refer to Capt. James Roosevelt of the Marines. I prefer to take the testimony of the distinguished leader from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not desire to go into that controversy, except to say that we are not in war, but we are in a great emergency. I am undertaking to say simply, without further elaboration, that if the emergency in fact exists—that is to say, if we determine that a real emergency in fact exists, and we have arrived at that conclusion upon the basis of reason, which of course ought to govern the conduct of nations in important international relationships—then, in my judgment, we may act as if we were actually in war so far as taking ships in our harbors is concerned.

In the first place there are in our harbors certain ships belonging to Italian

nationals or to the Italian Government. There are now under seizure two ships belonging to the German Government or to the nationals of Germany.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to ask the Senator if any of the ships actually belong to these two governments, or do all of them belong to nationals of the governments? Can the Senator answer that question?

Mr. GEORGE. I am not able to answer that question; but it has been assumed that they belong to nationals of the governments. I should like to say that, under the terms of a committee amendment if the vessels are owned by the government itself they shall not be requisitioned, seized, or taken, other than by purchase. So if it should turn out that the 28 Italian ships, as we describe them, or the 2 German ships, or any of them, belong to the governments of the countries named, then, as I see it, the bill has been very properly amended so as to require the taking over of such ships only by purchase.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield—

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then the provision as to any ships actually owned by the governments is more restrictive than the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], which does not prohibit their being requisitioned, but prohibits their being turned over to a belligerent.

Mr. GEORGE. I should so interpret it.

Mr. BARKLEY. So under the amendment of the committee, which already has been adopted, I believe, if the ships belong to either the Italian Government or the German Government they cannot be taken at all, for any purpose, except by purchase.

Mr. GEORGE. Except by purchase. That is my understanding of the amendment inserted in the bill by the Commerce Committee, to which the distinguished chairman of the committee yesterday referred in the course of his remarks.

It is well known, of course, that these 30 ships had been disabled in our ports. It is well known that they were first taken into protective custody because they had been disabled by their respective crews. It is, of course, well understood that the United States had a perfect right to take them into protective custody and into complete custody, and would have a right to go much further with respect to these particular ships than it has undertaken to go without legislative approval. Indeed, I think there would be no serious question that the United States could have taken over these ships, certainly so far as the use of the sabotaged or disabled ships is concerned, without this legislation; but, of course, the Government desired express legislative authority for its actions.

The status of the Danish ships and of other ships is perfectly well known. While Denmark is a neutral—with respect to the United States it is strictly neutral—and while we are neutral as to all coun-

tries, including Denmark, nevertheless it is known that the Danish Government is actually under some form of control or direction by one of the belligerents. I need not go into that matter.

Mr. President, the bill proposes to authorize the purchase or charter—and with respect to the proposal to purchase or charter there is no substantial dispute anywhere—and also the requisitioning or taking over of the title to these ships. The Government, if it should take over the title, would, of course, not desire to find itself embarrassed by being compelled to put into one classification the ships of one country and to put in a different classification the ships of another country. If we are justified in taking over the Danish ships, we are upon the same basis justified in taking over the ships of nationals of Germany and of Italy.

If it should turn out that these ships are owned by the German Government as such, or by the Italian Government as such, the bill provides for their purchase. There can be no quarrel upon that point, and the amendment raises no issue upon that point. But identically the same reason that justifies the United States in taking over the ships belonging to nationals of a neutral country applies to and authorizes the taking over of ships belonging to the nationals of belligerent countries. That reason is, as I have attempted to say, the existence of an emergency which justifies extraordinary action upon the part of a neutral; but when that extreme emergency arises it exists as certainly as if it arose while we were active belligerents in a contest with other nations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Assuming that the governmental agency determined, in the course of its investigation, that the Danish ships belong to the Danish Government, would the Senator's amendment apply under those circumstances?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Illinois misunderstood me. The committee amendment would apply.

Mr. LUCAS. I mean, the committee amendment that the Senator read a moment ago.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I think it would apply. That is my understanding of the statement made by the chairman of the committee, who is present. If it turns out that the ships belong to a foreign government itself, rather than to the nationals of some foreign government, either neutral or belligerent, my understanding is that, under the terms of the committee amendment, the ships can be acquired only by purchase.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator is correct. I can give an illustration.

There is in our waters today a Danish ship, owned by the Kingdom of Denmark. It is here as our guest. It is the guest of the United States Coast Guard. It has aboard it Danish boys who are undergoing training. My amendment would not permit that ship, or any ship owned by a

government, to be requisitioned or held or seized or taken by our authorities. We could buy it. We would buy it at arm's length. I do not think it is necessary for me to discuss the matter.

Mr. LUCAS. No; it is not. I was merely inquiring for information.

Mr. BAILEY. While I am on my feet I think I will ask the Senator from Georgia, for whose judgment I have the utmost respect, if I was not correct in my statement yesterday that the arbitrary taking by one country of a ship of another—a ship owned by the government itself, not by its nationals—is an invasion of and a challenge to the sovereignty of the nation, regardless of the location of the ship, and could be considered an act of war.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator is entirely right. Not only is the Senator's statement correct, but when a nation charters under its flag a ship of its nationals it gives to that ship a sort of extraterritoriality which is not possessed by the property that may be domiciled by permission of the Government within its territorial limits. I think there is no question about the correctness of the statement first made by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BAILEY. That whole subject, I may say, was thoroughly thrashed out in this country in the War of 1812, and I am always interested in the fact that Thomas Jefferson took the view that a ship with the flag of its nation over it carried under its bottom the sovereignty of the country; that wherever it might be located on the sea, down beneath the sea was temporarily the sovereignty of the country whose flag was flown from the mast of the ship. I do not say that it has been upheld in law, but that is always put forward in our books or in the controversy concerning shipping—and they were most extensive in the War of 1812—as the view of Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is again, as always, or, I should say, almost always, correct. I do not want to commit myself to a universal affirmative because it may be found on rare occasion to be necessary to controvert some conclusion of the able Senator.

Mr. BAILEY. I always feel that I am correct when I am with the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator very much, but the Senator has correctly stated the doctrine.

Ordinarily a neutral country is able to acquire ships, whether in its own waters or beyond, by negotiation, by purchase, by trade, by charter. Ordinarily when a country is still neutral, not engaged in war, it is not necessary for it to resort to the extraordinary powers which are set up in this bill. That is very true. But occasion may arise when identically the same great national emergency may exist as if the nation itself were engaged in war. I do not say that we have recognized the existence of such an emergency as that, and yet we have gone a long way. We have thrown open our shipyards and said that we would repair the disabled merchantmen, or even the ships of war, of one of the belligerents now engaged in the war in Europe. We have said that we would furnish defense articles, and

the broad definition of that term is almost all-inclusive and certainly includes arms and munitions of all kinds and descriptions. We have acted, in other words, as if we were faced by a great emergency; indeed, our whole course has been predicated upon the idea, upon the fact, as I think, that the Nation does face a tremendous emergency.

We need ships at this time; the power we have been seeking to aid and assist in this war needs ships beyond all doubt. The great primary need of Great Britain at this hour is, perhaps, ships and more ships, merchant vessels as well as other types or kinds of ships. We need ships to get our commerce out, to prevent its piling up upon our docks and in turn to prevent the stagnation of industry lying back of those docks. We need ships to enable them to maintain our commerce, our established commerce, our necessary commerce. England certainly needs ships in order to get supplies, including food and the implements of war, into her hands. Ships are a vital necessity; and if we have been justified in aiding Great Britain, if we have been justified in our own defense in aiding any free government or self-governing people who are resisting the aggressors, then we are justified, I think, in reaching the conclusion as a reasonable people that in our defense we may exercise the power to take over ships lying idle in our ports and make use of them. On that point I think there is no dispute.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is not inferring, is he, that there is anything in the pending amendment which challenges our right to take over the ships?

Mr. GEORGE. Not at all.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is no such provision in it. That is conceded?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The amendment purely refers to the disposition of a portion of them.

Mr. GEORGE. It goes only to the disposition of so many of them as may be acquired other than by purchase—the final disposition or the ultimate disposition of the ships. That is very true.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator agree that this bill, with this amendment included, would bring about precisely the objective stated by Assistant Secretary Long to the Commerce Committee to be sought by the bill?

Mr. GEORGE. I did not hear the Assistant Secretary.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Unfortunately, no record was made of his statement, but the Assistant Secretary stated, not only once but repeatedly that the purpose of this bill was to put these ships on our own normal trade routes, particularly with South America, on which most of the ships had been before their internment in this country, a purpose which was agreed to between the United States Government through its various agencies, the

Inter-American Committee, and other countries on this hemisphere.

Mr. GEORGE. As I said, I did not hear the Assistant Secretary when he testified before the Commerce Committee, but I understood yesterday in a colloquy between the Senator from Michigan and the chairman of the committee that precisely what the Senator from Missouri now says was stated before the committee by the Assistant Secretary.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So that our amendment simply makes the bill conform to the avowed objectives of our Government in passing the bill at all?

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator is correct in making that observation, and I would not dispute it. I think it can be said of the amendment that it compels or requires the disposition of the ships of the Italian and German nationals to be the same as the Senator from Michigan and the chairman of the committee and the Senator from Missouri understood the Assistant Secretary of State to announce as the purpose of the Government in taking over the ships.

So that brings us down to this one final question, Shall we require the Government to make that disposition of these ships? I do not think we should require the Government to do it, because I think it may be embarrassing to segregate these ships and to classify them apart from other ships which are taken over at the same time or under the same law, ships which belong to neutrals; but, primarily, I think we should not do it for this reason:

If these ships belong to the Governments of Germany and of Italy, the bill has already cared for them. If they belong to the nationals of Italy and of Germany, we should not go further and negative the only justification which authorizes us to take the Danish ships. In other words, we should not say that we are acting in a great emergency; that we are under an emergency which we, upon reason, conclude to present as grave a situation as if we were at war so far as the necessity of providing ships is concerned, and then negative that basis upon which the whole legislation is founded in the case of the ships belonging to the German nationals or the Italian nationals by providing that with respect to those ships we cannot do what we propose to do or may do with the Danish ships.

I express the hope that even with respect to the Danish ships we will charter or requisition the use of the ships, and that the Government, even if it takes over title, will see fit to use those ships on our own trade routes; and I express the hope that the same thing will be done with the ships of the nationals of the German and Italian Governments, because I think thereby we would get out of those ships all the use and all the service that we could get by taking them over and turning them over to Great Britain. If it be necessary, our ships that are released by putting into service on our trade routes any of the requisitioned ships, or ships taken over, can be turned over to Great Britain. We can do as we please, under the Lease-Lend Act, under legislation already passed,

with respect to our own ships, if any should be released.

I express the hope that the Assistant Secretary of State was correct in his declaration of our national purpose so far as these ships are concerned; and I would not apply it merely to the ships of the German nationals or the ships of the Italian nationals. I would not make a distinction between them, because I think when we make a distinction between them we unquestionably weaken the whole foundation upon which we propose to take this extraordinary step. It is an extraordinary step. It is not to be found in the precedents that have grown up under or in what we call international law, as I have already tried to say, very largely because so long as countries are neutral they are able to meet their emergent demands by ordinary barter or trade or purchase in the peaceful way, in the way that cannot be said to be unneutral at all. Usually, therefore, the necessity has arisen only when a nation found itself involved in war.

I do not want to go back into the Lease Lend Act, and I shall not do so, except to say that in my judgment the emergency at this moment—the necessity which justifies the use of these ships at this moment—is substantially the same as if there had been a formal declaration of war between the United States and the Axis group, because we cannot move our own commerce; we cannot move the implements of war, the defense articles which we have seen fit to provide for one of the belligerents, because the failure to move our manufactured and raw products away from our own ports means ultimately the stagnation of American industry, and means ultimately the necessity in some way of finding an outlet for our products. We are not required to wait; indeed, if we should wait until the actual necessity is upon us, we should then be powerless actually to defend ourselves by providing the ships we need.

So I can see very good reason and no real harm that can possibly come from treating alike any and all ships that may be taken over under this bill, giving them the same treatment, leaving the Government free to deal with them and handle them as it thinks wise. I again express the hope that the Government will find it possible, consistently with its necessities, to deal with all alike so far as the final disposition of the ships is concerned.

Mr. President, at last the authority upon which this bill rests is the right of a nation, in war or in case of extreme necessity for self-preservation, to assert its naked sovereign power.

The amendment is so narrowed, and I find my view and my hope to be so much in accord with what the amendment requires, that I have hesitated to make any statement about it; but my conclusion is that it is better that we stand upon much firmer ground, not to separate the ships into different categories, but to treat them all alike if they shall be taken over under this bill if it becomes law.

I therefore hope the amendment will not be approved.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the statement made yesterday and

repeated in part today by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is so succinct, cogent, and, in my opinion, so unanswerable as to the merits of the amendment proposed by him yesterday on his own behalf and on mine, that I shall detain the Senate only very briefly.

I merely desire to call attention again to the fact that it is admitted on all sides, and not denied by anybody, that the bill, if amended by the amendment offered yesterday by the Senator from Michigan on his behalf and mine, would exactly and specifically represent the ostensible objectives of this legislation; would specifically and exactly meet the requests and purposes enunciated by the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Long.

Mr. Long made in the Senate Commerce Committee a statement which unfortunately was not recorded. I think there is no dispute as to what the effect of his testimony was—at least, none that I have heard—on the rather large attendance of that committee. Mr. Long is one of the ablest, one of the most experienced, one of the frankest and most sincere officials of the State Department. He used to be a citizen of my State. In fact, I think he was appointed to the State Department as a resident of Missouri, although he actually lived in Maryland, and voted there for a number of years; but he is an able and distinguished former citizen of my State. I have the very highest regard for his opinion. He made a statement, officially representing the State Department, before the Commerce Committee, in which he specifically, and in some detail, stated the purpose of this legislation, which was that by reason of the conditions existing during this war, resulting in very considerable measure from the retirement from the South American-North American trade of the very ships proposed to be seized, there had been created a serious shortage in the carrying facilities necessary for the normal trade between North and South America, and that it was proposed, therefore, to take these ships, restore them to their normal trade routes, the trade routes which most of them had occupied before their internment, and certain other trade routes on which these very ships had for the most part been engaged; that is, trade routes necessary to the normal trade of the United States.

Mr. President, that is precisely what this amendment would do, and that is precisely what the amendment is intended to do. The Assistant Secretary of State was interrogated at some length—I should say for nearly 2 hours—by the members of the Committee on Commerce on that very question. He stated that not only was it the purpose of the United States, if the proposed legislation were enacted, not only the objective of the legislation itself, to take the ships and put them in operation to accommodate the normal necessities of the South American countries and of ourselves in trade between North and South America, but that we were actually bound by an agreement with our South and Central American neighbors to that very end, so that these ships and certain ships which would be taken by the Cen-

tral and South American countries would be put on the normal trade routes between North and Central and South America.

Incidentally, in connection with the correspondence between the committee and the Secretary of State, read by the Senator from Michigan this morning, I am very clear, because I interrogated him at some length myself, as to the testimony of the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Long, about the proposed Chilean seizures. It was to the effect that some South American countries, notably Chile, had proposed some time ago to seize certain German ships interned in their ports and to put them in their own normal trade. In the case of Chile it was proposed to seize three German ships, a matter which had not been consummated and completed for the reason that the Chilean Government was notified by the Government of Great Britain that they would not recognize any such seizure, and that if those ships put to sea under the Chilean flag they would be subject to seizure on the high seas by Great Britain. In other words, according to the statement of the Assistant Secretary of State, in the case of Chile, Great Britain had served warning of seizure under practically an identical policy with that contained in the pending bill; and some of us on the Committee on Commerce were interested to know what the difference would be between Chile seizing German-flag ships and the United States seizing certain German-flag ships—whether there was any difference in international law between Chile and the United States, and whether the United States had made any commitments to Great Britain which would change that rule.

I have known the Secretary of State for a great many years; I have the highest respect for him, in fact, a very deep personal affection for him. I know him to be frank and honest and sincere, and I can only explain the divergence between the testimony of the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Long, and the information contained in the letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Commerce by the Secretary of State himself, on the ground that some quibbling technicality has been availed of as to the form of the question propounded by the chairman of the Committee on Commerce.

Be that as it may, Mr. President, the proposed legislation, with the Vandenberg-Clark amendment added to it, would supply every bit of authority necessary or desirable to carry out the purposes announced on the part of the Government of the United States at least on the part of the State Department, by the authorized representative of the State Department, the Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I would find no hesitancy whatever in voting to exercise the right which I believe to be a legal right on the part of the United States in time of emergency, as the Senator from Georgia has stated, to take possession of these ships and use them for our own purposes. With a proper restriction, I could cheer-

fully and willingly vote for the bill for the purposes announced by the State Department itself. But I cannot vote for a measure which, in addition to carrying out the announced objectives of the measure, deliberately goes beyond that with a grant of authority to commit an act of war by seizing the property of one belligerent and turning it over to another belligerent.

Mr. President, that to my mind represents another of the successive steps which have been taken, designed, and intended to get this country into war, like a boy putting a chip on his shoulder and daring some other boy to knock it off. From my experience, I am convinced that if that course is continued long enough, someone will sooner or later knock the chip off, and there will be a fight.

What I object to in the bill is the deliberate inclusion of that grant, not necessary and, indeed, incompatible with the announced purposes of the legislation. I cannot see how any Senator on this floor can possibly justify a grant of power intended only to be provocative, whose only effect will be provocative, if the actions are taken which are incompatible with the announced purposes of the proposed legislation.

Therefore, if the pending amendment shall not be agreed to, as much as I should like to vote for the restoration of these ships to the essential trade routes of the United States, I shall be unable to vote for a measure which I regard not only as illegal but as immoral.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Mr. VANDENBERG. First, Mr. President, I ask for an order for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Downey	Murray
Aiken	Ellender	Norris
Andrews	George	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gerry	Overton
Bailey	Gillette	Pepper
Ball	Glass	Reynolds
Bankhead	Green	Rosier
Barbour	Guffey	Russell
Barkley	Gurney	Schwartz
Bilbo	Hatch	Shipstead
Brewster	Hayden	Smathers
Bridges	Herring	Smith
Brooks	Hill	Spencer
Brown	Holman	Stewart
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Butler	La Follette	Tobey
Byrd	Langer	Truman
Byrnes	Lee	Tunnell
Capper	Lodge	Vandenberg
Chandler	Lucas	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Wheeler
Connally	McNary	White
Danaher	Maloney	Wiley
Davis	Murdock	Willis

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The yeas and nays having been ordered on the amendment offered by the Senator

from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] and will vote. I vote "yea." If present, the junior Senator from Idaho would vote "yea." I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is absent from the Senate because of a death in her family.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is detained on important public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is attending the commissioning of the battleship U. S. S. *Washington*, and is therefore necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER] are detained in Government departments on important business.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the necessary absence of the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] and the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE]. If present, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea," and I am informed the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES]. If present, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and I am informed that the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—38

Adams	Clark, Mo.	McNary
Aiken	Danaher	Reynolds
Bailey	Davis	Shipstead
Brewster	Downey	Smith
Bridges	Gillette	Taft
Brooks	Gurney	Tobey
Brown	Holman	Vandenberg
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Walsh
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Wheeler
Butler	La Follette	White
Byrd	Langer	Wiley
Capper	Lodge	Willis
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	

NAYS—43

Andrews	Byrnes	Guffey
Austin	Chandler	Hatch
Ball	Connally	Hayden
Bankhead	Ellender	Herring
Barbour	George	Hill
Barkley	Gerry	Kilgore
Bilbo	Glass	Lee
Bunker	Green	Lucas

McFarland	Pepper	Thomas, Utah
Maloney	Russell	Truman
Murdock	Schwartz	Tunnell
Murray	Smathers	Van Nuys
Norris	Spencer	Wallgren
O'Mahoney	Stewart	
Overton	Thomas, Okla.	

NOT VOTING—14

Bone	McKellar	Rosier
Caraway	Mead	Thomas, Idaho
Chavez	Nye	Tydings
Harrison	Radcliffe	Wagner
Hughes	Reed	

So Mr. VANDENBERG's amendment, offered on behalf of himself and Mr. CLARK of Missouri, was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still open to amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 5 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to House Concurrent Resolution 34, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed as a House document 177,000 copies of a revised edition of the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government: What Is It? How Does It Function?" of which 45,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 132,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and it was signed by the Vice President.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF WAR DEPARTMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, and 10.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 6, 7, and 8; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "purchase of grave sites"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$73,030,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ", of which not to exceed \$9,134,035 shall be available immediately and exclusively for expenditure upon projects on account of which allotments heretofore have not been made, and, in addition, for the protection from flood waters at approaches to Fort Dix, New Jersey"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 5.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
J. W. BAILEY,
ROBT. R. REYNOLDS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
D. D. TERRY,
JOE STARNES,
ROSS A. COLLINS,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
D. LANE POWERS,
FRANCIS CASE,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, that leaves one amendment in disagreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on Senate amendment No. 5 to House bill 4183, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

May 15, 1941.

Resolved, That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 5 to the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Legislative action is complete on the bill except for one amendment. That amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. It was inserted by the Senate. The House has not agreed to the amendment, and I am constrained to believe that it will not agree to it. It relates to the authority of the Interior Department to agree with the War Department over mineral rights in a certain flood-control project located in my State.

Because of the conditions I move that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 5.

The motion was agreed to.

PRINTING OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT: WHAT IS IT? HOW DOES IT FUNCTION?"

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate, House Concurrent Resolution 34, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed as a House document 177,000 copies of a revised edition of the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government: What Is It? How Does It Function?" of which 45,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and

132,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

PRINTING OF MANUSCRIPT RELATIVE TO STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES (S. DOC. NO. 52)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing I report back favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 114 and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 114) submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Utah on May 13, 1941, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the manuscript entitled "Statement Showing Basic Data for the Formulation of a Policy Toward Strikes in Defense Industries in the United States, Together With Facts as to the Extent, Duration, and Severity of Those Strikes, and the Causes Therefor; Also a Summary of the State and Federal Law and Jurisprudence Which Defines the Rights and Status of Labor Insofar as They Relate in Any Way to Strike Situations," be printed as a document.

ACQUISITION AND USE OF MERCHANT VESSELS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4466) to authorize the acquisition by the United States of title to or the use of domestic or foreign merchant vessels for urgent needs of commerce and national defense, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The amendment offered by the Senator from Utah will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Immediately following the enacting clause, and before the word "That" in the third line, it is proposed to insert:

That whereas Congress has power to provide for the common defense and general welfare and to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and whereas for this purpose embargo acts and nonintercourse acts have from time to time been passed, and whereas the commerce of the United States is at the present time interrupted and the general welfare of its citizens is threatened and an emergency has been declared.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I should not have offered this amendment had I not consulted with the chairman of the Commerce Committee, who has the bill in charge.

The amendment affects in no way the structure of the bill. It merely adds a declaration of policy; and it has been deemed by those who have had charge of settling litigation with foreign governments arising as the result of the last war that the bill would be stronger and better if this introductory sentence were put in. I, therefore, ask the chairman of the Commerce Committee to accept the amendment so that it may go to conference with the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I see no objection to agreeing to the request. The whole matter relates to the preamble, and probably broadens the base of the rea-

sons for the legislation. With a view of taking the matter to conference, I have agreed to accept the amendment, and I hope the Senate will agree to it.

While I am on my feet I have something in my heart that I wish to say.

Yesterday I stated that in the matter of the preparation of our country for its present emergency the Maritime Commission, in the enlargement of shipyards and the construction of ships, was probably in advance of any other activity of the Government. I believe that statement will stand up. For several years we were building ships at the rate of 50 a year. Two years ago we began building merchant ships of from 7,000 to 10,000 tons at the rate of 100 a year. This has been done under the leadership of the Chairman of the Maritime Commission and the Commission itself. The Chairman is Rear Admiral Land.

I wish to say that the excellent state of our merchant marine, the unusual anticipation of our present situation, the rapid construction of modern, first-class ships, fully equal to our needs insofar as they have been built, and the plans now in operation for very greatly and rapidly increasing our merchant marine are due in very great measure to the unusual industry and great intelligence and devotion to duty of Rear Admiral Land. Of course, he has had the full cooperation of his Commission; and no one in paying tribute to him should fail to pay a similar tribute to the Commission.

I wish to add that the Committee on Commerce has learned to rely upon Admiral Land as a public servant singularly devoted to his duty, and probably better qualified for the duties imposed upon him than any other man in our country. I do not think we could find his equal. He is highly intelligent, perfectly honest, and remarkably industrious. I know of the sacrifices he has made, and I think I should not let the occasion pass without paying this tribute to him. I desire to express the thought that if all public servants were equal to him, the difficulties of our Government would be infinitely diminished.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, has my amendment been accepted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend section 5 (f), so as to read:

(f) The Commission, without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes may repair, reconstruct, or recondition any vessels to be utilized under this Act. Any other Government Department or agency by which any vessel is acquired or chartered, or to which any vessel is transferred or made available under this Act may, with the aid of any funds available, and without regard to the provisions of section 3709, repair, reconstruct, or recondition any such vessels to meet the needs of the services intended, or provide facilities for such repair, reconstruction, or reconditioning.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the amendment is presented at the request of

the Navy Department and is acceptable to the chairman of the Committee on Commerce. Briefly, it would permit the Navy Department to reconstruct, alter, repair, and make usable for naval purposes such ships as may be acquired or chartered by the Navy Department.

There is some doubt regarding the working of the law if some such amendment as this shall not be added.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

EAGLE OR OSTRICH?

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, in 1927 Charles Lindbergh thrilled the world by a flight across the Atlantic Ocean. The ship in which he made the flight was named the *Spirit of St. Louis*, for Charles Lindbergh represented the pioneering spirit of America. Because of that courageous flight, we called him the Lone Eagle. His deed indicated that he had the attributes of that noble bird. But today his short-sighted policy of appeasement and defeatism shows none of the attributes of the lordly eagle, but all the characteristics of the frightened ostrich. Which of these Lindberghs should America follow—Lindbergh the eagle or Lindbergh the ostrich; the lone eagle of 1927 or the frightened ostrich of 1941?

Just as the French Army made the mistake of trying to fight this war on the basis of the World War, so is Lindbergh making the mistake of trying to judge the world of 1941 by the world of 1927. The same flight which it took him 33 hours to make is now made in 8 hours. Today long-range bombers can fly that distance, unload their cargoes of death, and return. In other words, the Atlantic Ocean has shrunk until today it only one-third as wide as it was when Charles Lindbergh made his historic flight.

From the outset of the present struggle in Europe, England has followed a policy of "close the barn door after the horse is stolen." If England had closed the Suez Canal, and had invoked sanctions against Italy, it is very likely that Mussolini never would have invaded Ethiopia. If England had prevented Germany from overthrowing the Spanish Government, Germany's first major step toward control of the Mediterranean would have been stopped. If England had not given away Czechoslovakia, at Munich, the map of Europe would be different today. If England had furnished the promised aid to Poland, more soldiers now would be fighting on the side of liberty. If England had beaten Germany to the punch, and had moved enough forces into Greece to have commanded the respect of the Balkan states, England today undoubtedly would have strong allies in the Balkans.

Thus, England has followed the policy of "close the barn door after the horse is stolen," always "too late and too little."

Of course, it does not take a prophet to recount the mistakes of the past, nor is it difficult to sit on the sidelines and point out the mistakes of the other fellow. All of this would have no point if it were not applicable to our own policy. Up until now we have followed about the same policy of "too little and too late."

This charge, however, cannot be made against President Roosevelt. His warning that "the aggressor nations should be quarantined" came long enough ago that, had we acted upon it immediately, we could have been well armed by now. But, instead, many Americans at once began to criticize the President as a warmonger, and the timely warning was not heeded.

Then, again, 2 years ago this spring, President Roosevelt asked Congress to repeal the arms embargo, in order that our industries might increase their production capacity by supplying the democracies with defense materials. But the opposition raised its head, and Congress adjourned without taking this important step toward national defense.

All that summer was lost. Then, on September 1, war broke out in Europe, just as President Roosevelt had feared it would. Congress was called back into session; and, after lengthy debate, the embargo on arms was repealed, but not until we had lost several precious months of industrial preparation. I lay the responsibility for that lost time on the doorstep of the isolationists, whose opposition prevented Congress from repealing the arms embargo in the spring session of Congress, when President Roosevelt asked for its repeal.

Just think what it would mean in our defense effort if we had 5 more months behind us. Think how much our production would be increased over the present output. Think what it would have meant to England 5 months ago to have received the materials which she is receiving today. Think what it would have meant had she been supplied with enough planes and tanks to have armed the Greeks and the Yugoslavs. Suppose England had had enough ships to have transported 10 divisions to Greece, instead of the 2 or 3 she did transport. In fact, those 5 precious months which we lost in our production efforts, because of a failure to repeal the arms embargo, placed America just that much closer to war.

Then, again, many months ago President Roosevelt told us that the United States was in greater danger than it had been since the beginning of the Republic, and asked for a program of "full steam ahead" in the production of weapons. He called upon us for unity of purpose and action, but how have we responded to that call?

Immediately the radios rang with voices of denunciation, criticism, and division. The President's efforts to awaken the American people to their danger were referred to as warmongering and war hysteria. The idea that America was in danger was ridiculed. The thought that the Nazis might have designs on the Western Hemisphere was scoffed at and the American people were lulled to sleep with stories of their own potential strength. The result was that our production did not swing into full emergency tempo, but the American people continued with a "business as usual" frame of mind.

Then, again, at a later date President Roosevelt asked Congress to pass the lease-lend bill in order that America might become the arsenal of democracy. Once more the opposition appeared and

by every appeal to prejudice fought the passage of that bill to the bitter end. Then even after it had been passed by the people's duly elected Representatives in Congress, the same opposition opened up an organized campaign against the policy of aid to Britain, although the American people had already put their stamp of approval on that policy. Not only that, America had already launched the program of aid to Britain. We had charted our course. We were already irrevocably and irretrievably committed by word and deed to the program of aid to the Allies. The time for debate should have been over. The time for division should have been at an end.

Every true-hearted American should have preached unity instead of division. It was known that the success of our plan depended upon the speed and unity with which it was carried out. We had committed ourselves to the proposition that America's best chance of escaping war was to help the allies stop Hitler in Europe, but, in spite of this, the opposition launched an appeasement campaign in order to sabotage the public mind and bring to naught the efforts of this Government in giving effective aid to the Allies.

Although there were, no doubt, many sincere Americans who took part in this campaign, yet every public meeting which they held was the rallying ground for every pro-Nazi, every Communist, and every "fifth columnist" in the United States.

This is an organized campaign under the auspices of the so-called America First Committee. They are well financed. They have set up chapters in almost every community. They have been well publicized. Although they represent only a small percentage of the people of the United States, the radio networks have seen fit to give them most liberal radio time on the air.

What has been the result of this well-organized campaign? The result has been to sabotage America's defense effort. The result has been to encourage laborers to strike by making them believe that no emergency exists. The result has been to slow down the tempo of American production. The result has been to create dissension and division when we should have unity. The result has been to weaken England, strengthen Hitler, and increase America's chances for war.

Then, again, just lately President Roosevelt called upon industry for an intensive production effort. He asked for a 24-hour day and a 7-day week. He was answered by a whole new crop of strikes. But the organized opposition, which counts among its numbers every pro-Nazi and every Communist in the United States, has done its work so well in creating dissension, indecision, and opposition that we can scarcely pick up a newspaper without reading about the threat of more strikes. The heart of labor is sound. These laboring people would not jeopardize their own country if they were not led to believe that no emergency threatens.

Mr. President, I said at the outset that England had followed a policy of "Too

late and too little," or a policy of closing the barn door after the horse is stolen.

So have we in this country, as I have just shown by the timid and delayed action steps which we have taken, followed the policy of "Too late and too little."

A year ago I spoke on the floor of the Senate, and urged that American industry immediately be placed on a 24-hour basis, and that every emergency step be taken immediately that would be taken if we were actually in war.

It is my purpose at this time to urge a courageous and aggressive policy, which, if taken, would greatly increase our security and give America one final chance of escaping total war.

First. The President should immediately declare a war emergency and urge that all industries be placed on a war-time basis.

The 40-hour week should be relaxed in its application to technical workers, of whom there is a shortage. All industries should be placed on a 24-hour basis and 7-day week as rapidly as possible. The production of peacetime luxuries should be reduced to the minimum. All industries now manufacturing automobiles and similar peacetime supplies should be turned immediately to the manufacture of planes, tanks, and guns.

Such a move on the part of the President is necessary in order to bring our production to its peak. It is now obvious that we cannot continue under "a business as usual" psychology and undertake the production of a country like Germany, which for 7 years has devoted its entire energies to war production.

ESTABLISH CIVILIAN MORALE ORGANIZATION

Second. The Government should set up at once a giant, correlated organization for combating foreign agents in this and other countries and for countering and offsetting propaganda at home and abroad. Here on my desk is a large volume prepared by the Committee for National Morale, a committee which has made a thorough study of this kind of organization, and made recommendations. Such an organization is what I have in mind. This should not be done in an apologetic, piecemeal, half-measure manner. Congress should appropriate \$500,000,000 for this organization.

This modern war is a new war; it is a three-dimension war; that is, it is industrial and psychological as well as military. Therefore, if we are to build a national defense, we must be prepared to defend ourselves in the field of propaganda as well as in the economic field and on the field of battle.

One of the things which made it so easy for Hitler to conquer France was that the French people had a fortress complex. They had a Maginot line defense psychology. They thought in terms of military breastworks alone. But so complete was Hitler's psychological victory over France that the military battle of France was won even before it was begun.

Therefore I urge that we stop playing at national defense and set up a military defense organization to defend America against the Nazi psychological assault. This cannot be done by a few patriotic writers here, and a few wise statesmen

speaking there, and a few courageous newspaper editors somewhere else.

As we have seen the so-called America First Committee sabotage the defense efforts of the great majority of the people of this country we should realize that a small, well-organized minority can defeat a much greater but unorganized majority. Therefore we must provide for defense on the propaganda front.

Furthermore, this organization should be prepared to deal adequately with the saboteurs, spies, and foreign agents which are swarming all over, through, and under this country today.

The Dies committee, the F. B. I., and the Intelligence Divisions of the Army and Navy are not able to cope with this situation. In the first place, they have not enough money to employ sufficient personnel. In the second place, they should be coordinated and synchronized. Then, again, if they were able to cope with the situation in this country, we have no source of reliable information from other countries, but the Nazis and Communists and Japanese have. I have the uncomfortable feeling that the Nazis have a more accurate card-index system of information on American production today than is available to the President of the United States.

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

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Would the Senator mind telling me from what he is reading?

Mr. LEE. A statement which I prepared.

Mr. DANAHER. It was all so new to me that I wondered if it was something we should have known about.

Mr. LEE. I thank the Senator for the compliment of originality.

But, Mr. President, I expect some of Hitler's friends in the United States to reply immediately that if we should do this we would be doing the same thing that Hitler has done. I answer that the democracies have been forced to pattern Hitler's dive bombers. We have been forced to pattern his parachute troops. We have been forced to build big tanks in order to meet his big tanks. We have been forced to revise our military tactics in order to meet his panzer units. Therefore, why should we not pattern our psychological defense after his, since modern wars are fought in the field of psychology as well as on the field of battle?

When Orson Welles staged his radio program about the invasion of the men from Mars, thousands of persons in America were thrown into utter panic. We laughed about it here in America; but Dr. Goebbels, Hitler's propaganda minister, only smiled, and realized what a powerful weapon the radio would be in the hands of the Nazis.

Consequently, 8 brown-shirt storm troopers armed with automatics overpowered the radio station at Vienna while some 62 Nazis, disguised as civilians, found their way into the capital, murdered Dollfuss, and took over the government. The radio, acting in cooperation with the storm troopers in the capital, was able to keep the people de-

ceived about the true situation until the Nazis had made their victory secure.

Today 50 secret Nazi agents could take over almost any city in the United States and the people would be helpless. In fact, the people themselves would help bring about their own capture. The Nazis, by controlling the light and power plants and the source of water supply, by establishing one of their members as an officer in the police force, and by taking control of the radio stations, could give orders, and not only the civilians but the officers could be made to contribute to the capture of a city, as was done in Norway. The only way in which we can be protected from such tactics is by a counterorganization such as I suggest being established at once.

Remember, it was not by armed might alone that Hitler captured Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, and France. They went down under a double assault of steel and betrayal. Their radio stations, overpowered by "fifth columnists," blared Hitler's lies. Troops were sent in the wrong direction and a state of utter confusion was created which made further resistance seem hopeless.

Furthermore, if we hope to have any success in our efforts of hemisphere solidarity, we must be prepared to offset the propaganda which is now being unleashed in the Latin Americas. Already Dr. Goebbels' propaganda machine has unleashed a bitter denunciation of—as he calls the United States—"Uncle Shylock"; and it will take more than giving tea parties and receptions for their delegations in Washington, and more than lending them money through Jesse Jones, to offset the psychological assault which Dr. Goebbels has unleashed in the Latin American countries.

USE NAVY EFFECTIVELY

Now, Mr. President, I wish to urge as a third and most important step that the United States Navy and air force be used in the most effective manner possible to guarantee defense of the Western Hemisphere. The strategy of how that should be done, of course, should be left to our naval and military authorities.

If more defense could be secured for the United States by delivering war materials to England, that should be done, and done at once. On the other hand, if we could secure greater defense by taking up strategic positions along the West Coast of Africa, that should be done. If the naval and military authorities of the United States feel that our security makes it necessary to take steps to prevent the Axis from occupying Dakar on the West Coast of Africa, we should do it at once. In other words, we should immediately take such steps as are necessary for our own protection.

Why should we tie our hands with international laws which no longer exist? Why should we give Hitler every advantage? Why should we be our own worst enemies? The law of self-preservation is the first law of life. Nothing we can do or refrain from doing will prevent Hitler from destroying our liberty if he is ever able to do it. When our very existence as a free nation is at stake, it is national suicide for us to

stand on technicalities which are not recognized by the dictators. It makes an unfair and unequal contest when a democracy limits, hobbles, and handicaps itself by laws, rules, and niceties which the dictators treat with utter contempt.

I speak only as a layman. I do not know, from the standpoint of a military or naval expert, how important Dakar is to the protection of South America; but if it is as important as it looks on the map, and if it is as important as many students of geography claim that it is, we are just plain fools if we allow the Axis to seize that important position when we have the power to prevent it.

Only today comes the news from Italy that the Axis Powers are going to occupy the West Coast of Africa. From Dakar to South America is only 1,500 miles—2,000 miles nearer than from New York to the same point in South America. Fifteen hundred miles is within bombing range. The occupation of Dakar would give Hitler a jumping-off place to South America. If Hitler occupies Dakar, he will control the narrowest neck of the Atlantic Ocean, and with his land-based bomber planes he can effectually close that passage to the democracies. He will then have driven a wedge between North and South America. Then the United States will be forced to take up her defense at Panama and the Caribbean Sea, in a last-ditch fight for our survival.

Hitler already has control of the Mediterranean Basin. From air bases which he now controls, he is within easy bombing range of any place in the Mediterranean. He is in a position to harass the British Navy and render it ineffectual if not completely disable it. Whether or not the British will be able to defend Suez and Gibraltar is a very doubtful question. He is in a position to harass British traffic through the Mediterranean, the Suez Canal, and the Red Sea. He is, therefore, seriously threatening the British life line.

But the British can still maintain a life line by going around Africa, provided, of course, Hitler is not allowed to seize Dakar. If he does, then he will cut the British Empire in two. In the meantime, he will have continued his effective submarine campaign on the supply line to the British Isles. He will also have continued his pulverizing bombings of the islands. The British Empire will then begin to fall apart. The British Isles will be a little more than a heap of rubble. Much of the British Navy will have been destroyed or disabled. Hitler will then be able to turn his full attention to the conquest of South America, and eventually North America.

Mr. President, that would mean that we would be forced to abandon the Monroe Doctrine and make a last-ditch stand at the Panama Canal and in the Caribbean Sea. The Nazis, who have many friends in South America, and less scruples than the United States, would have no trouble in securing naval and air bases in South America. Then the Third Imperial Reich would be in a position to blackmail the United States into a war for which we are not yet prepared.

But, Mr. President, we do have a great Navy, if we have courage and foresight

enough to use that Navy in the most effective way to guarantee the defense of the western world.

But let us look the facts in the face. In spite of the gallant fight of the British, they have lost every battle with the Nazis. They have been outmaneuvered in almost every instance. Now, for one time in this war, I would like to see the democracies move to a point of vantage before Hitler beats them to it.

Hitler's scheme was, and still is, to take the world on the installment plan. If he can keep America in the role of a mere sympathetic onlooker while he cuts the jugular vein of the British Empire, and at the same time pulverizes the British Isles, he will have accomplished his fondest purpose.

Armed forces are useless if you are outmaneuvered strategically before the actual fight begins. Of what benefit are defense materials if you are outflanked before the first shot is fired? The defense into which we are pouring billions of dollars will protect us only if we do not permit the Axis Powers to outplay us strategically before the inevitable attack is launched, and inevitable it is.

Hitler will be stopped in his plans for South America only if his path to Dakar is blocked; but if he is able to take Dakar without a struggle, the United States will be placed in a position as vulnerable as that of the British Empire. If Hitler is allowed to take the Atlantic coast of Africa, he will have surrounded the Atlantic and gained control by controlling the ports with his deadly bombing planes.

If Hitler can keep our attention diverted from his plans in Africa by the operation of his fleet of submarine sharks in the North Atlantic, and the bombing of Great Britain, while he is carrying out his plan to encircle the Atlantic Ocean, he will have outmaneuvered the democracies again.

Therefore, we must keep our attention glued on the African Continent. It is there that the land battle of the Atlantic will be determined. If the Dakar base falls into German hands, the flank of the American Maginot line on the Atlantic Ocean will be turned.

Mr. President, America is the last stronghold of democracy, but our security and independence are threatened. We have waited too long already to take the bold and aggressive action which will guarantee our security.

The democracies have allowed their scrupulous regard for the niceties of international law to give the dictators every advantage. Therefore, if we are to survive as a free people, we must exercise the foresight and courage of free men who are willing to defend their right to remain free.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to suggest the absence of

a quorum, not that I intend to demand a roll call, though I wish to announce my own vote, but I think the Senators who are absent from the floor should have an opportunity to pass upon the bill if they desire to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Ellender	Norris
Aiken	George	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Gerry	Overton
Austin	Gillette	Pepper
Bailey	Glass	Radcliffe
Ball	Green	Reynolds
Bankhead	Guffey	Rosier
Barbour	Gurney	Russell
Barkley	Hatch	Schwartz
Bilbo	Hayden	Shipstead
Brewster	Herring	Smathers
Bridges	Hill	Smith
Brooks	Holman	Spencer
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bunker	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Langer	Tobey
Byrd	Lee	Truman
Byrnes	Lodge	Tunnell
Capper	Lucas	Vandenberg
Chandler	McCarran	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Walsh
Connally	Maloney	Wheeler
Danaher	Mead	White
Davis	Murdock	Wiley
Downey	Murray	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I understand, however, that he would vote as I am about to vote. I therefore vote "yea."

I also wish to announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is necessarily absent, and that if present he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. If the Senator from Utah were present, he would vote as I shall vote. Therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is absent from the Senate because of a death in her family.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are attending a meeting of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES] are detained on business in Government departments.

I am advised that the Senators whose absences I have announced, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is attending the commissioning of the battleship *Washington*, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is detained on important public business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is detained on business in one of the Government departments. I am advised that, if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the following pair:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], who would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—59

Adams	Gerry	Norris
Austin	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Glass	Overton
Ball	Green	Pepper
Bankhead	Gurney	Radcliffe
Barbour	Hatch	Reynolds
Barkley	Hayden	Rosier
Bilbo	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Schwartz
Bridges	Kilgore	Smathers
Brown	Lee	Smith
Bunker	Lodge	Spencer
Byrd	Lucas	Stewart
Byrnes	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McFarland	Truman
Connally	McNary	Tunnell
Davis	Maloney	Van Nuys
Downey	Mead	Wallgren
Ellender	Murdock	White
George	Murray	

NAYS—20

Aiken	Clark, Mo.	Taft
Brooks	Danaher	Tobey
Bulow	Holman	Vandenberg
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Wheeler
Butler	La Follette	Wiley
Capper	Langer	Willis
Clark, Idaho	Shipstead	

NOT VOTING—16

Andrews	Herring	Thomas, Utah
Bone	Hughes	Tydings
Caraway	McKellar	Wagner
Chavez	Nye	Walsh
Guffey	Reed	
Harrison	Thomas, Idaho	

So the bill, H. R. 4466, was passed.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BAILEY, Mrs. CARAWAY, Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. Mr. McNARY, and Mr. JOHNSON of California conferees on the part of the Senate.

SHIPMENT OF ESSENTIAL DEFENSE MATERIALS TO JAPAN

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I have two or three times referred to a concurrent resolution which is pending in both Houses of Congress relative to the alleged shipment of essential war materials by American companies to the Axis Powers. Many of us are greatly concerned with this all-important question; indeed, I think every Member of the Senate and every true American is.

We receive disturbing information from time to time. For instance, it is tremendously disturbing to learn that we shipped over four and a half million bar-

rels of petroleum to Japan in the first 3 months of this year. Most all the news is disturbing, but I have just received some news which is encouraging, and I wish to put it in the RECORD.

While the articles which I wish to have inserted in the RECORD refer to the fact that in the month of March alone we shipped one and a half million barrels of petroleum to Japan, yet last Saturday we imposed an embargo on the shipment of hyoscyamus. I do not know when I was relieved any more than I was to learn that we had shut off the shipment of hyoscyamus to Japan. I have never heard of it before, but along with the shipment of hyoscyamus, which I learn is henbane, we also last Saturday prohibited the shipment of stramonium, columbium, tantalum, cryolite, and fluor-spar. Hyoscyamus is henbane. Japan is to get a million and a half barrels of petroleum a month, but she is to have no more henbane from America.

In order that the public may have the benefit of this information, I ask unanimous consent to have the articles to which I have referred placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor] TOKYO'S OIL PURCHASES IN UNITED STATES MOUNTING

WASHINGTON, May 5.—Japan's feverish hunt for vitally needed oil—for its Army and Navy as well as for industry—was reflected today in Commerce Department statistics showing considerably increased purchases in the United States.

During March the United States exported 1,553,000 barrels of petroleum products to Japan, compared to 1,279,000 barrels in February and 1,491,000 barrels in January.

The Japanese need for oil for further Army and Navy activity and reduction of stocks because of war in China and penetration into Indochina was believed by experts to have forced intensification of efforts to import a lot of oil in a hurry.

The large shipments to Japan in March were despite recent United States export-control measures which require licenses for all-metal containers of 5 or more gallons capacity. This covers much of the petroleum shipments to the Far East.

Officials say 20 Japanese Government-owned tankers are now in constant service and Japanese shippers are experimenting with shipments in wooden barrels instead of metal containers.

Although there has been some agitation, particularly from Chinese sympathizers, for an embargo on all oil shipments to Japan Secretary of State Cordell Hull recently said that if embargoes were instituted they would not be directed against any particular nation.

Dr. Quo Tai-chi, China's Foreign Minister, in a radio address from Washington May 3 pleaded for the United States to stop supplying Japan with war weapons and especially with fuel for Japanese planes to bomb Chinese cities and towns.

In an analysis of Japan's oil resources E. Degoyler has reported to the National Petroleum Association that Japan's position in the event it decided to fight other nations as well as China "would seem hopeless."

Mr. Degoyler estimated Japan's production at only 2,500,000 barrels annually. The Russian half of the Island of Sakhalin produces 2,000,000 barrels yearly, but its ports are ice-bound 7 months of the year and the Soviet would need its own oil if the United States

cut off the 1,000,000 barrels a year normally shipped to Vladivostok.

To get the 14,000,000 barrels imported from the East Indies in 1939, Mr. Degoyer reported, the Japanese had to send tankers from 2,300 to 3,000 miles, past the Philippines and past Singapore, Britain's fortress in the Straits Settlements.

Japan's normal peacetime consumption is estimated at 25,000,000 barrels a year, while its military and naval consumption in 1938 was estimated at an additional 21,000,000 barrels, and in 1939 at an additional 16,000,000 barrels.

[From The Nation of May 17, 1941]

NO HENBANE FOR JAPAN?

The President announced on May 10 that he had approved the recommendation of Brig. Gen. Russell L. Maxwell, administrator of export control, and had issued a proclamation placing 8 additional articles under the export-licensing system. The articles are hyoscyamus (henbane), stramonium, columbium, tantalum, cryolite, fluorspar, chemical wood pulps, and digitalis seeds. Perhaps these materials are not less important for being little known. But this meticulous addition of obscure items to the list of articles for which an export license is required seems a little ludicrous beside the continued export to Japan of huge quantities of so important a war material as oil. The latest report of the Department of Commerce shows that our shipments of petroleum to Japan in March were 1,500,000 barrels, as compared with 1,280,000 barrels in February and 1,491,000 in January. These huge exports were in no way hindered by the necessity of obtaining licenses for them from General Maxwell, although when oil was put on the export-license list last summer it was assumed this would be a virtual embargo. It has turned out instead to be a meaningless sop to sentiment for an oil embargo, and we continue to provide fuel for the Japanese Navy and air force, and there is good reason to believe that Japan is not the only beneficiary of our willingness to let the oil companies, like our copper and steel magnates, make a profit on the sale of the materials of war to our enemies.

Few newspapers printed anything about the resolution introduced by Senator GILLETTE, of Iowa, and Congressman COFFEY of Washington for a joint investigation into trade with the Axis Powers in basic war materials. Too much money is involved here, and more courage is required than the average politician possesses. There are three possible channels through which the Axis may obtain supplies from this country. One is through Soviet purchases which would be later transferred to Germany. The trickle to which our trade with Russia has been reduced is sufficient evidence that this is not a major source of supply. The second, of course, requires no investigation. Our huge exports to Japan have been largely in war materials and machine tools. That some of this may be transshipped to Europe is indicated by the State Department's announcement that it has revoked all licenses for the shipment of scrap rubber to Japan and occupied parts of China, a belated move, like all the State Department's actions of this kind. For a rubber shortage here is already in sight. Washington correspondents were given to understand "off the record" that this move was designed to check one German source of supply, which would indicate that in some materials at least transshipments have been made from the Far East to Europe. There was a similar hint in the statement of Hugh Dalton, Minister of Economic Warfare, in London on April 25. Dalton said a shortage of ferrous alloys was developing in Germany and that negotiations were on in Washington to curb "supplies to enemy coun-

tries." Has Germany been obtaining American ferrous alloys through Japan or Spain? For Spain is the third intermediary through which war materials may be reaching the Axis.

Senator GILLETTE, in introducing the joint resolution for an inquiry, referred to the testimony of Joseph Curran, head of the National Maritime Union, that Standard Oil was delivering oil to Spain's Canary Islands for transshipment to Germany and Italy. E. B. Lyman, publicity director of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, explained afterward to a representative of the Federated Press that "first of all, you must understand we are an international company—that is, Standard Oil of New Jersey is a holding company with subsidiaries in many countries. We must keep an international viewpoint. As a private company we cannot declare our own boycott. As a general principle we sell to anyone that wants to buy and can pay for it until the State Department places an embargo on any country."

We believe that the Senate and House should not only pass the Gillette-Coffey resolution but should instruct the joint committee to inquire what oil, copper, steel, and other materials made by American companies or their subsidiaries in Latin America, the Near East, and the Dutch East Indies are reaching the Axis. British-American oil companies in the Dutch East Indies have just renewed their sales agreement boosting oil exports to Japan from 494,000 to 1,800,000 tons a year. We should like to know how much oil Japan has been getting from American oil companies in the Near East. J. H. Carmical, the oil expert of the New York Times, reported last July 28 that earlier in the year Japanese oil interests had purchased 1,000,000 barrels of oil from the Anglo-Iranian Co., a majority of whose stock is owned by the British Government. These British sales have been one of the principal arguments used by our oil companies against an embargo on sales of American oil to Japan. Both ought to be shut off.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LEE. Did the Senator say he had a resolution pending to stop the further shipment of oil and petroleum to Japan?

Mr. GILLETTE. The resolution to which I have referred calls for an inquiry into the extent to which American companies are contributing to this trade in essential war materials to the Axis countries, and it is before the Committee on Commerce, of which the Senator is an honored member.

Mr. LEE. Let me say to the Senator that it will have my support, as will any proposal to stop the shipment of petroleum, or anything else which has been furthering the Axis program. I think such a move would be worth vastly more in our defense effort than changing the direction the eagle is looking.

Mr. GILLETTE. The sentiments expressed by the Senator from Oklahoma do him credit.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it had been my hope that we might follow the bill just passed with either the priorities bill, which was unanimously reported from the Military Affairs Committee, or which was at least authorized to be reported yesterday, or the so-called Reconstruction Finance Corporation bill, on which a report was authorized yesterday from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

However, I find that neither of those bills was reported in time to be on the calendar at the present time. They are being reported today and will be on the calendar tomorrow. It had been my hope that we might dispose of those bills and one or two others before the end of the week, and that Members might be more or less free next week to catch up with their office work or perform such other duties as they might find convenient. Under the circumstances we cannot take up either of those bills at this time. Therefore, in the hope that we may take up one or both of them tomorrow, and that we may dispose of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, I shall ask that we next proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do I correctly understand that the Senate will meet tomorrow?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; the Senate will meet tomorrow.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know that at least one committee held a meeting today, at which it authorized the reporting of certain bills, and it would be very desirable to have them considered.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senate will be in session tomorrow.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

CONSIDERATION OF MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will proceed to call the calendar.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 30) amending rule VIII so as to prohibit action by unanimous consent on bills in cases where a Senator has given written notice of his objection to their consideration was announced as first in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

COMMODITY LOANS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

The bill (S. 935) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to commodity loans and marketing quotas, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, we disposed of the principle and objective of that bill in the conference report yesterday, so I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The motion was agreed to.

WITHHOLDING FROM THE MARKET COTTON OWNED BY THE GOVERNMENT

The bill (S. 1250) to provide for withholding from the normal channels of trade and commerce cotton of the 1940

and previous crops which is owned by the Government or which is pledged as security for Government loans was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I hope this bill will pass. It is of very great importance to the cotton growers. It was unanimously reported by the committee.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I never like to hold up bills, especially those reported by the able chairman of the committee. However, this bill brings into consideration a very large subject. Standing by itself, and applicable only to cotton, it covers only one phase of the problem. It had been my intention—and it may yet be—to consider offering an amendment providing for perhaps two other basic commodities, corn and wheat. I have been giving study to the matter, and have also recently received a great many letters and telegrams from farm leaders who wish further to consider the matter. For that reason I do not feel that I should consent today to any action on the bill.

I wish to have it understood that I am not attempting purposely to hold up the bill. My action is in the best of faith, as I have always attempted to act in matters which come before the Senate. The bill deals with only part of a large problem. The Bankhead bill, providing for a commodity loan of 85 percent upon cotton, should be considered in connection with this very measure.

I think we should also consider what the attitude of the Appropriations Committee might be with regard to the payment of parity, and how much we should pay toward parity. There is such a thing as making the benefits so generous as to throw the commodities out of line with other commodities not treated. It is possible to elevate the price to such an extent that the demands of the consumer are not met. The problem is a large one. In my judgment, this bill should be considered in connection with other legislation, particularly with reference to the question whether we should freeze one commodity without attempting to treat other commodities dealt with in the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

For that reason, and only for that reason, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. SMITH. I desire to make one further remark. It is unfortunate that cotton is not in the same category with grains. They are perishable. When it is taken from the weather, and when it is stored, cotton is practically imperishable. The Government has in its own possession 6,000,000 bales; it has an equity in approximately 4,000,000 additional bales, making in round numbers, according to the last report I have received, approximately 10,041,000 bales. Everyone knows that a crop of cotton is now on hand. Because of the action taken by the Senate yesterday and that taken by the House the day before, cotton has risen almost to the loan price, if it has not today risen to that price. The only thing that deters it from reaching the loan price—in which event there would not be any drain at all on the Treasury, because under those circumstances farmers would sell their cotton

at a price in excess of the loan price—is the cotton growers' fear of the Government's tremendous holding of cotton.

Under the terms of the bill I propose the Government could use the cotton for any purpose it sees fit, so long as it is not put into channels of trade or not offered as a hedge against a sale or a purchase. This cotton already is financed and provided for. The Government owns it. I do not know how much of it the Government will use. According to the reports I have received, some 300,000 bales have been used in channels other than channels of trade.

I had hoped that the Senate would see fit to put this matter beyond the realm of speculation and trade, so that we would give the current crop a right to the market. I appreciate what the Senator from Oregon has said, and I am perfectly willing to let the bill go over, in order that wheat and other commodities may be included according to their storage value.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit an intrusion, I desire to state that if we impound the ten and one-half million bales of cotton now in possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation, whether owned or whether held as collateral, that cotton will not enter into the channels of trade. I am curious to know what effect the loan price of 85 percent of parity on this year's spot cotton would have a year from now on the price of the frozen cotton.

Mr. SMITH. I think the probabilities are that it would go a cent or 2 cents above the loan price—that is, the 85-percent level.

Mr. McNARY. Is it the intention of the able Senator from South Carolina that this cotton should be taken out of the reservoir in which it is temporarily impounded and that it should receive the benefits of the parity loan price?

Mr. SMITH. It is the Government's cotton.

Mr. McNARY. Part of it is the Government's cotton. On half of it the title has passed. On half of it the Government simply holds a lien.

Mr. SMITH. According to its terms, the note the Government holds is a demand note, and the Government can take the cotton at any time and can take it at the current price.

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. Farmers now are withdrawing it.

Mr. McNARY. Yes. So, without this bill the farmer who would have an equity in this cotton could take it out and sell it today or during this year's crop season.

Mr. SMITH. According to the terms of the note, he could take it out and hold it until the 1st of July.

Mr. McNARY. After the 1st of July, he could take his cotton out of the reservoir in which it is impounded and could sell it at 85 percent of the parity price.

Mr. SMITH. He can sell it at that price now.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. Then, if that be true, the Senator's bill would apply not only to this year's crop of cotton but also to cotton which is frozen.

Mr. SMITH. The bill would not apply to this year's crop.

Mr. McNARY. The Bankhead bill, which provides for 85 percent of parity, does apply to this year's crop.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. That is what I say. I think the two measures must be treated in relation to each other. By this bill the Senator is attempting to freeze cotton which is now impounded and is attempting to keep it off the market. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] wants to give the cotton crop of this year a loan price of 85 percent of parity.

Mr. SMITH. That is this year's crop.

Mr. McNARY. Certainly. We must think of the owners of the 11,000,000 impounded bales.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator desires to quote the figures correctly.

Mr. McNARY. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH. There are about three and one-half million bales in which there is no equity at all.

Mr. McNARY. That is true. Whatever the total may be, or however the Senator may segregate the supplies of cotton in the consideration of his bill, according to my judgment we must consider it in connection with the Bankhead measure and the parity bill which is in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and over which there has been no controversy.

Mr. SMITH. The Government owns in fee simple 6,000,000 bales. That is in the Government's hands. The acreage has been reduced, and the loan price on cotton has been increased. It will not cost the Government anything more to keep it. It is in their own warehouses. I think, in justice to the farmers who are making a crop this year in excess of domestic consumption, that they should be given a free market on the basis of 85 percent of parity.

Mr. McNARY. But the Senator does not think that that should apply to the grower who now has a crop impounded?

Mr. SMITH. I do not know of any cotton grower whose crop has been impounded. Only a fraction of the crop has been impounded.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator must concede that there is a clear distinction between spot cotton—this year's crop—and the cotton of last year and the year before, now controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation. I have the greatest sympathy for the cotton growers of the South, and I think I have shown it by every word I have said on this floor and every vote I have cast. But in view of the three separate bills and the fact that cotton has been segregated from wheat, corn, tobacco, and rice, I think careful consideration should be given before further action is taken.

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator desires to offer an amendment, I shall be perfectly willing to accept it. I do not know anything about wheat and the storage of wheat and corn. If the Senator desires to offer an amendment, I will accept it. I have tried to do the best I could for wheat and corn.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator has done so.

Mr. SMITH. I have tried to do the best I could for all the products of agriculture, but in view of the fact that the price of everything the farmer has to buy is going sky-high, I think the time has come when he must be considered. I know that the Senator from Oregon entertains the same views on the matter that I do.

Mr. McNARY. Oh, yes. I think the Senator from Oregon is just as tender toward the condition of the farmer as is the able Senator who succeeded me as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am considering not only the farmer who today is raising cotton, but the man who raised it last year and the year before. My sympathies are not solely with one group; I am considering all cotton raisers as a group.

However, I do not desire to take up any further time. I am violating the rule; I am speaking longer than I should. But with the greatest of courtesy toward the Senator from South Carolina, knowing his sympathy for the bill, I ask that today it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. SMITH. I do not object; I join in suggesting that it go over; but I desire to say that the men with the equity in the Government's cotton are the very men who are making this year's crop. They cannot divide this year's crop from that of other years; they have gotten their loans on last year's crop and have spent it on this year's. If there is any equity coming to them I should be glad to have them get it; but I am trying to take care of those who are making this year's crop.

PAYMENTS UNDER SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 588) to give the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g), is amended by striking out subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g).

SEC. 2. Section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h), is amended (1) by striking out subsection (a); and (2) by striking out, in subsection (b), "Subject to the limitations provided in subsection (a) of this section, the" and inserting in lieu thereof "The."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama explain this bill? I have not had an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will be very glad to do so. When the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act was passed in 1936, immediately following the annulment of the original Agricultural Adjustment Act by the Supreme Court, there was grave doubt about the power of Congress, under the decision of the Court, to administer any Federal program relating to agriculture because of the very great length to which, appar-

ently, the opinion of the Supreme Court went. So, in passing the act immediately following the Supreme Court decision, there were, because of that doubt, included in the act provisions requiring that the administration of the Soil Conservation Act should be returned or sent back to the various States so as to have what were then called 48 little Triple A's. A certain length of time, 4 years, as I recall, was given—and it was extended 2 years—for the States to pass enabling acts in order to administer such money as Congress might grant to them under the Soil Conservation Act. The time will expire on the 1st of January.

Only about 12 or 15 States have passed enabling legislation; and unless a bill similar to this is passed, administration of the Soil Conservation Act will revert to some 10 or 12 States only, and there will be no authority to administer it elsewhere. In fact, it cannot well be administered locally; so this bill is to continue the present soil-conservation program, a program which was endorsed in the platforms of both political parties.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Alabama that, of course, I have no intention of objecting to the consideration of this bill, for I am very much in sympathy with the Soil Conservation Act.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think that act is probably the best legislation which has been enacted in relation to agriculture.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I, too, think it is one of the very best. I should like to remark, however, that I am, in general, very apprehensive about extending the permanent powers of the Agricultural Department, because I have seen so many instances of the very arbitrary exercise of power by the bureaucrats there. I recall that last fall and this spring the Senator from Alabama and myself, and all other members of the United States Senate interested in cotton, saw an extremely arbitrary exhibition of power by the bureaucrats of the Agricultural Department which required an act of Congress to correct, and which I was very glad to be one of the followers, under the leadership of the Senator from Alabama, in correcting. But I do, in general, regard permanent grants of power to the Agricultural Department with very great misgiving, although in this particular case I agree with the Senator that the passage of the bill is very necessary to effectuate the purposes of the Soil Conservation Act.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is true, for unless the bill were passed the act would terminate except in a few States.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator knows what I am talking about. I refer to the very arbitrary exercise of power in the matter of the reconcentration of loan cotton, which would have worked an intolerable outrage on the farmers of the interior.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I feel exactly as the Senator does about that matter. I thought it was an outrageous and unconscionable effort.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was glad to follow the leadership of the Senator from Alabama in correcting that situation, but that experience and others have

made me very apprehensive about making permanent grants of power to the Agricultural Department.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This bill was initiated on my responsibility; I was the coauthor of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and it was really my bill which was passed. I feel very greatly interested in its success, and unless something is done now, that law cannot, as I have stated it, be administered except in a very few States, and, of course, that would not be satisfactory to the Congress.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, on April 14 I introduced Senate bill 1324, seeking to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act of 1938, in such a manner as to provide for the insurance of producers of cotton against loss in yields of cotton due to unavoidable causes, including a provision for additional premium and indemnity in terms of lint cotton to cover loss of cottonseed, such additional premium and indemnity to be determined on the basis of the average relationship between returns from cottonseed and returns from lint cotton for the same period of years as that used for computing yields and premium rates. In other words, we want to assure to cotton growers the same type of protection now enjoyed by wheat growers under the Federal Crop Insurance Act.

However, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] introduced Senate bill 158 in January and it was very properly taken up by the committee to be reported. Therefore, in view of the fact that his bill was introduced first and also because he was author of the earlier bill which was vetoed by President Roosevelt last year, I now wish to pledge my support to the bill of the Senator from Alabama in lieu of my own, and I ask leave to submit a few remarks in support of same. It has the same objective, in the long run, as the measure proposed in my bill, and I gladly join him in urging enactment of his bill.

In his letter transmitting a report of the President's Committee on Crop Insurance in 1937, President Roosevelt stated:

I believe that legislation should authorize application of similar programs to other commodities (than wheat) when it is established that producers desire them and application of the plan to wheat has provided a backlog of experience in applying the principles of crop insurance.

On May 4, 1940, Senate bill 2635, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, was passed to extend to cotton the system of Federal crop insurance now applied to wheat. But President Roosevelt could not see his way clear to approve the bill. He is now convinced that the time is ripe for extending the insurance program to cotton, as evidenced by the following letter from Mr. Roosevelt to the Secretary of Agriculture under date of April 5, 1941, as follows:

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On May 4, 1940, I returned to Congress without my approval S. 2635 (76th Cong., 3d sess.), a bill which would have extended to cotton the system of Federal crop insurance now applied to wheat. My action was based on (a) the substantial losses incurred by Federal insurance

of wheat; (b) the lack of a sound actuarial basis for a self-supporting crop insurance; and (c) the belief that when such basis was established the producers of all major crops should share in its benefits.

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

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

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

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

After careful observation of the program and its results in the instance of wheat, based on my researches into facts and figures, I am firmly convinced that the crop-insurance program has amply justified itself. In fact, I am elated over the results obtained thus far.

The wheat crop insurance program has been in operation 3 years, and now is preparing for its sign-up campaign for the fourth time. The official report issued by the Crop Insurance Corporation is a veritable progress sheet.

During the first year of operation, that is, in 1939, insurance was written in 1,289 counties of 31 States. Losses paid on the 1939 crop amounted to about 10,000,000 bushels of wheat. Each succeeding year has witnessed substantial increases in the sign-up. The following summary speaks eloquently for the popularity of the program:

	1939	1940	1941
Number of premiums collected.....	165,777	360,656	420,077
Premium payments (in bushels).....	6,684,215	13,804,632	14,358,958
Estimated insured acreage (in bushels).....	7,235,050	12,764,124	10,946,284
Estimated insured production (in bushels).....	60,839,785	108,333,141	110,591,202

It is officially estimated that drought, floods, frost, hail, insects, plant diseases, and other unavoidable hazards take an annual toll of around 300,000,000 bushels of wheat every year. It is gratifying, indeed, to know that at least a part of this tremendous loss is now offset by crop insurance. The crop-insurance program has given the wheat farmer the protection of a guaranteed wheat income, and the result has been that the insured grower has always had some wheat to

sell, regardless of whatever perils the hostile forces of Nature might visit on his crops. It has helped farmers to stabilize their business of wheat growing. It has enabled the wheat grower to pay for his crop failures on the installment plan, so to speak, instead of absorbing the shock of crop failure all in 1 year. Actuarial rates have been developed from actual and appraised records for farms so that over a period of years the amount the grower pays in premiums will about balance with what he collects in indemnities.

Moreover, crop insurance has given the wheat grower a new source of credit, since, by assigning his contract, he can borrow money to continue his farming operations. With an insurance contract as collateral, he has become a much better credit risk. Insurance, too, has helped numerous wheat growers to protect their meager investments in land where one crop failure would have forced them off the land.

With assured wheat income, local rural communities, wholly dependent upon wheat for trade and existence, have been benefited. Crop insurance has made possible continued trade on Main Street by supplying some measure of purchasing power on the farm in crop-failure years. This purchasing power has had an indirect effect on city industry and urban labor in that the farm thus was able to buy what the city produced, whereas in former years of crop failures business and labor suffered.

It may be truthfully said that crop insurance serves another important purpose in the complex business of farming. It supplies the farmer with an irrefutable record of his land. Through insurance the grower can determine for himself the feasibility of continuing to grow wheat on land that otherwise might not prove unfitted for that crop until after repeated years of meager success and failure.

Aside from all economic considerations, the protection afforded by crop insurance goes a long way to boost the morale of the farmer thus protected. It gives him the precious feeling of security that comes with knowing that the elements and the insects and plant diseases cannot snatch away his whole year's hard work and investment in his crop. In years of crop failure the farmer who does not have crop insurance or some other reserve to fall back on must resort, if he needs funds, to borrowing, or he may have to seek private or public relief. Crop insurance gives him certainty and security in the place of uncertainty and insecurity. It is less expensive than borrowing because it eliminates the payment of interest and other borrowing costs which are usually inordinately high at those times when the farmer is pressed for funds. It is certainly less expensive to the Government than public relief because the farmer contributes through payment of premiums to his own need for funds following crop failures. It is less embarrassing to farmers to provide in advance through insurance for their own needs in years of misfortune than to have to accept public relief. In other words, the Federal crop-insurance program helps the farmer to help himself.

With the attained success of the wheat-insurance program as a backlog of experience, the time seems ripe for applying the program to what is commonly called the Nation's economic problem No. 1. That is to say, the cotton-growing South.

More than 2,000,000 American farmers depend on cotton for the major source of their income. Many of these farmers at one time or another have faced financial difficulties—even financial ruin—because of crop failures from causes beyond their control. The need for some form of protection against these unavoidable and seemingly inevitable production hazards has long been apparent. Crop insurance would seem now to point the way to meet these hazards.

Approximately 13,500,000 people in the United States are directly dependent for at least a substantial part of their livelihood on the cotton crop. This is almost 11 percent of the population of continental United States.

On 2,000,000 cotton farms of the South and Southwest there are more than 10,000,000 persons dependent on cotton for the greater part of their income. Cotton textile manufacturing in all its branches provides the support of approximately 3,000,000 citizens, and in other work based on cotton marketing and processing there are about 500,000. There are more cotton farms than those of any other type.

In good years the annual farm value of the cotton crop reaches \$1,000,000,000; adding to this the value of cottonseed products, approximating \$180,000,000 and \$1,000,000,000 as the approximate value of products of southern textile mills, we have in the cotton industry an annual business totaling \$2,180,000,000. This represents the Nation's largest single industry, and yet it is the most unprotected business.

Ten million persons dependent on cotton for the greater part of their income are more or less at the mercy of the elements, the insects, and the scourge of plant disease, to say nothing of disastrous fluctuations in cotton price.

In these times of low cotton price the growing of cotton is unprofitable enough from any angle viewed. Persons not familiar with the facts are shocked to know how much it costs to produce an acre of cotton. The following chart of official figures pertaining to cost of production is very revealing:

Gross cost per acre	
To prepare and plant.....	\$3.82
To cultivate and hoe.....	5.20
Harvest.....	8.15
Fertilizers.....	1.93
Seed.....	1.16
Ginning.....	2.73
Miscellaneous.....	3.39
Total, above items.....	26.38
Credit allowance per acre for cottonseed.....	4.53
Balance (net).....	21.85

If the grower rents his land an additional item of \$4.98 per acre must be added, bringing the total net cost per acre to \$26.73.

Translated in pounds, based on a 10-year average of yields per acre, the net cost of producing a pound of cotton, including rent, is 9.6 cents; excluding rent, 7.8 cents.

These figures are for the 1937 crop and are the latest production figures I have at hand, but the cost of production does not vary a great deal over an average period of years.

Taking into consideration the frequency of material crop losses that occur over the Cotton Belt and almost total losses that occur occasionally in lesser portions of the region, it is not surprising that the average annual income of the cotton farmer is so pathetically low.

The seriousness of hazards to cotton are graphically shown by Bureau of Agricultural Economics figures giving the percentage of reduction from full yield in recent years:

	Percent
1928.....	36.4
1929.....	43.8
1930.....	47.1
1931.....	27.8
1932.....	42.7
1933.....	28.6
1934.....	42.6
1935.....	36.8
1936.....	38.5
1937.....	23.1

Crop failures befall one part or another of the Cotton Belt practically every year. The consequence is that the farmers who suffer these crop losses have little or no income on which to live. Where borrowers are dependent upon a crop for income and that crop is subject to numerous uncontrollable hazards, the grower is often rated a questionable credit risk. Too many crop failures and his credit dries up completely. Or if he still is considered a credit risk, he generally must pay interest rate commensurate with that high degree of risk. Crop insurance would enlarge the availability of credit. It would provide the cotton farmer with a better distribution of income from year to year and thus alleviate some of the hardship brought about by crop failure. The burden of crop failure on cotton farms, as with wheat farms, has frequently been beyond the resources of the individual grower. At such times governmental relief is the only place to which the individual can turn. According to figures taken from the records of the Director of Information of the United States Department of Agriculture, the Federal Government spent for emergency agricultural relief a total of \$600,000,000 during the 10-year period from 1926 to 1935. A large part of this relief was absolutely essential because of crop failures.

The crop-insurance program is materially reducing the need for Federal and State Government relief in wheat areas, and it can do the same for the cotton South.

We do not claim that crop insurance offers a solution for all the cotton farmers' problems, for many of these problems are world-wide in scope. We do believe and nonestly affirm that application of the program to the Cotton Belt would make a great contribution to-

ward solution for many farmers of the problems that are caused by the hazardous factors of crop production.

By the same token, it would undoubtedly make a significant contribution to the welfare of the whole Nation, for it does not take an economist to know that the security and prosperity of the cotton industry has a marked influence on the security and prosperity of the entire country.

I am delighted with the findings of the comprehensive research that has been conducted by agricultural experts with the Crop Insurance Corporation and other departments of the United States Department of Agriculture with relation to the possibilities of cotton-crop insurance.

I have recently reread and analyzed again the statements of Mr. R. T. Baggett, associate agricultural economist of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, as presented before the Agriculture Committee of the House in July 1939. Since that time much additional information has been assembled, of course, and the more thought I give to the subject, the stronger becomes my conviction that we should no longer delay the inclusion of cotton and cottonseed in the crop-insurance program.

Mr. Baggett had made an objective study of conditions at first hand in the strategic areas of the cotton South. In my State, for example, he attended several meetings that were held in Mississippi, arranged by the director of extension, where discussions were held regarding the proposed plan for cotton-crop insurance. The farmers were asked to express their opinions as to how they thought insurance might be received there, and not a dissenting vote was cast in these meetings.

Furthermore, previous to the time these meetings were held, and previous to the time that crop conditions became critical in that area, the director of extension had sent copies of House Document 277, A Suggested Plan for Cotton Crop Insurance, to about 604 cotton growers in the State of Mississippi and asked them to read that and send to him their comments on the plan as proposed in that bulletin, and out of the 604 replies received, 403 were in favor of it. That is to say, 80 percent of the representative farmers of the State were in favor of the plan.

Mr. Baggett and his assistants selected strategic counties in various cotton States and completed actuarial computations to reflect tentative figures for premium rates on cotton, 75-percent coverage. Based on these tentative computations, it appears that the average rate for the State of Mississippi premiums is around 9 pounds per acre.

This chart of tentative figures for county average yield and county average premium rates for 75-percent insurance per acre for cotton-crop insurance in selected, strategic counties in all the typical cotton States is herewith presented, and I wish to make it a part of the RECORD.

Tentative figures for county acreage yield and county average premium rates for 75-percent insurance per acre for cotton crop insurance in selected counties in Cotton Belt

[From the report of R. T. Baggett, associate agricultural economist, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture]

State and county	11-year county average yield (1928-38)	County average premium rate
	Pounds lint	Pounds lint
North Carolina:		
Anson.....	252	8.3
Johnston.....	276	7.5
Rowan.....	288	9.5
Sampson.....	287	8.9
Vance.....	258	5.2
Florida: Madison.....	119	9.8
South Carolina:		
Allendale.....	208	9.8
Anderson.....	250	6.0
Chester.....	226	6.6
Darlington.....	229	12.8
Dillon.....	294	14.1
Orangeburg.....	248	12.4
Richland.....	188	9.0
Saluda.....	241	9.9
Spartanburg.....	271	5.4
Georgia:		
Burke.....	217	9.5
Carroll.....	254	4.3
Cherokee.....	230	4.4
Early.....	207	3.4
Floyd.....	241	7.7
Jasper.....	207	7.7
Jenkins.....	221	8.4
Laurens.....	199	12.3
Oglethorpe.....	193	9.8
Tattnall.....	196	12.7
Terrell.....	249	9.5
Tift.....	230	8.0
Walton.....	248	4.2
Wayne.....	198	16.0
Wilcox.....	200	6.4
Upson.....	161	13.4
Alabama:		
Barbour.....	157	13.0
Bibb.....	214	10.3
Escambia.....	221	9.3
Etowah.....	242	6.5
Lamar.....	219	7.9
Madison.....	238	7.1
Randolph.....	216	5.4
Sumter.....	147	8.5
Mississippi:		
Amite.....	177	12.0
Attala.....	186	7.3
Bolivar.....	281	14.6
Chickasaw.....	177	12.6
Claborne.....	198	10.5
Coahoma.....	289	11.3
Humphreys.....	276	11.0
Issaquena.....	265	16.4
Jasper.....	210	11.1
Lee.....	214	7.7
Marion.....	208	9.6
Perry.....	193	13.3
Tippah.....	203	10.4
Winston.....	187	12.9
Louisiana:		
Caddo.....	244	7.1
Concordia.....	294	14.1
East Carroll.....	344	10.3
Jackson.....	170	8.0
Jefferson Davis.....	228	9.3
Natchitoches.....	228	8.9
Red River.....	205	7.0
Richland.....	242	11.6
St. Martin.....	212	24.8
Tangipahoa.....	184	10.7
Texas:		
Archer.....	111	19.9
Bell.....	150	5.7
Brazoria.....	189	23.1
Brazos.....	173	10.0
Coleman.....	110	10.9
Dawson.....	138	17.2
Denton.....	148	8.0
Dickens.....	144	22.0
Donley.....	151	12.5
Ellis.....	173	6.7
El Paso.....	506	13.7
Guadalupe.....	136	10.7
Hardeman.....	122	18.4
Harrison.....	130	6.4
Hunt.....	162	7.5
Jones.....	121	16.9
Liberty.....	188	16.5
Lubbock.....	160	25.0
McCulloch.....	118	8.1
Nacogdoches.....	164	8.5
Nueces.....	205	8.6
Titus.....	138	6.6
Ward.....	173	13.7

Tentative figures for county acreage yield and county average premium rates for 75-percent insurance per acre for cotton crop insurance in selected counties in Cotton Belt—Continued

State and county	11-year county average yield (1928-38)	County average premium rate
	Pounds lint	Pounds lint
Oklahoma:		
Beckham	139	17.8
Canadian	140	17.5
Cleveland	143	10.0
Comanche	114	15.8
Dewey	122	17.6
Harmon	120	13.7
Jefferson	129	13.0
Johnston	122	11.0
McCurtain	137	11.1
Muskogee	135	17.7
Payne	133	16.5
Pittsburgh	127	10.7
Tennessee:		
Fayette	198	6.9
Giles	210	4.0
Herdin	181	6.3
Lake	323	10.7
Meigs	199	7.0
Rutherford	203	6.1
Arizona:		
Graham	538	8.1
Greenlee	320	17.6
Maricopa	356	4.3
Pinal	359	10.8
Kentucky:		
Calloway	232	13.7
Carlisle	249	18.2
Fulton	318	16.5
Virginia:		
Greensville	276	8.8
Mecklenburg	245	9.6
Princess Anne	304	16.4
Southampton	289	13.3
Arkansas:		
Arkansas	170	11.2
Chicot	238	9.5
Clay	245	12.0
Franklin	127	6.9
Garland	131	11.3
Lawrence	200	13.4
Lee	217	13.0
Little River	152	5.5
Lonoke	201	6.2
Ouachita	140	9.7
Scott	122	8.4
Stone	129	9.3

Mr. President, it will be noted that in certain parts of the Belt the risks are greater than they are in Mississippi and the premium rates are, of course, relatively higher. But the greater the risk in crop production, the greater the need for protection.

If we may assume that cotton farmers of other States are as interested in securing cotton-crop insurance as in Mississippi—where a representative 80 percent favored the plan even when it was still in its infancy, we may safely assume that cotton farmers over the entire Belt will be ready and eager, in large numbers, to take advantage of it—provided the proposed amendment passes, as I do most fervently hope it will. As a matter of fact, many cotton farmers are pleading for this protection and I do not see how we can turn a deaf ear to their pleas. They have seen that 55,929 wheat growers in 1939 were paid indemnities amounting to 10,163,487 bushels and that in 1940, 112,645 wheat growers received indemnities aggregating 22,887,713 bushels, and they are wondering why they, the cotton farmers, cannot likewise participate in a program which is working out so advantageously.

A reading of the 1940, or Second Annual, Report of the Manager of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, will convince the skeptical that the program

is being administered in a businesslike manner for the wheat farmers. The vast amount of convincing actuarial and other factual data made available through the Department of Agriculture furnishes sufficient evidence that cotton-crop insurance can also be made tenable. So I can see no reasonable argument against inclusion of our largest group of farmers in the whole Nation—the cotton farmers—in the crop-insurance plan. We have only asked for an additional appropriation of \$6,000,000 to administer cotton-crop insurance. Surely, even in the face of the necessity for retrenchment to as great extent as possible in nondefense expenditures, the 10,000,000 people who are dependent on the cotton crop for their principal source of income, are entitled to this small consideration.

As a matter of strict fact, the protection of this important sector of our population against the economic hazards that constantly threaten them, is a defense measure. As I look at it, proper defense is more than the mere assembling of physical implements of defense or the building of Army, Navy, and Air Forces. Proper defense should include protection against all the things that the people in our democracy have cause to fear. And what is more to be feared than the loss of one's source of livelihood? Few aspects of human pathos are more poignant than the loss of a crop into which the farmer has not only invested his dollars but his hard, unrelenting toil and his faith for the coming harvest.

Thomas Jefferson said, about 150 years ago:

The cultivators of the earth are the most valuable citizens. They are the most vigorous, the most virtuous, and they are tied to their country, and wedded to its liberty and interests by the most lasting bonds.

Those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God, if He ever had a chosen people, whose breasts He has made His peculiar deposit for substantial and genuine virtue. It is the focus in which He keeps alive that sacred fire, which otherwise might escape from the face of the earth. Corruption of morals in the mass of the cultivators is a phenomenon of which no age nor nation has furnished an example. It is the mark set on those, who, not looking up to heaven, to their own soil and industry, as does the husbandman, for the subsistence, depend for it on casualties and caprice of customers. Dependence begets subservience and venality, suffocates the germ of virtue, and prepares fit tools for the designs of ambition. Generally speaking, the proportion which the aggregate of the other classes of citizens bears in any State to that of its husbandmen is the proportion of its unsound to its healthy parts, and is a good enough barometer whereby to measure its degree of corruption.

It was true when Jefferson said it 150 years ago, and it is equally true today; the tillers of the soil are the most vigorous and courageous of our citizens, taken as a whole, and they are without question the backbone of our Nation.

It was true when Jefferson said it 150 years ago, and it is equally true today that dependence begets subservience and venality, suffocates the germ of virtue (and virtue includes patriotism).

It was true when Jefferson said it 150 years ago, and it is equally true today that the proportion which the aggregate

of the other classes of citizens bears in any State (or country) to that of its farmers is the proportion of its unsound to its healthy parts, and is a sure enough barometer whereby to measure its degree of corruption or instability.

Yes, Mr. President, I believe with all my heart that the inauguration of cotton-crop defense—defense against the thing that the farmer fears most—deserves consideration as a potentially important link in national solidarity and security. And I do most urgently plead for the passage of Senate bill 158, which would pave the way for this measure of defense for our cotton farmers.

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

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

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 158) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment on page 3, after line 11, to insert:

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

So as to make the bill read:

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 7. That section 508 of said act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection: "(e) In connection with insurance upon yields of cotton, to include provision for additional premium and indemnity in terms of lint cotton to cover loss of cottonseed, such additional premium and indemnity to be de-

terminated on the basis of the average relationship between returns from cottonseed and returns from lint cotton for the same period of years as that used for computing yields and premium rates."

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

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

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

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

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I favor this bill, as I have always favored crop insurance, but the last time the calendar was called some Senator objected. I understand that objection has been removed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That objection has been removed.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

CONTINUATION OF TEMPORARY INCREASES IN POSTAL RATES

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 105) to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time and passed.

LANDS ADJACENT TO TURTLE MOUNTAIN INDIAN AGENCY, N. DAK.

The bill (H. R. 3362) to amend the act of May 24, 1940 (Public, No. 520, 76th Cong.) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTRADITION OF FUGITIVES FROM JUSTICE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 269) to amend section 5278 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, which was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5278 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is amended by inserting after the words "an indictment found" the following: "or information filed by a prosecuting officer."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, this bill is for the purpose of amending the statute relating to the extradition of fugitives from one State to another.

The existing law provides that when the executive of any State or Territory demands any person as a fugitive from

justice of the executive of any other State or Territory, to which such person has fled, and produces a certified copy of an indictment or an affidavit made before a magistrate charging the person demanded with having committed treason, felony, or other crime, it shall be the duty of the executive of the State or Territory to which such person has fled to cause him to be arrested and to be delivered to the agent of the demanding jurisdiction.

The bill under consideration would amend the existing law by inserting the words "or information filed by a prosecuting officer" immediately following the words "an indictment found." The existing law dates back almost 150 years. Since that time many States have, in whole or in part, abandoned prosecutions by indictment and have substituted prosecutions by information.

The purpose of this bill is to give the same effect to an information as to an indictment in extradition cases between the States.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is the only effect of the bill to put information filed by the prosecuting attorney on the same footing as indictments?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think that is a very meritorious change. There are a great many States, including my own, that very rarely proceed by indictment, but proceed by information to a very much larger extent than by indictment.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is the reason for the bill.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF LAND IN SANTA YSABEL INDIAN RESERVATION, CALIF.

The bill (H. R. 3514) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to effect an exchange of certain tribal land of the Santa Ysabel Indian Reservation, Calif., for other land of equal value, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

W. R. LARKIN AND DORA LARKIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4064) for the relief of W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin, in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment on page 2, at the end of the bill, to insert a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the acts of June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 1363), and June 11, 1940 (Private, No. 362, 76th Cong.), for the relief of certain individuals named therein in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, are hereby supplemented and further amended by authorizing payment, pursuant to the provisions of said acts, of the sum of \$4,000 to W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin, in lieu of the payment of the sum of \$2,000 to W. R. Larkin, as therein authorized: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall accord recognition to any valid assignment executed by W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin to the Fort Hall Water Users' Associa-

tion of all or any part of the amount herein authorized for payment to them.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ACQUISITION OF INDIAN LANDS FOR CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

The bill (S. 1120) for the acquisition of Indian lands for the Central Valley project, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in aid of the construction of the Central Valley project, authorized by the acts of April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 115), and August 26, 1937 (50 Stat. 850), there is hereby granted to the United States, subject to the provisions of this act, (a) all the right, title, and interest of the Indians in and to the tribal and allotted lands within the area embraced by the Central Valley project, including sites of agency and school buildings and related structures, as may be designated therefor by the Secretary of the Interior from time to time, and (b) such other interests in or to any of such lands and property as may be required and as may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior from time to time for the construction of reservoirs, canals, ditches, pipe lines, highways, railroads, telegraph, telephone, and electric transmission lines in connection with the project, or for the relocation or reconstruction of such facilities made necessary by the construction of the project.

Sec. 2. As lands or interests in lands are designated from time to time under this act, the Secretary of the Interior shall determine the amount of money to be paid to the Indians as just and equitable compensation therefor. As to the tribal lands, the amounts so determined shall be transferred in the Treasury of the United States from the funds now or hereafter made available for the construction of the Central Valley project to the credit of the appropriate tribe pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 560). The amounts due individual landowners or their heirs or devisees shall be paid from funds now or hereafter made available for the construction of said project to the superintendent of the appropriate Indian agency or such other officer as shall be designated by the Secretary of the Interior for credit on the books of such agency to the accounts of the individuals concerned.

Sec. 3. Funds deposited to the credit of allottees, their heirs or devisees, may be used, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, for the acquisition of other lands and improvements, or the relocation of existing improvements or construction of new improvements on the lands so acquired for the allottees or heirs whose lands and improvements are acquired under the provisions of this act. Lands so acquired shall be held in the same status as those from which the funds were derived, and shall be nontaxable until otherwise provided by Congress.

Sec. 4. As to any Indian cemetery lands required for the project, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, in lieu of requiring payment therefor, to establish cemeteries on other lands that he may select and acquire for the purpose, and to remove bodies, markers, and other appurtenances to the new sites. All costs incurred in connection with any such relocation shall be paid from moneys appropriated for the project. All right, title, and interest of the Indians in the lands within any cemetery so relocated shall terminate and the grant of title under this act take effect as of the date the Secretary of the Interior authorizes the

relocation. Sites of the relocated cemeteries shall be held in trust by the United States for the appropriate tribe, or family, as the case may be, and shall be nontaxable.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to prescribe such regulations as he may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this act.

EASTERN AND WESTERN CHEROKEES

The bill (S. 1113) for the relief of the Eastern and Western Cherokees, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$432.28, with interest at 5 percent per annum from January 1, 1874, to the date of the passage of this act, the same being the balance arising from the sale of the Cherokee Strip, the title to which was vested by the treaty of 1846 (9 Stat. 871) in the whole Cherokee people, and said fund having been found due by the Slade-Bender Award and appearing as item 3 in the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States in 1906 (202 U. S. 101); and when appropriated shall be placed to the credit of the Eastern and Western Cherokees and paid to their attorney of record by the Secretary of the Treasury.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution, Senate Resolution 96, submitted by Mr. ADAMS, making rule XVI applicable to amendments to relief and work-relief bills, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

LAND OWNERS ON UTAH INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT

The bill (H. R. 3987) to provide relief for, and to promote the interests of, the landowners on the Utah Indian irrigation project, Utah, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WATER FOR FIRE FIGHTING BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ADJACENT TO THE DISTRICT

The bill (S. 234) to authorize the Chief of Engineers of the Army to enter into agreements with local governments adjacent to the District of Columbia for the use of water for purposes of fire fighting only was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chief of Engineers of the Army is hereby authorized to formulate regulations and enter into agreements with county or other local governments in communities adjacent to the District of Columbia for the use of unfiltered water from the supply conduits along Conduit Road between the Dalecarlia Reservoir and Great Falls for emergency purposes in fire fighting only.

TRAINING OF ENLISTED MEN OF THE ARMY AS AVIATION STUDENTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1371) to authorize the training of enlisted men of the Army as aviation students, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, on page 2, line 3, after the words "amount of", to strike out

"\$5,000" and insert "\$10,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to cause the detail of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of other components of the Army of the United States in active Federal service for training and instruction as aviation students, in their respective grades, in such numbers and schools as he shall direct: *Provided*, That enlisted men so detailed as aviation students who are undergoing courses of instruction which require them to participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights shall be issued Government life insurance in the amount of \$10,000 under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 (Public, No. 801, title VI, pt. 1), except that the premiums shall be paid by the Government during the period such enlisted men are undergoing training and instruction, and upon completion of training and instruction as aviation students they shall have the option of continuing such policies at their own expense: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed as repealing or otherwise affecting existing statutory authorizations for the appointment and training of aviation students or aviation cadets.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

LITTLEFIELD-WYMAN NURSERIES

The bill (H. R. 819) for the relief of Littlefield-Wyman Nurseries was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FOOT'S TRANSFER & STORAGE CO., LTD.

The bill (H. R. 1151) for the relief of Foot's Transfer & Storage Co., Ltd., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RUSSELL H. GAUSLIN

The bill (H. R. 1267) for the relief of Russell H. Gauslin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADAM M. GARMON

The bill (H. R. 1355) for the relief of Adam M. Garmon was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENTS TO CERTAIN SETTLERS IN PYRAMID LAKE INDIAN RESERVATION, NEV.

The bill (S. 13) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to certain settlers in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue patents for certain lands entered pursuant to section 1 of the act of June 7, 1924, entitled "An act for the relief of settlers and town-site occupants of certain lands in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev.," upon the payment of unpaid balances based upon reappraisals made in 1934 as follows: J. A. Ceresola, \$4,595.89; W. J. Ceresola, \$4,376.11; Domenico Ceresola, \$4,926.63; M. P. Depaoli, \$4,878.56; and the Garaventa Land & Livestock Co., \$2,951.51: *Provided*, That the foregoing amounts, together with interest at 3½ percent per annum from date of reappraisals made in 1934, shall be paid within 90 days from the date of the passage and approval of this act: *And pro-*

vided further, That in the case of the death of any of the entrymen, payments may be received from and patents be issued to the heirs or legal successors of the entrymen herein named.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND IN WASHINGTON TO CECILIA CROW ARQUETTE

The bill (H. R. 3404) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey the right, title, and interest of the United States in certain property, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEVELOPMENT OF FARM UNITS ON PUBLIC LANDS

The bill (S. 1089) to extend the time limit for cooperation between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Farm Security Administration in the development of farm units on public lands under Federal reclamation projects, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of August 7, 1939 (Public, No. 307, 76th Cong., 1st sess.), as amended by the act of June 17, 1940 (Public, No. 636, 76th Cong., 3d sess.), is hereby further amended by striking out "during the fiscal year 1941," and by inserting "during the fiscal year 1942."

CLAIMS OF UTE INDIANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 215) to amend the act entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on any and all claims which the Ute Indians or any tribe or band thereof may have against the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1938, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments, on page 2, line 5, before the word "by" to strike out "and", and on page 2, after line 7, to insert "by striking out the word 'of' following the word 'ownership' appearing in the first proviso of the said section; and by striking out the word 'constituent', in section 1 and inserting in lieu the word 'constituent'", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the Act entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on any and all claims which the Ute Indians or any tribe or band thereof may have against the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1938, is hereby amended by striking out the words "anything in any other acts of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding" and inserting in lieu thereof a period and the following: "Anything in any other acts of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding"; by striking out "range 35" wherever it appears in such section and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "township 35 north"; by striking out the word "of" following the word "ownership" appearing in the first proviso of the said section; and by striking out the word "constituent" in section 1 and inserting in lieu the word "constituent."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. MURDOCK subsequently said: Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 215 was

passed. I do so for the reason that the act which the bill amends was originally introduced in the House by me, and I have not had time to see just what the amendments are, but they are included in Senate bill 215. So I enter that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered.

FRANK T. HINES

The bill (S. 875) to authorize the President to appoint Frank T. Hines a brigadier general in the Army of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this bill is identical with one which passed the Senate at the last session of Congress. It would merely permit Frank T. Hines, when and after he completes his Government service in the Veterans' Administration or in any other branch of the Government, to retire as a brigadier general, with the retired pay of a brigadier general.

As the Senator from Missouri knows, for he served with him during the World War, General Hines has had an unusually outstanding and brilliant record as an officer in the Army. He started as an enlisted man back during the days of the Spanish-American War, served through the Philippine Insurrection, continued in the Army doing outstanding work, being assigned to especially difficult and important details because of his great ability and great devotion, served through the World War, and then, at the close of the World War, resigned from the Army. Not very long after his resignation a terrible situation developed in the Veterans' Administration; and the then President of the United States, President Harding, sent for General Hines and asked him if he would not come back into the Government service and serve as Administrator of the Veterans' Administration at least until that Administration could be cleaned out and put on an efficient basis. General Hines has been Administrator ever since that time; and I think veterans and nonveterans and persons generally throughout the United States pay tribute to him for his fine work as Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

Perhaps the most outstanding achievement of General Hines' whole career was when he was in charge of the service of embarkation. He was the man more than any other man who was responsible for the feat which really surprised the world—namely, the great feat of putting more than 2,000,000 men across the Atlantic Ocean during the World War, sending across that ocean the American Expeditionary Force.

All the bill would do would be to give General Hines the right to retire as a brigadier general, because he has been in the service practically all the time, except for a very short period of time, rendering service to the Government; and had he continued on as a brigadier general of the Army, of course, he would have enjoyed that right.

I hope the Senator from Missouri will join me in supporting the bill. If he has any particular question to ask, I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I have no particular question to ask. I have great respect for General Hines, and admiration for him, and liking for him. This seems to me, however, to be a very unusual sort of bill. As a matter of fact, of course, the President of the United States has the right to appoint anybody he wants to appoint a brigadier general. The office of brigadier general is the one office in the United States Army or Navy, so far as I am advised, to which the President has the right to make an appointment. The President may make an appointment ab initio, if he desires, to the office of brigadier general.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. HILL. The Senator may be right about that, but that is not my understanding of the law today. Under the existing law, I do not think the President would have authority to appoint General Hines or anyone else a brigadier general.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He would if he is not above the retirement age. The President did it in the case of General Pershing. He jumped him from a captain to a brigadier general. He did it in the case of General Funston.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is eminently correct. The then President of the United States did it in the case of General Pershing, and in the case of General Funston, and perhaps in other cases; but, as the Senator from Missouri so well knows, since that time the law has been very materially amended; and I think I can assure the Senator from Missouri that the President now would have no authority to appoint General Hines or anybody else a brigadier general.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, nevertheless, in spite of my respect for General Hines, in view of the fact that the President of the United States has recently evinced a disinclination to commission a general officer who has voluntarily retired even as a Reserve officer, I do not think we ought to pass this special kind of legislation. In other words, I think Gen. Hugh Johnson's services during the last war were fully as valuable as were those of General Hines. One may be in favor with the administration, and the other may not be in favor with the administration; but when we even refuse General Johnson a commission which it would cost him possibly forty to fifty thousand dollars a year to accept in case he should be called into active service, and when he has been very highly recommended by the War Department for reappointment, I do not think we ought to pick out other retired officers who voluntarily retired for their own reasons for the purpose of making an exception to the rule. Therefore, I think the bill ought to go over.

Mr. HILL. Let me say that whatever may be the merits of the case of Gen-

eral Johnson, I do not think that case is analogous to the case of Gen. Frank T. Hines, because Gen. Hugh Johnson, as we know, has been out of the Government service for quite some time—some years, in fact. He came back for a short time during the NRA, but, except for that short period, I think he has been out of the Government service most of the time since the World War; whereas General Hines has continued in the Government service practically all the time since the World War.

I will say to the Senator from Missouri that the bill does not make General Hines a brigadier general with the thought of calling him into the service, as Gen. Hugh Johnson might have been called into the service. It simply permits General Hines, when he finishes his Government service, to receive the retired pay of a brigadier general, the rank he occupied when he last served in the Army. It is not calling him back to service, as was the case with Gen. Hugh Johnson. That was a case of calling an officer from inactive duty, from civilian life, back into active military service. The passage of this bill would not in any way affect General Hines' present active status. He would continue on as the Director of the Veterans' Administration. The only thing it would do would be that when he did finally finish his Government service, he then would receive the retired pay of the rank which he held while he was in the Army.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think the bill ought to go over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PERSONS FROM SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4125) entitled "an act to amend Public Law No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress, so as to relieve 3-year Regular Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard members and certain members of the Reserve components thereof from selective training and service," which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, on page 2, line 12, after the figure "2", to insert a semicolon and the words "or any person who as a member of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve shall have satisfactorily served for at least 3 consecutive years on active duty before or after or partially before and partially after the time fixed for such registration; or any person who as a member of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve shall have satisfactorily served for at least 1 year on active duty and for at least 2 consecutive years in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps or with an organized unit of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve, before or after or partially before and partially after the time fixed for such registration," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 (b) of Public Law No. 783, approved September 16, 1940, be amended to read as follows:

"(b) In time of peace, the following persons shall be relieved from liability for training and service under section 3 (b) and from

the liability to serve in any Reserve component of the land or naval forces imposed by this act:

"(1) Any person who shall have satisfactorily served as an officer or enlisted man for at least 3 consecutive years in the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard before or after or partially before and partially after the time fixed for registration under section 2.

"(2) Any person who as a member of the active National Guard shall have satisfactorily served as an officer or enlisted man for at least 1 year in active Federal service in the Army of the United States, and subsequent thereto for at least 2 consecutive years in the Regular Army or in the active National Guard, before or after or partially before and partially after the time fixed for registration under section 2; or any person who as a member of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve shall have satisfactorily served for at least 3 consecutive years on active duty before or after or partially before and partially after the time fixed for such registration; or any person who as a member of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve shall have satisfactorily served for at least 1 year on active duty and for at least 2 consecutive years in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps or with an organized unit of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve, before or after or partially before and partially after the time fixed for such registration.

"(3) Any person who is an officer or enlisted man in the active National Guard at the time fixed for registration under section 2, and who shall have satisfactorily served therein for at least 6 consecutive years, before or after or partially before and partially after the time fixed for such registration.

"(4) Any person who is an officer in the Officers' Reserve Corps on the eligible list at the time fixed for registration under section 2, and who shall have satisfactorily served therein on the eligible list for at least 6 consecutive years, before or after or partially before and partially after the time fixed for such registration.

"(5) Any person who is an officer or an enlisted man in the organized Naval Reserve or the organized Marine Corps Reserve at the time fixed for registration under section 2, and who shall have satisfactorily served therein for at least 6 consecutive years, before or after or partially before and partially after the time fixed for such registration or any person who is an officer or an enlisted man in the Naval Merchant Marine Reserve or Volunteer Naval Reserve or Volunteer Marine Corps Reserve at the time fixed for registration under section 2, and who shall have satisfactorily served therein for at least 8 consecutive years, before or after or partially before and partially after the time fixed for such registration."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, before the bill is passed, if it is to be passed, I should like to offer an amendment, on page 2, in line 4, to add a proviso reading as follows:

Provided, That any person who has had such prior service and has already been inducted for service may upon application be discharged and shall not be liable for further training and service in time of peace.

The point is that when the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 was passed there were certain branches of the service which were overlooked, and the bill now under consideration, House bill 4125, is designed to obviate the effect of that omission, which is to discriminate against certain other branches of the service, the standing Army being one of them.

We have discovered since the bill was reported that under its operation one who has already been inducted into service would not get the relief which the bill provides for all those who in the future would be inducted into the service. It is for that reason that the amendment is offered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator's amendment really carries out the intent and purpose of the bill which the committee had in mind when it reported it, and what the House had in mind when it passed the bill. The language was not as it should have been, and did not make certain that the exemptions under the bill would apply to men who had been drafted before the passage of the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct. The selective training and service organizations have been consulted by telephone, and they thought the bill did make this provision; but upon examination of the measure they found it did not, and recommended that the language suggested be added. The amendment has the recommendation of all the different branches of the military, naval, and marine services, as well as of the Treasury Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PAY OF PARACHUTE TROOPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1063) to provide increased pay for certain military personnel while engaged on parachute duty, which had been reported by the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments, on page 1, line 1, after the word "That", to strike out "an officer or warrant officer" and to insert "hereafter any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man", and on page 2, line 4, after the words "per month", to insert "in the case of any such officer or warrant officer, and additional pay at the rate of \$50 per month in the case of any such enlisted man", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States not in flying-pay status who is assigned or attached as a member of a parachute unit, including parachute-jumping schools, and for whom parachute jumping is an essential part of his military duty and who, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, has received a rating as a parachutist or is undergoing training for such a rating shall receive, while engaged upon duty designated by the head of the department concerned as parachute duty, additional pay at the rate of \$100 per month in the case of any such officer or warrant officer, and additional pay at the rate of \$50 per month in the case of any such enlisted man.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of some member of the committee what increase in pay is provided and what relation this has to those

in the submarine service and those in the aviation service.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator from Massachusetts is addressing his remarks to me, I have to say that I did not introduce the bill and did not report it, and therefore would have to refresh my recollection by reading the report. If the Senator has some question, I might ask that the bill go over temporarily until I have an opportunity to examine the report.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Let the bill go over.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to know whether it has any reference to an increase in pay that is important to aviators and those employed in the submarine service.

Mr. HILL. It does have relationship, but I think it would be best for us to read the report, and under the circumstances I am in favor of the bill going over.

Mr. WALSH. I am in favor of some increase, but I should like to know whether there is uniformity with other departments, so that there will not be such a situation that other departments will be asking for increases because of this increase.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

Mr. WALSH subsequently said: Mr. President, I call attention to Senate bill 1063, Calendar No. 271, appearing on page 6 of the calendar. When the bill was called a few minutes ago, I made inquiry concerning the measure, and it was stated by members of the Military Affairs Committee that they desired to examine the report. I have now examined the report, and have no objection to the bill. I therefore ask that it be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to remind the Senate that the amendments to this bill were previously considered and agreed to.

Is there objection to returning to the bill and considering it now?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WORKING CONDITIONS OF REDCAPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 105), which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor, or his designated representatives, is hereby directed to undertake immediately an inquiry into the wages, hours, and other conditions and practices of employment of redcaps by railroad or terminal companies in view of the minimum wage requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1060), under his investigatory powers under said act, and to ascertain and report to the Senate—

(1) The extent to which such conditions and practices violate the letter or the spirit of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 or other Federal statutes, if at all;

(2) The extent to which such conditions and practices are susceptible to regulation under the Fair Labor Standards Act in its present form; and

(3) What legislation, if any, should be enacted for the purpose of further regulating wages, hours, and other conditions and practices of employment of redcaps under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of the resolution the following:

The Administrator shall give a full opportunity to both the employees and the employers to present publicly any evidence, information, data, or argument they may care to present, and shall report such evidence and other data to the Senate with his findings and conclusions.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this amendment was adopted in the Committee on Education and Labor. The resolution is one authorizing an inquiry into the situation regarding redcaps, with a view to possible legislation under the wage-hour law. I myself think that some legislation is necessary. The amendment merely proposes that the investigation, which the Administrator is instructed to make, shall be a public investigation, giving both sides opportunity to be heard. Otherwise there seems no particular reason for the investigation, because the Administrator may make an investigation on his own account. It seems obvious that if the investigation is to be of value to the Senate in determining on legislation, it is desirable to have public hearings, and let both the redcaps and the railroads appear before the committee and have their testimony recorded, so that it may be considered by the Senate. Otherwise, we would have to undertake another complete investigation before the Committee on Education and Labor when the report comes in, and hold hearings of our own, repeating those which have already been had. I do not see that there can be any reasonable objection to the proposal that a record be kept of the hearings and that everyone be given an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. BARKLEY. Inasmuch as the resolution was submitted by the Senator from Utah and reported by him from the Committee on Education and Labor, I should like, in his absence, to inquire whether any other member of the committee objects to the amendment. I believe the Senator from Louisiana is a member of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I would suggest such an amendment myself. I think it should be adopted, because the purpose is to give both sides an opportunity to present their views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee reported an amendment to strike out the preamble.

The preamble was rejected.

SNAKE OR PAIUTE INDIANS

The bill (S. 613) authorizing the Snake or Paiute Indians of the former Malheur Indian Reservation of Oregon to sue in the Court of Claims, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction be, and the same is hereby, conferred upon the Court of Claims, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States by either party as in other cases, anything in the Judicial Code of the United States and amendments thereto to the contrary notwithstanding, and notwithstanding the lapse of time or the statute of limitation, to hear, examine, and adjudicate the claims of, and decree just compensation for, any and all claims of the Snake or Piute Indians of the former Malheur Reservation of Oregon arising or growing out of the Executive orders of September 12, 1872, May 15, 1875, and July 23, 1880, setting aside certain lands as a reservation for said Indians, which lands were taken from them and restored to the public domain by the Executive orders of January 28, 1876, September 13, 1882, May 21, 1883, and March 2, 1889; and it is hereby declared that the taking and the loss, without just compensation to the said Indians, of their lands, reserved to them by the said Executive orders of 1872, 1875, and 1880, and which were restored to the public domain by the said Executive orders of 1876, 1882, 1883, and 1889, is sufficient ground for the court to render equitable relief, and the court shall determine the acreage of the lands set aside for the said Snake or Piute Indians by the aforesaid three Executive orders, as near as may be, and shall determine the value thereof as fixed and classified under the terms of the public land and mining laws of the United States, provided the minimum value shall be fixed at \$1.25 per acre, and render just compensation for the value and loss of use of the same. For the purpose of this act the Snake or Piute Indians of the former Malheur Reservation shall be defined to be all Snake or Piute Indians who occupied and used lands set aside under the said three Executive orders creating the Malheur Reservation (1) from September 12, 1872; (2) from the time of establishing their home on such lands if such home was established between September 12, 1872, and January 1, 1878; or (3) from time of their birth if they were born on such lands after September 12, 1872, and who continued to occupy and use such lands until their removal therefrom by force in 1878, and their descendants. Any payment or advances made to the said Indians by the United States shall not be pleaded as an estoppel but may be pleaded by way of set-off, where such payments or advances have inured to the benefit of said Indians.

SEC. 2. The claim of said Snake or Piute Indians of the former Malheur Reservation of Oregon shall be presented by petition or petitions to be filed within 5 years from the approval of this act and shall make the said Indians party plaintiff and the United States party defendant. Such petition shall be verified and signed by such attorney or attorneys employed by the representative or agent of said Indians under and by virtue of authority given at a council of said Indians duly called by the Indian Department and held on October 1, 1934, and by virtue of a certain contract entered into by said Indians with their representative or agent dated October 6, 1934, in accordance with existing law, which may be made upon information and belief, and no other verification shall be necessary. Official letters, papers, documents, maps, and other public records, or certified copies thereof, of any department of the Government shall be available to the Government and the claimants, and may be used in evidence, and be furnished without cost.

SEC. 3. Upon final determination of such suit instituted hereunder, the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction and fix and determine a reasonable fee for all services rendered before the departments of the Government, committees of Congress, and the courts, not to exceed 10 percent of the amount recovered. In addition thereto, all necessary and proper

expenses incurred in the preparation and prosecution of such suit hereunder, the said fees and expenses shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury out of any sum or sums found to be due said Indians, when appropriation therefor is made by Congress to pay any judgment rendered, and the balance of any sum or sums shall be placed in the Treasury of the United States as a trust fund to the credit of said Indians decreed by said court to be entitled thereto, and shall draw interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of said judgment, and shall be subject to appropriation by Congress for the benefit of said Indians.

SEC. 4. That for the purpose of the distribution of the proceeds of such judgment, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make a proper roll of said Indians within 2 years from the date of the approval of this act. Each community of the Snake or Piute Indians of the former Malheur Reservation of Oregon shall prepare a roll of its membership, which roll shall be submitted to a council of the majority of their Indian chiefs, who lived on the above said Indian reservation, for its approval or disapproval. The said central council of these chiefs shall prepare a combined roll of all members and descendants of members of the respective communities of said Indians of the former Malheur Reservation of Oregon and shall submit the same to the Secretary of the Interior for a final approval, which shall operate as final proof of such Indians to share in the benefits of this act.

GALLUP-DURANGO HIGHWAY

The bill (S. 1296) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing annual appropriations for the maintenance of that portion of Gallup-Durango Highway across the Navajo Indian Reservation, and providing reimbursement therefor," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 606), entitled "An act authorizing annual appropriations for the maintenance of that portion of Gallup-Durango Highway across the Navajo Indian Reservation, and providing reimbursement therefor," be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary for each fiscal year, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, for maintenance of that portion of the Federal-aid highway from Gallup, N. Mex., to Shiprock, N. Mex., across the Navajo Indian Reservation and that portion of the State highway in New Mexico between Gallup, N. Mex., and Window Rock, Ariz., serving the Navajo Reservation, reimbursable from the tribal funds of the Indians of said reservation: *Provided*, That Indian labor shall be employed as far as practicable: *And provided further*, That if no funds are available no expenditure shall be made."

SAGUARO NATIONAL MONUMENT

The bill (S. 394) to revise the boundaries of the Saguaro National Monument was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the exterior boundaries of the Saguaro National Monument, Ariz., established by proclamation of the President dated March 1, 1933 (47 Stat., pt. 2, 2557), are hereby revised and amended so as to include within said monument all lands in section 8, the northwest quarter, the south half of the northeast quarter, and the south

half of section 9, the southwest quarter of section 10, the west half of section 15, sections 11, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 32, 33, and the north half of section 34, township 14 south, range 16 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered, on behalf of the United States, to purchase at an appraised value of \$25 per acre, all privately owned lands and rights thereto within section 8, the south half of the southeast quarter of section 9, the north half of section 17, and section 29, township 14 south, range 16 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$42,000 for the purposes of this section.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered, on behalf of the United States, to purchase, at the appraised value of \$1,300, a certain well and pumping machinery in place, together with the following-described land surrounding and including said well:

Beginning at a point one thousand and seven feet south of the north boundary of section 31, township 14 south, range 16 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, and thirty feet east of the west boundary of said section 31, thence due east four hundred and sixty-eight feet, thence due south one hundred and eighty-six feet, thence due west four hundred and sixty-eight feet, thence due north one hundred and eighty-six feet to the point of beginning, a total of two acres, more or less, all located within the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of said section 31: *Provided*, That such purchase shall include easements of way for power lines and water lines to be forever vested in the United States through the north half of said section 31 between the above-described land and the dedicated county highway land on the north boundary of said section 31: *And provided further*, That said purchase shall vest in the United States absolute title to all water rights in the west half of the northwest quarter of said section 31. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$1,300 for the purposes of this section.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed, on behalf of the United States, to acquire title from the University of Arizona to the southwest quarter of section 10, and the west half of section 15, and from the State of Arizona to all of sections 11, 14, 22, 28, and the east half of section 21, all in township 14 south, range 16 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to said university as partial reimbursement for the value of the southwest quarter of said section 10, the west half of said section 15, and in consideration of the expenditures of said university in protecting and acquiring for the benefit of the United States the cactus forest growth on all of the lands described in this section, the sum of \$55,000.

SEC. 5. With the exception of the lands described in section 4 of this act, the State of Arizona may relinquish in favor of the United States such portions as it may see fit of all other State lands described in section 1 of this act, and shall have the right on such relinquishments to select in lieu thereof other unreserved and nonmineral public lands within the State of Arizona equal in value to those relinquished, said lieu selections to be made in the same manner as is provided for in the Enabling Act of June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 558), or, in the discretion of the State of Arizona, under the provisions of section 8 of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended and supplemented by the act of June 23, 1936 (49 Stat. 842). The payment of fees or commissions is hereby waived in all lieu selections made pursuant to this section.

SEC. 6. The provisions of the proclamation of the President dated March 1, 1933 (47 Stat., pt. 2, 2557), creating the Saguaro Na-

tional Monument, are hereby repealed insofar as they affect the north half of the northeast quarter of section 9, the north half and the southeast quarter of section 10, and the east half of section 15, township 14 south, range 16 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, and section 5, township 15 south, range 16 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian.

SEC. 7. Jurisdiction over all lands within the boundaries of the Saguaro National Monument as described in section 1 of this act is hereby vested in the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the National Park Service. Except for the areas described in sections 1 and 6 of this act, all lands within the Saguaro National Monument as established by said proclamation of the President dated March 1, 1933, are hereby restored to the Coronado National Forest, to be administered in accordance with existing law by the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the United States Forest Service, subject to all valid existing rights which may have accrued in favor of private individuals.

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS

The bill (H. 3368) authorizing expenditures for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to this bill, in fact, I favor it, but two Members of the Senate have filed minority views, and, noting their absence, I ask that the bill go over today.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to state that it is very important that the bill be passed as soon as possible, because it is an authorization upon which an appropriation must be obtained in an appropriation bill shortly. While I cannot, of course, insist on taking it up in the absence of the two Senators who filed the minority views, I do hope that within the next few days we can dispose of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. I am sure the request will find compliance.

Mr. HILL. As the distinguished majority leader has stated, it is important that the bill be passed without further delay. I hope we may have the cooperation of both the minority and majority leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

PAULA LIEBAU ANDERSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 327) for the relief of Paula Liebau Anderson, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 7, to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$2,500"; on page 1, lines 10 and 11, to strike out the words "unlawful construction by the Alaska Road Commission of a road across her land, and the", and on page 1, line 12, before the word "negligence" to strike out the word "the" and insert the word "her", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paula Liebau Anderson, formerly a resident of the Territory of Alaska, and now residing at Little River, Calif., the sum of \$2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for compensation for damages sustained by her on account of the destruction of buildings on the property occasioned by negligence of Government employees, which sum shall in-

clude full and complete settlement of any and all claims of Paula Liebau Anderson allegedly arising out of the extension of the boundaries of the Mount McKinley National Park by the act of March 19, 1932 (47 Stat. 68): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DELLA B. BIRNBAUM

The bill (H. R. 336) for the relief of Della B. Birnbaum was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAUL T. WARD

The bill (H. R. 513) for the relief of Paul T. Ward was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JULIUS SPRINGER

The bill (H. R. 682) for the relief of Julius Springer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

J. K. LOVE

The bill (H. R. 696) for the relief of J. K. Love was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

W. A. FACHT

The bill (H. R. 1678) for the relief of W. A. Facht was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PER CAPITA PAYMENTS TO APACHE, KIOWA, AND COMANCHE INDIANS, OKLAHOMA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1341) authorizing a per capita payment of \$10 each to the members of the Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche Indians in Oklahoma, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "any", to insert "available"; in line 7, after the name "Oklahoma", to strike out "and"; in line 8, after the words "payment of", to strike out "\$10" and insert "not to exceed \$20"; in line 10, after the word "act", to insert "which payment shall be credited to the individual account of each Indian to be expended in accordance with the individual Indian money regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to withdraw as much as may be necessary from any available funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche Indians in Oklahoma, to make immediately therefrom a payment of not to exceed \$20 to each member of the Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche Tribes living on the date of the passage of this act, which payment shall be

credited to the individual account of each Indian to be expended in accordance with the individual Indian money regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing a per capita payment of \$20 each to members of the Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche Indians in Oklahoma."

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITY, DAYTON, OHIO

The bill (S. 1420) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed title in certain lands of Veterans' Administration facility, Dayton, Ohio, to the county of Montgomery, State of Ohio, for highway-widening purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to transfer by quitclaim deed title to the county of Montgomery, State of Ohio, for highway-widening purposes to the following-described strips of land of Veterans' Administration facility, Dayton, Ohio:

PARCEL NUMBERED 1

Situated in section 1, township 3, range 5, east, Jefferson Township, and section 36, township 4, range 5 east, Madison Township, county of Montgomery, State of Ohio, being a tract of land twenty-five feet in width west of and adjacent to the existing west right-of-way line of Gettysburg Avenue, extending from the north right-of-way line of Germantown Pike to the south right-of-way line of Eaton Pike, the west line of said tract being forty-five feet west of the east line of said sections and parallel thereto, containing two and five-tenths acres, more or less.

PARCEL NUMBERED 2

Situated in section 1, township 3, range 5, east, Jefferson Township, county of Montgomery, State of Ohio, being a tract of land five feet in width north of and adjacent to the existing north line of the Dayton-Liberty Road, and extending from the north right-of-way line of the Germantown Pike to the east right-of-way line of Princeton Drive, the northern line of said tract being 35 feet north of the south line of said section and parallel thereto, containing three-tenths of an acre, more or less.

PARCEL NUMBERED 3

Situated in section 1, township 3, range 5, east, Jefferson Township, and section 36, township 4, range 5 east, Madison Township, county of Montgomery, State of Ohio, being a tract of land 10 feet in width east of and adjacent to the existing right-of-way line of Princeton Drive, and extending from the north right-of-way line of the Dayton-Liberty Road to the south right-of-way line of the Eaton Pike, the east line of said tract being 30 feet east of the west line of said sections and parallel thereto, containing 1½ acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. Such grant shall be conditioned upon the approval by the proper authorities of the county of Montgomery, State of Ohio, of an agreement to (a) move the one-story frame building (wash house), the two-story brick building, the reservoir and the pump house, and fill in the gaps which removal of the buildings will leave in the fences, in accordance with specifications to be furnished by the Administrator of Veterans'

Affairs; (b) restore all areas within the reservation affected by this work as nearly as possible to their original condition, including any necessary sodding; all without expense to the United States. The deed authorized by this act shall contain express reservations that should the land cease to be used for highway purposes then all right, title, and interest therein shall immediately revert to and revert in the United States and such deed shall contain a covenant that title to the buildings and other improvements presently located on this property shall remain in the Government and that when their removal becomes necessary for widening of the roadway they shall be moved therefrom and relocated at the expense of the county in accordance with specifications to be furnished by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

TRANSFER OF LAND, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITY, ROANOKE, VA.

The bill (S. 1421) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. a small piece of land at Veterans' Administration facility, Roanoke, Va., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed, in consideration of \$100, to transfer by quitclaim deed to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co., the following-described property located at Veterans' Administration facility, Roanoke, Va.:

All that certain strip or parcel of land situate in the county of Roanoke, State of Virginia, bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a point corner to lands of the Veterans' Administration and right-of-way of Roanoke Terminal Division of the Norfolk & Western Railway Co., said point being north fifty-two degrees three minutes east twenty-six and twenty-eight one-hundredths feet from the center line of old west-bound main track of said railway at station 139 plus 47.4 also north fifty-two degrees three minutes east from the center line of present west-bound main track MP N-261 plus two thousand nine hundred and forty feet, more or less, as measured from Norfolk, Va.; thence with the northern line of said right-of-way northwestwardly about three hundred and fifty-six feet to a point radial to said center line of old west-bound main track at station 142 plus 91.3, said station being also in the center line of a culvert; thence through the lands of Veterans' Administration by a straight line eastwardly about three hundred and eighty-five feet to a point in an offset in said northern line of right-of-way; thence with said offset south fifty-two degrees three minutes west, crossing a rail monument at forty-three and six-tenths feet, a total distance of seventy feet to the point of beginning, containing two-tenths of an acre, more or less.

BOUNDARY LINES OF WIND RIVER INDIAN LANDS, WYOMING

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2672) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement fixing boundary lines on Wind River Indian lands, Wyoming, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized in his discretion to determine and fix permanently the bound-

aries of allotted, tribal, and ceded Indian lands along the Big Wind River in sections 21, 22, 27, and 28, township 3 north, range 1 west, Wind River meridian, in Wyoming: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall not act until all of the owners, white and Indian, shall have given their consent in writing to the permanent location of the boundaries so far as they affect their respective lands. The consent of the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes as to tribal and ceded lands may be given by the tribal business council. The consent on behalf of the minors, Indians non compos mentis, and Indians who cannot be located after advertisement and reasonable search for not less than 30 days may be executed by the Superintendent in charge of the Wind River Indian Agency.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The resolution (S. Res. 87) submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma March 13, 1941, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventy-seventh Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

SALE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED LANDS IN HAWAII

The bill (S. 1345) to authorize the sale of certain Government-owned lands in the Territory of Hawaii to the Honolulu Plantation Co. was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to sell and convey to the Honolulu Plantation Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Territory of Hawaii, upon such terms and conditions as he deems advisable, but at not less than the appraised value, the remaining portion of the Makalapa Military Reservation, consisting of 5 lots, designated as lots "A," "B," "C," "D," and "E," having an aggregate area of 7.52 acres, situated near the city of Honolulu, in Halawa, Ewa District, on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, the net proceeds of such sale to be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

AWARD OF NAVY CROSS TO HECTOR MERCADO

The bill (S. 372) awarding a Navy Cross to Hector Mercado was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Hector Mercado, captain, Peruvian Navy, Minister of Marine and Aviation of Peru, be awarded a Navy Cross, to be prepared under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for extraordinary heroism on the occasion of an explosion on board the U. S. S. *Kearsarge* on April 13, 1906, while he was a foreign officer under instruction on that vessel.

ALLOWANCES FOR RENTAL QUARTERS IN THE CANAL ZONE

The bill (S. 874) relating to allowances for rental quarters of certain naval officers stationed in the Canal Zone was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any amounts paid to the Panama Canal or lessees thereof by any officer of the Navy or Marine Corps incident to his occupancy of quarters under the jurisdiction of the Panama Canal during the fiscal years 1935 and 1936, which were in excess of the amounts paid such officer as rental allowance, shall to the extent of such excess be refunded to such persons upon presentation of a claim therefor to the Comptroller General.

PETER JOSEPH COSTIGAN

The bill (S. 1073) for the relief of Peter Joseph Costigan was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers or sailors Peter Joseph Costigan, ex-seaman, United States Navy, who enlisted November 29, 1913, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the naval service of the United States on the 30th day of December 1915: *Provided,* That no compensation, retirement pay, back pay, pension, or other benefit shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

APPOINTMENT AND DISCHARGE OF AVIATION CADETS

The bill (S. 1469) to amend the act of April 15, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 156; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 34, sec. 842), and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act approved April 15, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 156; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 34, sec. 842), is hereby amended to read as follows: "That the grade of aviation cadet is hereby created in the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve. Aviation cadets shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy from male citizens of the United States under such regulations as he may prescribe: *Provided,* That each aviation cadet shall sign an agreement, with the consent of his parent or guardian if he be a minor, to serve for a continuous period of not more than 4 years on active duty, unless sooner released: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to discharge at any time any aviation cadet or to release him from active duty.

Sec. 2. The first proviso of section 5 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1176; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 34, sec. 853c), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided,* That aviation cadets and officers commissioned pursuant to authority contained in the Naval Aviation Reserve Act of 1939 may be required to serve on active duty for a continuous period of 4 years or for such periods as they agree to serve under the provisions of section 1 of the act approved April 15, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 156; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 34, sec. 842), from date of appointment as aviation cadet."

APPOINTMENT OF MIDSHIPMEN FROM MEMBERS OF NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS AND "HONOR SCHOOLS"

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1801) amending the act of

February 27, 1936 (49 Stat. 1144), which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, on page 2, line 4, before the words "the members", to insert "from among."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

REDUCTION IN COURSE OF INSTRUCTION AT THE NAVAL ACADEMY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4368) authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction at the Naval Academy, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "authorized", to insert "to reduce, in his discretion"; and, in line 4, after "1945", to strike out "to reduce, in his discretion", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to reduce, in his discretion, until August 1, 1945, the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy from 4 to 3 years and to graduate classes which have completed such reduced courses of instruction.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

SORTING, INDEXING, ETC., CERTAIN SENATE PAPERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, Senate Resolution 116, submitted by Mr. TYDINGS on May 13, 1941, which had been reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$2,000" and to insert "\$1,500", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate not to exceed \$1,500 for the employment of necessary clerical and other assistance in sorting, indexing, and transferring from their present storage space in the Senate Office Building the files of bills, documents, books, and other material of the Senate document room and Senate library, as directed by the Committee on Rules.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1300) to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, with respect to the making of grants of aid, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "law, in", to strike out "making grants of aid" and to insert "making available conservation materials"; in line 9, after the word "making", to strike out "grants of" and insert "available" on page 2, line 4, after the word "approved", to strike out "materials

for such grants of aid" and insert "conservation materials"; and in line 9, after the word "approved", to strike out "materials for such grants of aid" and insert "conservation materials", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in making available conservation materials consisting of seeds, seed inoculants, fertilizers, liming and other soil-conditioning materials, trees or plants, or in making available soil-conserving or soil-building services, to agricultural producers under this subsection, the Secretary may make payments, in advance of determination of performance by the producers, to persons who fill purchase orders covering approved conservation materials or covering soil-conserving or soil-building services, furnished to producers at not to exceed a fair price fixed in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary, or who render services to the Secretary in delivering to producers approved conservation materials, for the carrying out, by the producers, of soil-building or soil-conserving practices approved by the Secretary."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, with respect to the making available of conservation materials and soil-conserving or soil-building services."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

STRENGTHENING OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 76, which I favorably reported today from the Military Affairs Committee. I think when it is brought to the attention of Senators they will consider it appropriate to consider today, notwithstanding the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) extending the application of section 6 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the strengthening of the national defense," approved July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), to all territories, dependencies, and possessions of the United States, including the Philippine Islands, the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia, was read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of section 6 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to expedite the strengthening of the national defense," approved July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), shall be applicable to all territories, dependencies, and possessions of the United States including the Philippine Islands, the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia, and the several courts of first instance of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands shall have jurisdiction of offenses committed in the Philippine Islands in violation of the provisions of that section or of any proclamation, or of any rule or any regulation, issued thereunder.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the committee report on Senate Joint Resolution 76 explaining the joint resolution, in view of the circumstances under which it was passed.

There being no objection, the report (No. 308) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) extending the application of section 6 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the strengthening of the national defense," approved July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), to all Territories, dependencies, and possessions of the United States, including the Philippine Islands, the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia having considered the same, report favorably thereon with recommendation that it do pass.

Section 6 of the act approved July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), reads as follows:

"Sec. 6. Whenever the President determines that it is necessary in the interest of national defense to prohibit or curtail the exportation of any military equipment or munitions, or component parts thereof, or machinery, tools, or material, or supplies necessary for the manufacture, servicing, or operation thereof, he may by proclamation prohibit or curtail such exportation, except under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe. Any such proclamation shall describe the articles or materials included in the prohibition or curtailment contained therein. In cases of the violation of any provision of any proclamation, or of any rule or regulation, issued hereunder, such violator or violators, upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment. The authority granted in this section shall terminate June 30, 1942, unless the Congress shall otherwise provide."

"Approved, July 2, 1940, 10:55 a. m., eastern standard time."

The controls of exports instituted by the Government following the enactment of the law cited, supra, have developed the necessity of the extension of these controls to all Territories, dependencies, and possessions of the United States, including the Philippine Islands, the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia, in order that this Government may be able to control materials that otherwise would be lost to the Government, particularly some commodities that are produced in the Philippine Islands which are of great importance in the defense program.

The amount of manila hemp, for example, exported from the Philippines to Japan has increased over 35 percent, from 280,000 bales in 1939 to 387,000 bales in 1940. Hemp is of great importance to our Navy and is being used in increasing quantities. Other materials, such as iron ore, coconut oil, copra, and mahogany, are being exported from the Philippines to Japan and to Russia. The mining of a high-grade ore for Japan has risen to about 1,200,000 tons a year, and the ore goes exclusively to Japan because of the freight rates. Most of the lumber exported from the Philippines goes to Japan. Copra, or dried coconut, with a 40-percent oil content, which may be used in making glycerin for explosives, is going to Japan and Russia in considerable amounts. In 1940 Japan took

200 long tons of copra, and in the first 3 months of 1941 she took 7,000 tons. Vladivostok recently took 5,600 tons of copra from the Philippines. Japan took 685 tons of coconut oil last year, and in January and February of this year she took 5,133 tons of coconut oil. These materials are of great value to our national-defense program, and an adequate system for exercising control in this situation is essential.

Section 5 of the act of Congress approved August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 416), an act to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, reads:

"That the statutory laws of the United States hereafter enacted shall not apply to the Philippine Islands, except when they specifically so provide or it is so provided in this act."

In light of that law, and since the act of July 2, 1940, does not refer to the Philippine Islands, it is obvious, as the necessity exists for such action, that Congress should make specific provision by including the Philippine Islands by name in this measure.

The Honorable JOAQUIN M. ELIZALDE, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines to the United States, appeared before your committee and expressed the unqualified support of the Commonwealth government for this legislation which would control the exports from the Philippines of materials necessary for national defense.

Extension of controls to the Canal Zone is considered necessary in the interest of defense, to preclude diversion of materials sent to the Canal for a particular purpose.

War Department letter follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 8, 1941.

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Acting Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: There is enclosed herewith draft of a joint resolution designed to extend the application of section 6 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the strengthening of the national defense," approved July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), to all Territories, dependencies, and possessions of the United States, including the Philippine Islands, the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia.

The status of the Philippine Islands is such that section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), does not apply thereto and there is presently no control over the export from the Philippine Islands of materials essential to the defense of the United States.

On the other hand, the Philippine Islands are still a dependency of the United States (*Cincinnati Soap Company v. U. S.*, 301 U. S. 308, 322 (1937)), and the United States is obliged to defend and protect them until they attain complete independence, which, under present law, will occur in 1946. Because it now exercises no control over exports from the Philippine Islands, the United States is placed in the position of attempting to conserve all resources essential for its national defense and at the same time allowing articles and materials essential for that purpose to be removed from one of its dependencies without restriction.

In view of the immediate need of defense materials by the United States and because of its policy of conservation of resources to satisfy defense needs and to carry out our declared policy of cooperation with democratic powers, it is highly desirable that the inconsistent position of the United States which is described above be rectified. To accomplish this it will be necessary to extend our control of exports to include the Philippine Islands and all of our Territories and possessions, including the Canal Zone, from

which strategic and critical defense materials might be shipped out.

Because there is no United States court in the Philippine Islands, criminal punishment for a violation of this proposed law committed in the Philippines can be accomplished only by conferring appropriate jurisdiction on the courts of the Philippine Commonwealth.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there are several nominations of postmasters on the calendar. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, and as in executive session, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

WILLIAM ANDREW SMITH

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I rise at this time to express regret at the passing away on yesterday of a faithful public servant, Mr. William Andrew Smith, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clerk. Those of us who have been here longer than some others have for years noticed his faithful service. He was a modest, retiring gentleman, but very faithful in his duties, and he never complained. I am informed that he had been in the Government service for 67 years, 8 months, and 1 day. I wish to express these few words of appreciation of his services to his Government and to the Congress, as an example of a most efficient and effective public servant. I am glad of this opportunity to pay him tribute.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I join in the expressions of regret of the Senator from Minnesota. I have known Mr. Smith as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clerk, with his office in the rotunda of the Capitol, for 28 of the 67 years referred to by the Senator from Minnesota. I have never known a more faithful, efficient, or conscientious public servant. Of course, he occupied a position which did not command any publicity. He never had his name in the headlines of the newspapers; and yet I dare say he rendered to the Government of the United States a service the value of which would be equal to that of the service of many other men who become more prominent in the public eye. I deeply regret his passing. I am glad of the opportunity offered by the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota to pay a brief tribute to Andy Smith, as we always knew him.

ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 16, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 15 (legislative day of May 8), 1941:

POSTMASTERS

NEW JERSEY

Raymond J. Hughes, Sr., Beachwood.
John W. Guire, Long Branch.
Leo Francis Nash, New Egypt.
Helen I. Babnew, Woodbury Heights.

OKLAHOMA

Willie F. Cowan, Jennings.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 15, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, help us this day that with unselfish devotion to duty and the rectitude of our behavior, we may bring to our country the wisest service; how rich is life when we do good, filling our minds with pure thoughts and setting our ambitions on objects altogether worthy. We pray that our motives may have unity of purpose and poise and our hearts blend the virtues which make us the conscious heirs of eternity. Let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us and life become richer and eager to seize the opportunity of each passing hour. Grant that we may do homage to our country because of its ideals, for the glorious army of martyrs for liberty and humanity; inspire us to hallow it as an instrument of Thy holy purpose throughout all the world. Oh disperse the clouds which overshadow it that the dreams, the hopes of freedom, and fraternity may be realized wherever man is found. Almighty God, lead us ever to praise the power that made us free, and bless the flag which declares to the world our national honor. May our Zion hear the Voice in the wilderness, making straight the highway for the Prince of Peace. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) entitled "A joint resolution relating to corn- and wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended."

ADJOURNMENT OVER

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

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ex-

tend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Constantine Brown.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, and 10.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 6, 7, and 8; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "purchase of grave sites"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$73,030,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "of which not to exceed \$9,134,035 shall be available immediately and exclusively for expenditure upon projects on account of which allotments heretofore have not been made, and, in addition, for the protection from flood waters at approaches to Fort Dix, New Jersey"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 5.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
D. D. TERRY,
JOE STARNES,
ROSS A. COLLINS,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
D. LANE POWERS,
FRANCIS CASE,

Managers on the part of the House.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
J. W. BAILEY,
ROBT. R. REYNOLDS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 1: Provides for the purchase of grave sites, instead of the "purchase of land", as proposed by the Senate.

No. 2, relating to rivers and harbors: Appropriates \$68,268,640, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$63,100,040, as proposed by the House, the increase of \$5,168,600 to be applied to projects as follows: Boston Harbor, seaplane channel; channel from Manteo to Oregon Inlet, N. C.; Silver Lake Harbor, N. C.; Pearl River, Miss. and La.; Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City.

Nos. 3, and 4, relating to flood control, general: Appropriates \$73,030,000, instead of \$71,129,000, as proposed by the House, and \$79,234,035, as proposed by the Senate, the agreed upon increase applying to the following projects: Guyandot section of Huntington, W. Va.; Lugert-Altus flood-control and reclamation reservoir (Oklahoma); protection of flood waters at approaches to Fort Dix, N. J.; and restores the House provision for commencing authorized projects not heretofore undertaken, amended to make available an additional amount of \$1,101,000 for the project pertaining to the Guyandot section of Huntington, W. Va., and to provide for the protection from flood waters at approaches to Fort Dix, N. J., instead of to military reservations generally, at a cost of \$350,000.

Nos. 6, 7, and 8, relating to the Panama Canal: Appropriates an additional amount of \$260,000 for the erection of quarters for employees in the Canal Zone, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 9 and 10, relating to the employment of aliens in the Canal Zone: Strikes out the matter inserted by the Senate.

Disagreement

The committee on conference reports in disagreement amendment of the Senate, No. 5, relating to compensation of the Osage Tribe for mineral rights in an area required for flood-control purposes.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
D. D. TERRY,
JOE STARNES,
ROSS A. COLLINS,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
D. LANE POWERS,
FRANCIS CASE,

Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] is recognized.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, this bill carried, when it left the House, \$221,272,228, which was exactly the total of the Budget estimates.

The Senate added to the bill \$13,533,635, none of which had Budget support. The conference committee has agreed to \$7,329,600 of that increase, which, if their action be approved, would mean a bill total of \$228,601,828.

Of the amount of the increase to which we have agreed, \$3,056,000 may be said to be on account of national-defense projects.

The chief interest in this bill, Mr. Speaker, is in the river and harbor and flood-control appropriations. As to the

former, the Senate added \$5,168,600 for 5 authorized projects and your conferees have agreed to the Senate's action. The names of the projects and the amounts allowed for each are as follows:

Boston Harbor, seaplane channel—	\$1,500,000
Channel from Manteo to Oregon Inlet, N. C.-----	45,000
Silver Lake Harbor, N. C.-----	60,000
Pearl River, Miss. and La.-----	1,897,000
Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City-----	1,666,600

As to the last project, I might say that the House bill included therefor \$1,700,000. So, the total of new money for that stretch of the Missouri River will be \$3,366,600.

For flood control, general, the difference between the provision therefor, as approved by the House, and the action agreed upon by the conference committee, is the addition of \$1,901,000, instead of \$8,105,035, as proposed by the Senate, the agreed-upon increase applying to the so-called Guyandot project at Huntington, W. Va., \$1,101,000, to the Lugert-Altus flood control and reclamation reservoir in Oklahoma, \$450,000, and to the protection from flood waters at approaches to Fort Dix, N. J., \$350,000.

The provision made by the House for commencing new projects, namely, the diversion of \$6,554,035 from amounts set up in the estimates for presently going projects remains as the House proposed. The Senate proposed an appropriation in lieu of such diversion. Since, under either arrangement there was no allocation to specific projects, the selection of projects still rests, under the law, with the President. It is true that the engineers indicated to the Senate certain projects to which they would recommend that the money be applied, but the final say, after all, is with the President.

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

Mr. SNYDER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted the RECORD to show the reason why I did not sign the conference report. I am the only member of the conference committee who did not sign the report. I am in favor of every item in the bill which has anything to do with national defense. I am in favor of every increase in those items. I am opposed to the increases in the bill as it now stands as to those items which are nondefense items. I am referring particularly to the items which were increased over and above the Budget estimate. I personally feel that this is no time to increase nondefense items; that those items ought to be decreased rather than increased.

I just wanted the RECORD to show that fact.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 2 minutes?

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

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Indianapolis News is one of the leading newspapers of the city of Indianapolis in my State. Prior to last Saturday, for some days, they have been running in parallel columns opposing articles by the Indiana Committee for National Defense and by the America First Committee, having to

do with the matter of conveying and our participation in the war.

On last Saturday the News published on its front page and in all editions that day a sample ballot with two questions: One, whether or not the person taking part in the poll favored the conveying of war supplies to Great Britain; and, second, whether or not they favored the United States entering the war.

The precise questions were:

1. Do you favor conveying by the United States of ships carrying war supplies to Great Britain?
2. Do you favor the United States entering the war and sending of our troops abroad?

The ballots could be voted by carrier or by mail or be deposited in the News office, and the balloting was to close on Monday at midnight.

They have compiled the results of that ballot and I think they are extremely interesting. That poll, which I think was fair, and which was taken after these differing arguments had been run in the paper, discloses that only 8 percent favored convoys, while 92 percent opposed convoys. Five percent favored entry into the war and 95 percent favored staying out of the war and are opposed to entry into the war.

If that is a fair sample of the sentiment—and it seems to me from what I have read of these varying arguments appearing in the article and from the way the ballot was presented, giving persons generally an opportunity to take part in the poll and the right to express their will one way or the other—then I say it is something that all of us ought to be thinking about.

Personally, I have expressed myself as opposed to conveying. Conveying may not be total war, but inevitably it would mean our Navy at war. The close similarity of the vote against conveying and against participation would indicate that the people believe that conveying means war, even as suggested by the President. Incidentally, I wonder if samplings of public opinion similar to this poll did not have something to do with the recent postponement of the President's speech. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. SNYDER. Is it on the conference report?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; it is not. It is something about the RECORD. I wanted to call attention to a statement that was made in the RECORD yesterday.

Mr. SNYDER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on page 4056 of yesterday's RECORD you will find this statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook], referring to a statement I made. He said that I was "charging on the floor of the House violations of law when no violations of law existed."

I call the attention of the House and of the gentleman to the fact, as can be learned from the public press, that one man, who was one of a group of 200 which was following a car pursuing a

truck of the Currier Lumber Co., and which finally forced it to the curb, was, on a public highway, hit over the head with a board and that subsequently he died.

If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] will explain to the House how in Michigan a man can be hit over the head on a public highway with a board and killed without a violation of the law, I would be glad to have his views.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 9, line 18, after the word "project", insert "Provided further, That in aid of the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Hulah Dam and Reservoir project on the Caney River, Okla., and Kans., authorized by the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1571), as amended, for the control of floods in the Verdigris River Valley, the Osage Tribal Council be, and it hereby is, authorized, upon payment of just compensation therefor, and with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to release and relinquish to the United States of America such right, interest, and control in and over the minerals reserved to the Osage Tribe by the act of June 28, 1906 (34 Stat. 539), as amended, as may be found by the Secretary of War to be necessary for the construction, maintenance, and operation of said Hulah Dam and Reservoir project: *Provided further*, That construction of said project may be undertaken when the amount of money to be paid to the Osage Tribe as just compensation for the release and relinquishment herein authorized has been agreed upon by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Osage Tribal Council: *Provided further*, That the amount agreed upon as just compensation for the release and relinquishment herein authorized shall be paid by the Secretary of War out of appropriations made for flood control, general, to the Secretary of the Interior for disbursement in the manner provided by section 4 of the act of June 28, 1906 (34 Stat. 539), as amended, for the disbursement of royalties received from the leasing of minerals owned by the Osage Tribe."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 5.

The motion was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF REVISED EDITION OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT, WHAT IS IT? HOW DOES IT FUNCTION?"

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report back favorably without amendment (Rept. No. 540) a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) authorizing the printing as a House document of a revised edition of the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government, What Is It? How Does It Function?" and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed as a House document 177,000 copies of a revised edition of the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government: What Is It?"

How Does It Function?" of which 45,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 132,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say in reference to this publication that when it was first proposed to the Committee on Printing I did not favor it. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] wanted me to read it. I took the time to read it, and I want to say that it is worth while for every Member of Congress—in fact every person in this country—to read. [Applause.] It is really something that will enlighten all of you. As it says, it is the meat in the coconut. One can read it through in a short time.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. How many copies will that give each Member?

Mr. JARMAN. That will give each Member of the House 300 copies and each Member of the Senate 450.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter in reference to the Federal Communications Commission.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Mr. F. Peavey Heffelfinger, chairman of the National Grain Trade Council, Minneapolis, Minn., before the United States Chamber of Commerce, on April 30 last.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the conference report on the civil functions War Department bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. SABATH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not desire to recognize any other Member to proceed for 1 minute, because opportunity to do so was afforded when the House met, before we entered on the business of the day.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. O'NEAL, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4756) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 539), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. POWERS reserved all points of order on the bill.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4756) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for 1 hour, to be limited to the bill, and that this time be equally divided between the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] and myself.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, that is satisfactory to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4756, with Mr. RICHARDS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the smallest regular appropriation bill that comes before the Congress each year. The preparation of the bill has been an interesting service because it relates directly to the expenses of the legislative branch and other activities here on Capitol Hill. Incidentally, may I say, that this is the first time the present chairman has served on this subcommittee, and only one member of the subcommittee has served thereon, prior to this session. As chairman I feel extremely fortunate in being associated on this subcommittee

with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON], who have served faithfully and highly intelligently in the performance of their responsibilities.

These gentlemen, by their attitude toward the appropriations and estimates, have exhibited a sound business viewpoint and have cooperated in all the examinations and in all the determinations that we have made. I am very grateful to them for their loyal cooperation and the service which they have rendered the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, we have made some very substantial cuts in the estimates for this bill. It is very discouraging to a member of the Appropriations Committee at this time to go through all of these tremendous estimates that have been brought here in connection with many of the appropriation bills. Sometimes we get a little track-sore and perhaps think, "What is the use?" But I may say for this committee, that it has not lost its old appreciation of thrift and the desirability of trying to save where we can, and endeavoring to make \$2 rather than \$3 do the same amount of work.

We have considered estimates and appropriations necessary for the Senate, the House of Representatives, the Capitol Police, the Joint Committee on Printing, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the Office of Legislative Counsel, the Architect of the Capitol, the Botanic Garden, the Library of Congress, and the Government Printing Office.

The bill came to us with estimates totaling \$27,092,870. It is interesting to note that although the President sends these estimates to us, the Supreme Court and the legislative branch are excepted from review by the Budget and by him, leaving to the Appropriations Committee the duty of performing all the pruning of these estimates. We have reduced the \$27,092,870 to \$24,846,047, or a cut of \$2,246,823. We have eliminated 90 percent of the increase sought and that, we feel, is real economy.

A large part of this reduction came in items of public-works estimates. Many improvements were suggested for the Capitol Buildings and Grounds and the Library Buildings and Grounds, but we reduced the public-works program—by that I mean the work to be done in building and improvements—by \$1,590,148. In making up this amount we eliminated an item for reconstructing the terraces of the Capitol, amounting to \$375,000; an item for repaving of roadways and reconstruction of sewers on the Capitol Grounds, \$390,970; an item for the removal of the John Marshall statue to the Supreme Court, \$3,000; and \$25,000 for the purchase of a statue of George Washington, to be placed at the foot of the hill where the statue of Marshall now stands; an item of \$566,000 for air conditioning the book-stack areas of the old Library of Congress Building; and items for improvements and elimination of fire hazards in Library Buildings, \$139,780. There also was an item for re-

moval of the greenhouses down near the Botanic Garden, involving \$90,000. We took this out entirely.

We felt, Mr. Chairman, that only the essentials should be taken care of at this time and under present conditions. Repairs, improvements, and maintenance that are absolutely necessary are provided for. These larger expenditures which could be deferred—worthy and desirable—we decided to eliminate. We also made many other cuts in estimates for personnel, operating equipment, minor improvements, and so forth, totaling \$656,675.

I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to a chart in the hearings on pages 362-363. Prior to my service on this subcommittee there were many things I did not particularly understand about the organization here on the Hill. I did not know who paid certain clerks, who was responsible for this activity or that, and what the administrative jurisdiction consisted of. You will find this chart enlightening as a graphic representation of the administrative organization of the House.

I will not attempt to go into all of the details of the House of Representatives appropriations. They are in the hearings and in the report, prepared by the ever faithful and highly intelligent clerk of this committee, Mr. Shield. Along with all the other chairmen, I want to bear testimony to the fact that we could not operate without his zealous devotion and intelligent aid in the preparation of these bills.

Many requests came to this subcommittee and—this is the one very distasteful part of the bill to the subcommittee—there were many requests for promotions and for regrading of positions. They came in tens and tens and tens to us. A few changes in salaries were made in this bill, subject to your action. They are listed in the report on page 4. I will not attempt to go into all of those, but I should like to explain the method and procedure of increasing salaries in the House of Representatives.

We have a Committee on Accounts, a very careful and well-managed committee. It is the legislative committee for consideration of resolutions and bills authorizing these changes, just as the Committee on Naval Affairs is the legislative committee for matters relating to naval affairs. It has been the custom here for a long time, and it is being observed this year by this subcommittee, that nothing is carried in the legislative appropriation bill by way of promotions and new positions for the House unless it has the approval of the Committee on Accounts, the legislative committee. The recommendations in this bill in that respect have the approval of the Committee on Accounts and there are no recommendations in here of that character that do not have the approval of that committee.

I shall touch on a few items that may be of particular interest to the House.

It has been the custom at some time early in the tenure of office of each Speaker that \$2,500 be provided for an oil portrait of him, the details of it to be handled by the Speaker. This bill car-

ries \$2,500 for a portrait of our highly respected and beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN.

There is one item in this bill that has been considered for a long time as highly important, and I believe it is well justified. This bill includes \$50 for next fiscal year for air-mail stamps for each Member of Congress. We are hopeful that this may really mean an economy, or certainly that part of the amount necessary to pay for these stamps will be saved to the Government. Many Members send telegrams because of the urgency of their official business, and these telegrams cost the Government quite a bit of money.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Many of these telegrams could be supplanted by air-mail letters at a charge of 6 cents instead of whatever the telegram would cost. We hope the telegraph outlay on the part of the House will be decreased below the amount provided here because of that fact.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What does the cost of the telegrams of the Members of the House amount to annually?

Mr. O'NEAL. I do not have the figures before me, but it is a considerable sum. I shall be pleased to furnish that information for the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. I believe it would be interesting for the House to know that.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I wish to compliment the committee for really giving consideration to this item for air-mail stamps. I believe it is only fair to the Congressmen that they be given this amount, because the public expects the Congressmen to act quickly. The mail service with the old 2- or 3-cent stamp was all right when that was the best we could do, but now, with air-mail service available and the public demanding speedy service, it seems to me it is only fair and right, and in the interests of economy and efficiency, that provision be made that Congressmen be provided with air-mail stamps. I compliment the committee for including that item.

Mr. O'NEAL. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

May I say that I have just learned that the amount spent for telegraph service is between \$75,000 and \$80,000 a year.

Mr. DONDERO. I wish to compliment the committee for this suggestion of the use of air-mail stamps. I am sure it will save the Government a great deal of money.

Mr. O'NEAL. The committee appreciates the gentleman's confidence.

The Committee on Revision of the Laws is given an additional \$1,500 for next year, making the total amount \$8,000 for work on the United States Code and the District of Columbia Code. They did not use the \$6,500 they were given this year. They are doing very efficient work. The chairman of that committee, the gentleman from New York

[Mr. KEOGH], is deeply interested and is doing one of the finest jobs any member of that committee has ever done.

Under the Architect of the Capitol, the committee saw fit to make the reductions mentioned above in Capitol improvements. The details of the Architect's appropriations will be found on page 6 of the report. We feel we have provided sufficient funds and sufficient personnel for the work essential to be carried on by the Architect.

One or two essential improvements of importance have been necessary under the Architect. The sum of \$144,000 is recommended for modernization of 6 of the 12 elevators in the Old House Office Building. Under appropriations made several years ago 6 of the elevators were completely replaced, and the remaining 6 were partially modernized by the installation of new cabs, shaft doors, and a new annunciator system. The machinery controls, shaft equipment, and safety devices of the 6 are the same as installed in 1906. Traffic counts show that the elevators in this building carry on average load of 7,000 passengers daily. This load as compared with the elevator traffic in commercial office buildings, instead of being distributed over the peak periods of morning, noon, and night, is fairly evenly distributed throughout the day. The committee felt obliged to recommend this sum in the interest of assured safety and uninterrupted service for patrons of the building. The age of the mechanical equipment is such that it is more prudent to make the expenditure now than to risk deferment in a market of rising costs.

Two major improvements at the Capitol power plant are the item of \$28,000 for replacement of boiler steaming tubes and an additional screen at the water intake pumphouse on the Potomac River to cost \$45,000. Some of the Members inspected the power plant and the pumphouse, and these special improvements are highly necessary. If anything happens to the present screen at the water intake that would require repair under the water the entire power plant would be shut down, and that contingency cannot be allowed to happen, so we felt obliged to recommend the installation of this reserve screen. The condition of the boiler tubes is such that they have been rolled to such an extent that the metal has become thin and will not stand additional repairs. This plant is very essential to the heating, lighting, power, and air-conditioning of all the buildings on Capitol Hill, and it should be kept in first-class operating condition at all times.

The committee did not allow the \$28,000 for the two statues, which were mentioned a little while ago. I shall be pleased to go into the reasons for that if anyone cares to ask about it, but the report is explicit on the subject.

The Botanic Gardens I shall just mention again in passing. In a desire to beautify the Mall, the Architect of the Capitol wanted to clear out all of the old greenhouses belonging to the Botanic Garden down here and move them all to another point, which would have cost \$90,000. Due to the fact that there are

temporary buildings and other buildings in the vicinity which are quite unsightly, the committee felt that this amount should be eliminated or at least deferred.

I would like to go more fully than I have time for into the appropriations for the Library of Congress. It is a most interesting agency of the Government, and they are doing a very splendid job over there. The new Librarian has started important work of an executive character.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, a member of the committee.

Mr. HARE. I appreciate the fact that the time is limited, and for the benefit of the chairman, who is well posted on this bill and who has given his undivided attention to every detail of it, may I suggest that he may utilize any time that he may have felt should be yielded to any other member of the committee? I should be very glad to yield such time to the chairman for his disposal.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is very kind of the gentleman.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I want to make the observation that the gentleman from Kentucky is entitled to the thanks of the Congress and the thanks of the entire country for the splendid work that he and the members of his subcommittee have done in the preparation of this bill. He has applied to this task all of the faculties of his splendid business mind. I also wish to call attention to the fact that the Budget estimates for this bill totaled \$27,092,870. The committee has made a cut of \$2,246,823, or nearly 10 percent, which I think is a most remarkable record of economy, and one that challenges national attention and entitles the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] to the thanks and encomiums not only of the Congress but of the entire country. [Applause.]

Mr. O'NEAL. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I had just started to mention the fact that the new Librarian has installed a thorough accounting department over there which the Library has not had heretofore, and is accomplishing other reforms of an administrative nature which should result in greater efficiency and reduce some costs. I believe, as an executive, the Librarian is doing a splendid job, and as an educator and a scholar it is my opinion, and I believe the opinion of the subcommittee, that Mr. MacLeish is bringing something to the Library which cannot be measured by any yardstick and is of the greatest value in making our Library one that will perform a service unmatched anywhere in this field.

I wish it were possible to go into the operations of the various departments of the Library, the wisdom of their purchases, the discretion the Library is using in the selection of the various items that

go into the collections, the project for microfilming some of the rare books and papers in England of which there is only one copy extant, the operation for preservation of newspapers which are disintegrating, by filming them and preserving the film, and many other interesting matters which are set forth in the hearings, but that would take too long. However, I do suggest that the Members of the House of Representatives spend more time in the Library to see for themselves what a wonderful institution it is.

There is one matter I do want to mention specifically and that is an item in the bill for the purchase of the Herndon collection of Lincoln material. It is the last great collection of Lincoln papers that is available in this country. You will recall that the firm of lawyers at Springfield, Ill., was Lincoln & Herndon. Mr. Herndon wrote a life of Lincoln. This collection consists of 12 original letters of Lincoln, 750 legal papers written or signed by him, and approximately 1,400 letters about Lincoln written to Herndon by persons from whom he made inquiries about Lincoln, and a number of notebooks one of which he carried during the Lincoln-Douglas debates.

There was once a bill before the House authorizing \$150,000 to acquire this material. We have placed in the bill the amount of \$50,000 for this purpose. We believe this collection should be in the Library, and we trust that it can be acquired at a reasonable figure.

The Government Printing Office is allowed, under this bill, \$4,157,000, which is \$135,000 under the Budget estimate. The latter reduction is made possible by the change in the format of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from two to three columns. The increase of \$337,000 over the 1941 bill includes \$92,000 to finish the edition of the Definitive Writings of George Washington, and \$245,000 on the basis that Congress will be in session 2 months longer in the fiscal year 1942 than the normal 6-month session usually appropriated for. I wish that every Member of the House could take the time during the year to go to the Government Printing Office. There is no better operated business anywhere, in my opinion, than the Government Printing Office. There is a highly intelligent executive job being done there, and it is being done on a large scale. The complaint has been made heretofore that the prices were too high and that the Government printing could be done more cheaply if only private commercial printing establishments could have a chance to do it. This year the Public Printer had occasion to let out work to contract in the amount of \$2,000,000, and I think there were about 1,000 contracts. The bids came in, and the statement made by the Public Printer is that these bids were approximately 20 percent higher on the average than what the Government Printing Office does the same work for. I think this experience furnishes data that answers those who have heretofore criticized the Government Printing Office costs as being excessive when compared with commercial prices.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

There is an amount in the bill to complete printing the Definitive Writings of George Washington, and this will be the final sum. There are 26 volumes that have come off the press, and there are 11 more volumes and 2 indexes to be printed, which will complete the job. In connection with these volumes the committee has ascertained that there are now serving in Congress 75 Members of the House and 14 Members of the Senate who have not been entitled to receive the original 26 volumes and would not be entitled to receive the remaining 13. Accordingly a provision is included in the bill authorizing the Superintendent of Documents to distribute to such Members a complete set upon an application in writing therefor. Sales of the sets have not reached expectations, and there is a surplus from which this distribution can be made.

In addition to what has already been mentioned, there is inserted in this bill the usual provision with reference to employment of those who are Communists or those who advocate the overthrow of the Government by force or violence, and also the usual provision preventing the employment of aliens under appropriations contained in this bill, except in one instance in connection with the Library. There is an exception that not to exceed 10 positions in the Library may be filled by aliens if Americans cannot be found to do the same work. This is necessary because in the translation and use of orientalia and other material of that character you must have some foreigners who are ineligible to become citizens of this country.

We trust the bill will receive your favorable consideration and I will now be pleased to answer any questions. [Applause.]

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the gentleman whether it is possible to obtain a list of the publications that have been purchased by the Library since Mr. MacLeish has been in charge of the Library.

Mr. O'NEAL. I am sure Mr. MacLeish will furnish the gentleman from Ohio with a list if he will request it. We found Mr. MacLeish very cooperative in giving all the information we sought from him.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wish to compliment the gentleman for his splendid work on this bill, as a fellow Kentuckian. Did the gentleman say that these Lincoln-Herndon papers are now in the Library?

Mr. O'NEAL. They are offered by a Mr. Hartzoff, who has them for sale. He acquired them, so the story came to us, at a cost estimated at forty-thousand-odd dollars, many years ago. He has declined offers in excess of the amount that we are appropriating here. It is a recognized collection. Mr. Carl Sandburg, an authority on Lincolniana, believes the Government should own these papers. The Library Committee of the House has gone over it and recommends that this be done.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And the purchaser claims to have paid more than \$50,000?

Mr. O'NEAL. We can only estimate what he paid for them.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And he has held it for a number of years?

Mr. O'NEAL. He hoped that he would be able to get \$150,000 for them.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And the Library Committee thinks \$50,000 would be a reasonable sum?

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman is in error to this extent. I think those papers belong to Mr. Emanuel Hertz, the author. He is dead. I assume the committee is dealing with the estate.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is not the testimony before the committee. A dealer has the collection and has had it for some time.

Mr. DONDERO. Then it is out of the hands of the estate. He came here several years ago and asked \$150,000 for it. That was at the time when the Honorable Henry Rainey was Speaker of the House.

Mr. O'NEAL. My understanding is that Mr. Hartzoff owns the collection.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman from Kentucky has made an extremely fine contribution, as always. Will the gentleman state whether the appropriation for the Library of Congress is much larger this year than in preceding years?

Mr. O'NEAL. There is a net increase of \$170,830. The Librarian, when he came before the committee a year ago, had only been there a short time. He had made a very remarkable study of the Library in the brief time that he was in office, but obviously could not make a complete administrative analysis. The committee withheld some things last year that were not asked again this year. We have disallowed many of his requests this year for additional personnel, and other items. We have, however, made our grants in personnel from his preferential list, and I think the Librarian will be satisfied with what we have done as far as we have gone. With the increase in last year's bill and the increase in this year's bill, the Library appropriations will be about \$700,000 more a year than when Mr. MacLeish took office. The Library will have more employees and better equipment and larger collections and should render a greater and more efficient service.

Until the Annex Building was completed, just prior to Mr. MacLeish's appointment, the old building was badly congested and there was no space in which to put additional personnel and carry on essential activities. The cataloging, indexing, and classifying of books and material had fallen in arrears badly, and other necessary work to keep the service current had to be neglected. With the new space available there was room adequately to house the collections and additional personnel, and we have

made provision altogether in last year's bill and this for 182 additional positions. This is a considerable increment and will go far to bringing up arrearages and rendering more efficient service all around. That was not all the Librarian requested, but it is all we thought should be provided.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very glad to hear of the work that Mr. MacLeish has performed. He is a Massachusetts man, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to make a long speech about this bill. I think the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], our able chairman, has covered the subject quite well. I have served on the legislative Appropriations Committee for the past 9 years, and under various chairmen. With no reflection upon any former chairman, I say that no one has ever given more time, no one has ever given more thought, and no one has ever been more conscientious about this legislative appropriation bill as has our present chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL.] [Applause.]

The legislative appropriation bill is not, in my opinion, a very pleasant one to handle in committee. I mean by that the items are so close to us that it is not too interesting to constantly sit in hearings and go over these matters. Usually we spend about a week conducting hearings on the bill. This year the chairman held hearings for at least 3 weeks. He took at least 4 days to mark up the bill, and, in my opinion, has done a splendid job. I think it is the best legislative appropriation bill that we have had before us for many years, and I congratulate him and the other members of the committee for the excellent work that has been done. [Applause.]

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the legislative appropriation bill is being brought in with a cut of \$2,200,000 and odd, or practically 10 percent, of the Budget estimates. I think the committee has done a reasonably good job in making those cuts and at this time express the hope that some way may be found so that the other bills that this Congress will be called upon to consider will get just as good consideration and just as good cuts, in proportion, as have been made with this bill.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], as chairman of this subcommittee, has fulfilled the expectations of his friends as a chairman.

There are a great many bills which have already been considered where we have carried far too much money. There are other bills to come where the tentative estimates that are here and the actual estimates that are here, are beyond all reason. Before very long I am going to take an opportunity to analyze the Budget and point out in detail some of the places where I think large sums of money can be saved. In the meantime right now I am going to give you an instance where I believe very considerable items could be saved and where I believe, in the consideration of the measures that

are to come before us we should be alert and ready to cut.

Today we have a tentative estimate—not an actual estimate—for W. P. A. of \$975,000,000. The actual estimate has not yet arrived, as I understand it. I believe we could save \$800,000,000 of that without the least bit of trouble. We have at the present time enormous numbers on W. P. A. at a time when it is absolutely impossible to procure farm help in the same localities. It is absolutely impossible to procure help on defense projects. We should not continue this outfit as a work outfit. We should only continue it where there is absolute necessity and those folks could not get a job if they honestly tried somewhere else. If the thing was handled by the localities, I believe the entire problem where any Government assistance might be required could be handled for \$200,000,000.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman recall that in this strike up in the northeast which closed the shipyards one of the grievances of the union was that the Government was employing W. P. A. workers, and they struck against the employment of W. P. A. workers? That was just this last week.

Mr. TABER. Yes. Now, we could save practically all of the Civil Conservation Corps appropriation, \$250,000,000, which has been estimated. They have to go out now and recruit boys to go into it. When you get into that kind of a situation it is absolutely ridiculous. We ought to get rid of that. If it ever had a purpose to serve, and I doubt it, it has no purpose to serve at this time.

The National Youth Administration is running private boarding schools all over the lot, and it is absolutely impossible for any constructive work to be done in it.

They are spending more time on this sort of thing and most of the month in getting over to the exclusion of the things they started to do, such as the aid to students, schools, and colleges. Out of the one hundred and thirty-odd million dollars which has been estimated we could easily save \$100,000,000.

Of the R. F. C. money in the Farm Security Administration we could easily save \$100,000,000 in loans to farmers. These loans are not needed at the present time.

The farm-tenancy plan is a menace to existing farmers, and we could easily save \$50,000,000 on that.

We could save \$100,000,000 on the Surplus Commodities Corporation and help the farmers. This does not help the farmers at the present time, because it results in giving away the farm products at a time when they would otherwise be bought and paid for with cash, and causes far more damage to them than the purchase of the commodities in taking them off the market helps give.

From the civilian-pilot training program we could easily save \$20,000,000. These civilian pilots are getting no credit from the Army for this work, and most of the money that is spent in this way is wasted.

There are all sorts of small items such as the Library of Congress, the Federal

Communications Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Social Security Administration whose inefficiency is so notorious that a cut of 25 percent in most of their appropriations would improve their efficiency. The following is a summary of some suggested cuts that would improve the economic situation of the country and provide more labor, help to prevent inflation, and improve the morale of the American people:

National W. P. A.	\$800,000,000
Civilian Conservation Corps	250,000,000
National Youth Administration	100,000,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation and Farm Security Administration	100,000,000
Civilian pilot training	20,000,000
Federal Communications Commission	50,000,000
Surplus Commodities Administration	100,000,000
Miscellaneous (including all sorts of small items)	100,000,000
Total	1,520,000,000

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has justly commended this subcommittee for effecting almost a 10-percent cut in this legislative appropriation bill over that of a year ago. I, too, congratulate the committee, and add that it is refreshing and encouraging to note that here, at last, there has been an effort on the part of a New Deal dominated committee to give the taxpayers of the country a little consideration.

Time and again we have seen appropriation bills come before the Congress this session and, in spite of the demand for reduction in nondefense spending, we have seen increases over the previous year. The Interior Department appropriation bill, which we passed yesterday, carried a heavy increase over the preceding year, and every effort that was made on the floor of the House to pare a few dollars from the total was overwhelmingly shouted down by the majority. Most of the Members on the other side of the aisle have formed such a habit of spending the other fellow's money that it has been practically useless and a waste of time for the advocates of economy to attempt to effect certain reductions in needless expenditures.

The people of the Nation face a difficult task to pay for the reckless squandering of the New Deal. The full force of the size of this job has not yet struck home, but pay day is just around the corner. Next year the people of America will start paying; and when they do, it is safe to predict that their wrath will be felt by those who have been responsible for plunging this Nation down the road to inflation and bankruptcy. In-

stead of the more abundant life that Mr. Roosevelt promised when he was running for President the first time, the American people, of all classes, will see the spiraling of taxes and the cost of living, and will watch the American standard of living tailspin to the lowest levels in the past half century.

Of course, the new tax bill will be introduced as a defense measure, but the people of America will not be fooled. They will not forget this tax bill was made necessary by 8 years of New Deal spending, and that upon the mountain of peacetime debts is now being piled a mountain of war debts that must be paid.

And that is not all, for when the people of America meet the internal-revenue collector next spring they will have merely the first taste of what is yet to come. It will be many years before the New Deal debts will be liquidated. In the meantime we will see purchasing power diminish, incomes fall, prices skyrocket; and, through necessity, every man, rich or poor, will be forced to give up habits, pleasures, comforts, commodities, and articles that he has been accustomed to enjoy as a matter of course through the years.

You members of the majority party can smile and grin as you shout down efforts to economize, but it would be safe to bet that those smiles and grins will be wiped away when Old Man Whiskers turns the American taxpayers' pockets inside out and hands most of the contents to Mr. Morgenthau, of the Treasury, to pay for your 8-year spending orgy and for Mr. Roosevelt's war.

I do not want to appear facetious, but I am so elated over the savings effected in this appropriation bill that I might suggest it would not be out of order for someone on the majority side to offer a resolution to make this a national holiday. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will not use the 5 minutes. However, I do want to call the attention of the House to the fact that we have now in Michigan this question as to whether we are to have Reuther and communism or whether we are to have national defense and Americanism.

When the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] was on the floor, I spoke about this strike on the east coast which is holding up the shipbuilding program. Now, get these facts: We in Congress appropriate money for relief. We have the W. P. A. Then along comes this war program, and we appropriate money for national defense. The men who are engaged in national defense go on strike because the W. P. A. workers are employed on the job. Can you beat that? Can you beat that one? Is there any reason why they should do that and so keep men for whom jobs are available on the relief rolls?

Let us get back to this question:

REUTHER AND COMMUNISM OR NATIONAL DEFENSE AND AMERICANISM?

Walter Reuther is the man who, when in Russia with his brother, sent word back to his comrades in America to "carry on the fight for a Soviet America."

He is the man who, according to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], made the statement that he would "give the people, the President of the United States, and officials of the General Motors Corporation until next Thursday morning to agree to union demands or a strike will be called in the 61 plants of General Motors, where that union has bargaining rights."

The time limit originally fixed by Reuther expired today. Reuther, we are now advised through radio and press, has given the President, the American people, and General Motors until tomorrow to meet his demands. Notwithstanding that agreement, four plants have been shut down by strikes, we are told by the noon press.

Information now is to the effect that the President, the people of the United States, and General Motors are all to surrender to this disciple of Stalin; this worker for communism; this man who is asking that, because of his patriotic service to America, because his services are indispensable in industry, he be granted exemption from the Conscription Act. If the administration runs true to form, it will, of course, favor this supporter of communism.

Reuther is entitled to deferment, it is said, because his presence is necessary to industrial peace. The truth is that he is, and always has been, a troublemaker, and his removal to Army service will be one of the finest contributions that can be made to industrial peace.

We know that General Motors has millions of dollars' worth of defense orders. We know that the demands of Reuther and the C. I. O., which are for an increase of 10 cents per hour in the wage rate, will be paid, except 2 or 3 cents, by an addition to the cost of the defense materials which are being made by General Motors. General Motors, if the wage increase is granted, will not pay more than 2 or 3 cents. The balance of the burden falls back directly upon the taxpayers. Hence the strike is a strike to compel the taxpayers to pay more for national defense by some 8 or 10 cents per hour than they are now paying.

The workers in General Motors receive an annual compensation of from \$2,000 to \$2,500 per year, which certainly is more than the average farmer, clerk, or small businessman receives for his services.

An additional demand of the C. I. O. is that a provision for the closed shop, or, as they term it, "union security," be incorporated in any agreement which may be drawn.

"Union security," analyzed, means nothing more nor less than a closed shop. It means that on defense orders amounting to millions of dollars no man can work in the General Motors plants until he has secured the consent of the C. I. O.

officials and paid the amount demanded by them for a work permit.

Whatever may be said of the demand for a wage increase, the demand for a closed shop is un-American and unjust to all other workers and American citizens.

As was said yesterday by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] on the floor of the House, the union activities such as are carried on by the C. I. O., which this man Reuther is carrying on, are nothing less than treasonable.

And yet, in behalf of this man who has been charged so accurately and so truthfully with a course of conduct which, in time of war, would be treason, there is a request that he be exempted from serving his country, as required by the Conscription Act.

It remains to be seen whether General Motors will betray its loyal independent workers; sell them out to Reuther and his Communist supporters; compel them, in order to hold jobs in General Motors plants, to join that union. If it does, patriotic citizens the country over should refuse to buy General Motors products and should let General Motors sell its products to members of those unions who have a monopoly of the right to work in General Motors plants.

Just why should any person, denied the opportunity to work in a General Motors plant, buy one single cent's worth of goods manufactured by General Motors?

If General Motors and the C. I. O. enter into a conspiracy to bar everyone but members of the C. I. O. from employment in its plants, is there any reason why you and I should spend one nickel with that company? Let General Motors and the C. I. O., as long as they have built a fence around the General Motors plants, live within that fence; buy and sell of each other and let the rest of us patronize those who give employment to us and to our friends. It is a poor rule that does not work both ways.

There is more behind this strike than appears on the surface. Next Wednesday, May 21, there will be an election in the Ford plants to select bargaining agents. If Reuther and Thomas, who said he would close the Ford plants, can get General Motors to agree to a closed shop and an increase of wages, then the argument will be presented to the Ford workers, "Look what we have done for you at General Motors. We have secured an increase. True, we have added to the cost of national defense. True, we held up the national-defense-production program, but look what we got out of it for General Motors workers. Look at what we can do for you."

And so, regardless of patriotism, regardless of justice and fair dealing, the argument will be made to the Ford workers and once again the slogan, "The public be damned," will be given circulation.

What cares Reuther or any of his ilk if they can accomplish their two purposes—bring every workman in Detroit under their domination and hold up from time to time preparations for national defense?

In delaying the Ford election, the N. L. R. B. gave Reuther his opportunity to call a strike in General Motors, force

a closed shop, an increase in wages at public expense, all to be used as ammunition in the Ford election.

The Governor of Michigan played into his hands and aided his cause when he failed to open the gates of the Ford plants to the workers.

We have yet to hear of any prosecution of the Ford Co. for permitting organizers of the C. I. O. to wear their buttons and solicit members on company time or company property. In fact, all of the Communists and all the governmental agencies seem determined to aid Hitler's campaign by furthering the cause of State socialism, interfering with national defense here in America.

The National Mediation Board, the National Labor Relations Board—yes, the administration itself—so far have assisted Reuther and his kind in their unpatriotic drive.

It remains to be seen whether the draft board will give him, this advocate of communism, this man who would control production, this man who has been received by the administration in Washington, exemption from serving his country as other men are required to serve and so enable him to continue his subversive work.

Hank Greenberg was drafted and went without protest. So did Martin, chairman of the New York Stock Exchange. So have hundreds of thousands of other young men.

If the administration does not secure exemption for Reuther, it may still grant him a commission, as soldiers of the Roosevelt family have been granted commissions, and assign him to the Mediation Board. He would there find himself in company with John Brophy, who sits as an alternate and who was described by John Lewis in 1930 as a—

Fakir, repudiated leader, traitor to the unions, opportunist, and purveyor of every falsehood, slander, and deception.

Whether the administration is making progress with its national-defense program or not, it certainly is making progress in its campaign to subject the industry of this country, the workingmen of this country to communistic leaders.

Let us take a look at the situation in another industry.

CONVOYS WITHOUT SHIPS

If the Communists and labor racketeers will not let us build ships, how will we get aid to England? "For if a man knows not how to rule his own house," how shall he restore peace, bring freedom to all the world?

Forgetting for the moment the question of the advisability of conveying supplies to England, let us consider the question of our ability to supply the ships necessary for that purpose.

The President recently requested and Congress granted the authority to seize a large number of ships owned by foreign governments but lying in our harbors.

It is claimed that we cannot furnish Britain the promised aid unless we either convoy that aid or make the sea lanes safe by patrol. Ships and more ships are demanded by Britain. The capacity of our present shipyards and of any which we may be able to construct will

be taxed to provide the necessary vessels. This is conceded.

Before we undertake the task of aiding Britain to regain control of the high seas, before we undertake to make safe the shipment of munitions to Britain, it might be well that we take an accounting of our ability to furnish the ships absolutely necessary for that purpose. We know what we have on hand and we know that the number is not great enough to answer the purpose.

We do not know how many tons of ships will be sunk by Hitler's raiders, submarines, bombers, or mines. One thing is certain: That is, that the total which this country and Britain now has, or may be able to produce, is not enough. Common sense, then, would lead us to adopt every possible means of increasing our ship tonnage. It is strange, indeed, that those who insist upon convoys or patrols, whichever term you prefer, will take no active steps to make their objective possible; that they will not take the steps necessary to make possible the construction of the ships we must have.

Day before yesterday we learned that the building of ships in some 11 ship-building yards, involving the construction of some 70 vessels, was suspended on the west coast. Among those vessels were 4 cruisers and 27 destroyers. With the Nation being led and driven toward war, with the administration declaring that our armed ships will sail the seven seas and defy whatever adversary may be met thereon, patriotism and prudence demand that we leave nothing undone which will aid us to meet, on at least even terms, the foe we seek.

Why should the administration or this Congress talk and advocate a course which will involve us in war and at the same time refuse to adopt a policy which will give us at least some chance of meeting successfully whatever may come?

Yesterday we learned that a navy-yard strike in Boston halts drydock work there. That strike, we are told, is holding up a \$30,000,000 program. That company has millions of dollars' worth of construction work. And, believe it or not, one of the union demands is that W. P. A. workers be discharged or refused employment.

Unless a man is master in his own house, unless we can, here in our own country, produce those things, that is, ships, trucks, and planes, which all admit are absolutely essential for our preservation, if we become involved in war, it is not only foolish but suicidal to betray ourselves into a position where we invite attack without being prepared to meet it.

Why these stoppages of work?

According to William Green, president of the A. F. of L., the west-coast strike is "an outlaw strike." That strike continues despite the request and the protest of Secretary of the Navy Knox and of Emory Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, each pointing out that it is interfering with national defense.

J. P. Frey, president of the metal trades division of the A. F. of L., has said that it was a violation of the agreement which the union had with the employers. All three of these men have appealed to the strikers to return to work. So far their appeals and their protests were in vain.

Yet the moment it is proposed in Congress that we enact legislation that does not prohibit a strike but merely calls for a cooling-off period, William Green, testifying before the House Judiciary Committee of such legislation, said, and I quote:

But the probabilities are if Congress would say, "You must do that," then there would be rebellion.

Brother Green is treading on dangerous ground when he announces that if Congress, the representatives of the people, for the preservation of our Government, enacts a law which requires men to aid in providing for the national defense, "the probabilities are" that "there would be a rebellion." No one knowing the men who work believes any such thing. Workingmen will render patriotic service just as quickly and freely as any man.

As well might the drafted boys, their relatives and friends say that they will not serve this country. Mr. Green admits the wisdom of the cooling-off period. Mr. Green also said, testifying before the House Judiciary Committee:

The American Federation of Labor is unqualifiedly opposed to the enactment of any legislation providing for the settlement of disputes through waiting periods or other forms of compulsion.

George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the A. F. of L., told the House Rules Committee:

I have personally signed agreements as long as I have been connected with the trade-union movement that call for a cooling-off period. We agree with the employer that when the expiration of an agreement is reached we set a 3-month period aside in which you have to give notice; that is standard practice and has been for 50 years; that provides for a cooling-off period by agreement between employer and employee so that it cannot be used as a weapon by one side or the other.

In spite of the fact that it has been the policy of the A. F. of L. for 50 years to provide for a cooling-off period, Mr. Meany testified:

We would be opposed to this bill if this cooling-off period were only 10 minutes instead of 25 days.

Mr. Meany and Mr. Green admit the policy is good, but object to incorporating this practice into the law of the land. What they favor they say is just, right, and reasonable if obtained by agreement, but they insist it should not be compulsory, and their argument is that if men are compelled to work they become slaves.

They forget that the right of the individual must always be surrendered when the public safety is at stake. They forget that the right of the individual to remain in his home and go about his business no longer exists when a national emergency threatens and a conscription law is put upon the books. They ignore the fact which now confronts us, that on the west coast, in spite of all agreements between employer and employee, the national safety is being endangered because willful men, members of the A. F. of L., refuse to follow the practices of the A. F. of L. or to abide by their own written agreements.

Perhaps no more than 5 percent of the employees would refuse voluntarily to surrender temporarily whatever individual right they might have when patriotism called, but just as long as that 5 percent can disrupt, disorganize, hinder, and delay national defense they must be made to conform. Nor does it seem hardly fair for the employees in General Motors to, at this time when they are receiving an average of \$2,000 to \$2,500 per year for their services and when so many are receiving far less, demand a wage increase of 10 cents an hour when we know that 7 cents of that increase must be paid by the taxpayers, through an addition to the cost of the tanks, trucks, and all other defense material that General Motors produces.

In the west-coast strike the employees were receiving a wage of \$1 an hour. They demanded \$1.15 per hour; the company has offered to pay them \$1.12, but for an additional 3 cents per hour they hold up the construction of cruisers and destroyers, when no one can be certain that such delay might not be the turning point in the war to come.

Here in Washington a strike of teamsters employed by a sand and gravel company is stopping construction on Government projects. What is the difference between the acts of Hitler, who would assail us from without, and the acts of these men who render his task easier of accomplishment by denying us the means of successfully meeting his attack?

Before we send convoys abroad, let us put our own house in order. Let us so organize our shipyards that we may build the vessels necessary to carry aid to England, to defend our own Nation on the high seas. Before we travel across the sea to seek war on the Continent of Europe, let us adopt a policy which will enable our industries to give us all those things which are necessary for our own defense.

Let us amend the N. L. R. A., make it possible for men to work in defense of their country without restriction. Let us make it impossible for anyone, any time here at home, to make us helpless, to destroy our ability to defend ourselves.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON].

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE SITUATION IN KANSAS RELATIVE TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENT OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT CALLING FOR SAFEGUARDS WHICH RESTRICT THE USE OR DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION CONCERNING APPLICANTS AND RECIPIENTS FOR PURPOSES DIRECTLY CONNECTED WITH THE ADMINISTRATION OF OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE, BLIND ASSISTANCE, AND AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to give a history of social-security legislation, with particular emphasis on the provision restricting the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients of old-age assistance, blind assistance, and aid to dependent children, which is causing turmoil and misunderstanding throughout Kansas.

I am sure the Governor of Kansas, the State legislature, the press of my State, and the public in general will welcome

this authentic statement of facts, which follows.

In 1935 Congress passed the Social Security Act and established the Social Security Board as the Federal agency to represent the interest of the Federal Government in the cooperative Federal-State public-assistance programs. One of the Board's responsibilities under the act is to approve or disapprove public-assistance plans submitted by the States which wish to obtain Federal money to aid them in making public-assistance payments to their needy aged and blind and their dependent children. In reviewing these plans for approval the Board must make certain that each plan meets certain minimum requirements set forth in the act. One of these requirements is that the State agencies provide in their plans for the protection of confidential information and records obtained and maintained in connection with making public-assistance payments to needy people.

This requirement contained in the Social Security Act grew out of the experience which many States were having. In some States the general public had unlimited access to the records of the public agency and in others the names and addresses of people who were getting public assistance were published periodically in newspapers along with the amounts of money each person received. In many of these States candidates for local, State, and National office wrote letters to the recipients and promised that their monthly allowances would be increased if they would put the "right party" in office, or accused the persons then in office of bad administration of the assistance programs, or told recipients that their payments would be decreased if they put candidates of the opposing party in office. In addition, some commercial organizations had obtained the names of the recipients and had circularized them with all types of literature. Pressure groups, promising to help the recipients get larger payments, solicited contributions from them.

Men and women were forced to see their names published and their need for help made public. Many old and blind persons as well as mothers with dependent children were forced to choose between humiliation and hunger. In many cases the truly needy did not apply for aid while those who were less sensitive and sometimes not so needy did so. Many sensitive people who did apply were unwilling to give the welfare agency the complete information necessary to establish their eligibility because they could not be sure how many unscrupulous or curious or unsympathetic people would have access to the personal facts in their lives. The local and State welfare agencies, therefore, found it difficult to obtain information they needed to operate the programs efficiently and in accordance with the State and Federal laws.

These problems were brought to the attention of the Social Security Board by the States, and when its opinion was asked, the Board recommended to the States that in the interests of efficient administration and in line with the spirit

of the Social Security Act the information obtained from and about applicants and recipients of public assistance should be safeguarded from indiscriminate use and publication.

However, it was made clear by the Social Security Board that all information on the basis of which his eligibility for public assistance was determined should be made available to the applicant or recipient for whatever use he might wish to make of it. Similarly, it was recognized and emphasized by the Board that it was often necessary for other responsible Government departments to have access to lists of recipients to perform supplementary functions related to the administration of the public-assistance programs, such as writing checks and auditing accounts. However, the Board advised the States that when information was made available to other agencies for such necessary functions the agencies in question should be required to safeguard the confidential nature of the information they obtained.

In 1939 the Social Security Board made certain recommendations to the President and the Congress of the United States relative to desirable changes in the Social Security Act. Among them was a recommendation that Congress amend the Social Security Act in such a way as to require State plans to include reasonable regulations governing the use and custody of records containing information about applicants and recipients of public assistance. The recommendations included, as well, the statement that publication of names and addresses of recipients and the amount of assistance they received should not be permitted. Source: Proposed Changes in the Social Security Act, a Report to the President and to Congress of the United States, pages 26 and 27.

It is evident from the hearings relative to the Social Security Act amendments of 1939 before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, that Congress intended to prevent the commercial and political exploitation and humiliation to which these needy people were subjected by the publication of their names and other information in the public press. It was pointed out that a provision such as that recommended by the Social Security Board should be put in the Social Security Act in the interests of efficient administration since efficient administration was directly related to obtaining the full cooperation of applicants and other persons who were interviewed in relation to the establishment of eligibility for public assistance. Source: Hearings relative to the Social Security Act amendments of 1939 before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, volume 3, pages 2407 to 2412.

As one of the amendments to the Social Security Act in 1939, Congress specifically provided, in sections 2 (a) (8), 402 (a) (8), and 1002 (a) (9), that before a State could receive Federal money its plan must—

provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of old-age

assistance (aid to dependent children, aid to the blind). (Source: Social Security Act as amended in 1939.)

At that time the Kansas delegation in the Congress was composed of two Republican Senators, six Republican Representatives, and one Democratic Representative. With the exception of one Republican Representative, who was paired against the amendment, the entire Kansas delegation voted for the bill. It was passed by the House of Representatives by a vote of 361 to 2, and by the Senate 57 to 8.

A letter was sent to all States to remind them that this amendment was effective July 1, 1941, and that, as of that date, protection of confidential information was required as a condition of the continuance of Federal matching of State money for public-assistance purposes. This letter was sent to all State agencies responsible for administering one or more State public-assistance programs in cooperation with the Federal Government. A copy of this letter was sent to the Kansas State Board of Social Welfare on December 3, 1940. A reading of the contents of this letter leaves no reasonable doubt that each State plan would have to conform to this amendment to the Federal act before the Social Security Board had authority, after July 1, 1941, to continue authorizing grants of Federal money to the State for public-assistance purposes.

This fact was recognized by many persons in Kansas, and the subject has been discussed in Kansas newspapers for the last several months. In the Topeka Journal of January 29, H. L. Schultz, newspaper columnist, discussed letters from Washington to the State welfare department and indicated that these letters had quoted the paragraphs from the Federal law which required the States to protect confidential information about applicants and recipients of public assistance. A story in the Emporia Gazette for February 4 discussed this provision of the Federal act and stated that the Kansas Legislature had been informed of the provision of the Social Security Act and that unless necessary legislative action was taken Federal funds could not be granted to Kansas after July 1, 1941. On February 5 the Times in Kansas City, Mo., recognized that Federal funds could not be granted to Kansas if the necessary legislative action was not taken, and on February 19 the Gazette, in St. Joseph, Mo., reported that Frank Milligan, chairman of the State social-welfare board, reported to the welfare committee of the Kansas Legislature that Congress had passed this amendment to the Social Security Act in 1939, and indicated that the Social Security Board had advised the Kansas welfare agency of the requirements of the Federal act. In the Topeka State Journal of March 6 Schultz, a newspaper columnist, stated in the Weekly Political Letter that the legislature was dodging the welfare issue, part of which concerned the adjustment of the State law to the requirements of the Federal Social Security Act on the protection of the confidential nature of records.

However, it was not until April 3 that the Governor formally informed the Kan-

sas Legislature of the situation. His letter to the president of the Kansas Senate is quoted in the Journal of the Kansas Senate for April 3. With his letter the Governor enclosed a copy of a telegram he had received that day from Mr. Ed. McDonald, regional director of the Social Security Board in Kansas City. The telegram and letter from the Governor mention a previous letter which the regional director had sent to the Governor on February 1. Copies of this letter had been made available to the chairman of the State board of social welfare on February 3 and on February 21 to the chairman of the committee on public welfare of the Kansas House of Representatives. According to Mr. McDonald's telegram, this letter of February 1 had called the Governor's attention to the requirements of the Social Security Act with regard to the publication of lists and disclosure of other information about applicants and recipients of public assistance. However, the Governor implied in his letter to the legislature that the telegram of April 3 was the first indication that the Social Security Board had made that noncompliance with this provision of the Social Security Act would result in making the Kansas plan out of conformity with the Federal act, thus making it impossible for the Social Security Board to authorize Federal grants to Kansas after July 1, 1941. The Governor stated in his letter:

I wish to call your attention to the fact that Mr. McDonald's statement to the enclosed wire is the first time he has ever informed me that Federal grants would not be made unless we ceased publication. (Source: Journal of the Kansas Senate for April 3, 1941).

Other officials in Kansas were aware of the situation—the Governor says in his letter that he had been informed of the requirements of the Social Security Act—and the newspapers had been carrying stories about the situation for as many as 3 months before the Governor implied in his letter to the president of the senate that McDonald's telegram of April 3 was the first time that he knew for sure that Kansas would not receive Federal grants for public assistance if publication did not cease.

It has been thought by some Kansans that the State constitution prohibits the State legislature from enacting legislation to conform to the requirements of the Federal Social Security Act on this subject. The article of the constitution in question is article 15, section 2, which reads as follows:

An accurate and detailed statement of the receipts and expenditures of the public moneys, and several amounts paid, to whom, and on what account, shall be published as prescribed by law.

The significant portion of that quotation is in the last four words, "as prescribed by law." It has often been found by the Supreme Court of Kansas, as well as in the courts in other States, that certain constitutional provisions are not self-executing—they require legislative action to make them effective. Source: *Woodward v. Bowles* (61 Kans. 569, 60 p. 331 (1900)); *State ex rel Burnett v. Deck* (106 Kans. 518, 188 p. 238 (1920)); *State*

ex rel. Crumb v. The Mayor of the City of Helena (34 Mont. 67, 85 p. 744 (1906)). Article 15, section 5 of the Kansas Constitution specifically states that publication shall be "as prescribed by law." It would seem, therefore, that this is a direct command to the legislature to set the limits and bounds which are to be used in the publication of expenditures of public money.

In other words, the Legislature of Kansas may provide by law for the publication of such expenditures as it seems fit and to determine by legislative action the extent and details of such publication. For instance, if the legislature wishes to publish the total amounts paid for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, and the total numbers of persons to whom such aid is paid, it would be within its province to provide for that type of publication and such a provision would not be contrary to the Federal Social Security Act.

Other States have constitutional provisions similar to article 15, section 5 of the Kansas Constitution. The Ohio Constitution contains a provision on publication of expenditures which is identical with the Kansas provisions. In contrast with the action of the Kansas Legislature, however, the Ohio Legislature has not made provision for the publication of lists of recipients of public assistance, nor has the question of the necessity to do so ever been brought up. The Constitutions of South Dakota, Minnesota, and Colorado also contain provisions requiring publication of certain information relating to the receipt and expenditure of public money, and yet no objections to enacting legislation to conform to this provision of the Social Security Act have been raised on constitutional grounds by any of these States.

It is interesting to note that, despite the existence of the constitutional provision which has now been brought up as a barrier to the enactment of this necessary legislation and which, it has been argued, requires the publication of expenditures of public moneys in detail, the State of Kansas does not always publish a detailed accounting of all expenditures of State moneys. Source: Thirty-first Biennial Report, Auditor of State and Register of Land Office, Kansas, for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1937 and 1938.

Thus, it would seem that the imaginary hurdle of the constitutional provision disappears upon investigation. What, then, is the situation with regard to existing statutory provisions which would have to be amended in some way to conform to the Social Security Act? There are two provisions of the Kansas statutes which conflict with the Social Security Act on the matter of safeguarding the confidential nature of information about applicants and recipients of public assistance, and which, if not satisfactorily amended, will make it impossible for the Social Security Board to authorize the granting of Federal funds to Kansas after July 1, 1941.

First. Section 19-228 of the General Statutes of Kansas, annotated, 1934, provides:

The board of county commissioners shall cause to be published a statement, at the close of every regular or special meeting, of all sums of money allowed, and for what purpose; said statement to be published once in some paper of general circulation in the county. They shall also publish a statement of the estimate of expenditures for the various purposes upon which they based their levy of a tax for the various purposes of revenue.

The attorney general of Kansas, in an opinion dated July 21, 1939, construed this section to mean that names of recipients of public assistance and purposes of the payments to them must be published.

Second. The other provision in conflict with the Social Security Act is section 39-713 (d) of the 1939 supplement to the General Statutes of Kansas, 1935, which provides:

The county board and the private agencies shall maintain two files of the cases; one shall be the public file, which shall contain the approval and financial data needed.

By virtue of this provision, information relative to public assistance cases is specifically made public in one of the files.

The Kansas Legislature is faced with the necessity of amending these statutes in such a way that they will not conflict with the Social Security Act, and with the necessity of enacting affirmative legislation to protect the confidential nature of information received from and about applicants and recipients of public assistance.

In so doing they will be making it possible for the counties in the State to save approximately \$50,000 a year, which is about what it costs, all counties combined, to publish these lists each month. C. O. Hitchcock, Reno County commissioner, said at a meeting of the county commissioners in Topeka, on April 24, that it cost his county about \$1,400 a year for publication costs alone, and E. R. Burke, Montgomery County commissioner, told the assembled group that his county had never published the names of recipients. This is true of about 11 counties in the State and 5 others have recently abandoned the practice of publishing lists, using the money saved for more essential welfare expenditures.

It is unfortunate that the Governor did not more forcibly call this matter to the attention of the legislature early in its regular session, since it is now necessary, as the Governor has indicated, to call a special session of the legislature, the expense of which will have to be borne by the already overburdened taxpayers of Kansas.

However, strangely enough, it is now rumored that the Governor and the Attorney General of the State believe that a way can be found to comply with the Federal requirement without the necessity of amending the State constitution and without the necessity of amending the Kansas statutes. If this rumor proves to be true, it is hard to understand why the Governor should have raised the issue in the first place, since it has created a situation whereby thousands of deserving persons have been unnecessarily disturbed as regards continuance of assistance which they so sorely need.

In closing, it might be well to emphasize that the making of public assistance available to needy people under the terms of the Social Security Act is a joint program involving the administrative and financial cooperation of the Federal, State, and local governments. Since the Federal Government assumes responsibility for paying half of the assistance payment granted to each individual declared eligible for public assistance by the appropriate State agencies, it is not only the privilege but it is the responsibility of the Congress of the United States to require through legislation that the States subscribe to certain minimum requirements found by experience to be necessary to the efficient administration of the State programs in which Federal money is being spent. And it would seem, also, that it is the privilege and responsibility of the Legislature of the State of Kansas to the citizens of the State to cooperate with the Federal Government by amending State legislation in such a way as to make possible the granting of Federal funds to the State after July 1, 1941.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Montana [Miss RANKIN] 3 minutes.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, yesterday noon I was called to the caucus room in the House Office Building to meet 500 women who had come from New York to express their opposition to having our men sent to Europe. I wish every member of the delegation from New York, New Jersey, and the surrounding territory could have been present to feel their enthusiasm, their courage, and determination not to send our men to Europe. These women, whose organization is called Women United, Inc., of New York, unanimously adopted the following statement as the sense of that assembly, and which, by request, I shall read for the RECORD:

This resolution unanimously adopted by 500 members of Women United, Inc., of New York, at a meeting held in the caucus room, House Office Building, May 14, 1941:

We are shocked and grieved to read in the New York newspapers this morning that the Right Reverend William T. Manning, Protestant-Episcopal bishop of New York, has urged that we "should now do our full and open part in this conflict."

Bishop Manning's speech in favor of convoys and armed intervention in the eternal wars of Europe without our being attacked is typical of the dual loyalty of many English-born American citizens. As much as we respect Bishop Manning and his right to freedom of speech, we feel that those Americans born in England should not take the lead in sending American boys to fight for the British Empire in China, India, Africa, and Europe.

We are prompted to make this statement because Bishop Manning is only one of many British-born subjects urging our entrance into the war. The Reverend Frank Kingdon, chairman of the New York Chapter of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, and one of the most pronounced advocates of intervention and war, was likewise born in England.

This raises the question of dual loyalty, and the time has come for English-born subjects to decide whether they are for America first or still owe their allegiance to Great Britain.

This resolution expresses the desire of a great many people that, after all, loyalty in America should be to America first.

My father was born a British subject, all my ancestors who were not born in America came from England; but I believe we owe a loyalty to our American traditions, to our American mode of life, and to our American ideals of democracy. We must express now our opposition to the use of the war method and to the sacrifice of our greatest treasure, the youth of our country, or there is danger of losing the civilization we have developed. I will lend my support to any measures providing a way by which we can aid England to protect her people if that way does not entail our use of the war method and the sacrificing of our young men or the jeopardizing of our own national defense. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, for a few minutes I desire to speak on a subject that I am not so keen about discussing here. There is, however, need for it. Let me say first that I have no word of criticism of any of our employees, either here about the Capitol or in the House Office Buildings. I feel we have about as efficient a force of people both here in the Capitol and in the House Office Buildings as could be found anywhere in America. They are courteous, cordial, considerate, painstaking, and extremely helpful. This applies to all. I have not met an employee around here to whom this does not apply. There is, however, a condition both in the old House Office Building and here in the Capitol that ought to be remedied and it is something I felt at this time—and not being facetious—I ought to discuss.

I have always been taught that cleanliness was next to godliness. When on Monday mornings I come to my office and open my desk and find a nest of cockroaches in the top drawer you can appreciate how I feel.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. How large are they?

Mr. BENDER. I have not found any of them over 3 inches long. [Laughter.] Frankly, the condition is such that it is most distressing. The women in the office are very much distressed—in fact, all of us are. Only yesterday when I was in the telephone booth I happened to glance over to where the towels are kept alongside of the sink in the cloakroom. I noticed one of the Members moving the towels and at least 50 cockroaches scampered out from back of the towels at the sink.

I believe that a general house cleaning, during one of our recesses, is highly desirable here in the Capitol as well as in the House Office Building. I do not believe we have nearly as much to fear from Hitler invading the Capitol as we

have from the cockroaches walking off with the place. I hope that sufficient money is provided here so that we can have a general house cleaning.

I trust that the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], will allow me to offer an amendment appropriating \$10,000 for a regular housecleaning so that we might get rid of these pests.

Mr. O'NEAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman does not want to defer that until November, does he?

Mr. BENDER. Not this November. I think it is highly essential that this be done immediately.

Mr. CANFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CANFIELD. May I suggest it would be hard to get rid of them? They are bureaucrats.

Mr. BENDER. I appreciate that. All of you who have offices in the old House Office Building know what I am talking about. [Applause.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Montana, for whom I have always had the highest regard, called attention to a resolution or action of some organization criticizing those of British descent in the United States who are active in behalf of Great Britain, and who are, therefore, charged with being guilty of dual nationality or dual allegiance. I am fully appreciative of her own patriotism and also of her devotion to the cause of peace, and consequently she directs attention to those who are in favor of national defense and to the giving of aid to Great Britain. She stated she is for America first. I am satisfied that she is, but, as I stated on the floor a few days ago, we should all be for America first, last, and all the time, and do everything to safeguard our country from every possible involvement in war. Unfortunately, she and many others do not seem to realize the importance and necessity that for our own protection it is necessary for us to give all possible assistance to Great Britain, a nation fighting for its very existence and at the same time if not directly, then indirectly, for our country.

Mr. Chairman, it is to be regretted that there are so many who do not realize that if a destructive Nazi or Fascist force should defeat Great Britain we would be left alone to continue the struggle to save democracy from these ruthless aggressor nations. The gentlewoman complains of the activities of British Americans and seems to ignore the great Nazi, Fascist, and Communist propaganda that is now

rampant in our country. In that connection I can assure her that I receive daily at least 10 letters, appeals, and resolutions emanating from Nazi sources against giving any aid to Great Britain to 1 that I receive from so-called British Americans. Most of the letters I receive protesting the giving of aid to Great Britain come from persons of German descent, and it appears to me that many of them fail to appreciate the rights and privileges they are accorded and enjoy in our country.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, it is well for all of us to remember that America should come first, and not only that but last and all of the time. Of course, those people who favor aid to Great Britain feel that anything that may be done for Great Britain will help America. Personally, I am of that opinion. I believe that if Great Britain should be defeated we would be in the position of being all alone to fight against Hitlerism, Naziism, and communism. Therefore, I think an effort should be made by all of us to do everything in our power to aid the cause of America and everything possible to expedite national defense.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] called attention to threatened strikes and to assaults on the part of union strikers, but conveniently ignores mentioning the tactics of some of the unwise industrialists who engage professional strikebreakers and sluggers. It is to be regretted that there should be so much strife in industry, such as in the steel and automobile industry, especially in view of the unusual prosperity these industries have been and are now enjoying. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, is it to be regarded as a wonder or strange that wage earners and labor organizations, observing the great profits that these industries are making, should seek to obtain an increase in their meager wages? The gentleman stated that they demanded a 10-cent or a 10-percent increase; I do not recollect which. Is it not a fact that the profits of many industries have increased from 50 to 100 percent? Yes; it is true, and therefore labor feels that it should share in a small portion of the large profits which inure to these industries, which have been made possible due to their efforts and labor.

Mr. Chairman, I was very resentful and bitter against some of the maritime unions when I read in the press that they threatened to strike, but this morning during the course of the hearings held by the Committee on Rules on the Bland bill (H. R. 4700) to provide for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interests of national defense, it was disclosed that most of the water transportation companies and shipping owners desire to only handle cargoes which permit the highest possible freight rates and are reluctant to haul less profitable strategic-metals shipments because of the lower freight rates on such products. Much more to my surprise was the testimony that was given that freight-rate charges have been increased as much as 500 percent and that in some cases the freight-charges returns on two trips of a ship covered its entire cost

of construction. After that evidence was given I can no longer feel resentful against the maritime workers for endeavoring to obtain a small increase in their daily wage to enable them to make both ends meet, in view of the increased cost of living. Some day in the near future I shall call attention to the tremendous profits these steamship companies are reaping and to the advantage they are taking of labor.

Now, with reference to the W. P. A., I am of the opinion that most of the work done by that great organization and its relief workers has been performed on national-defense projects. I regret that a strike should be called by labor organizations because of the work performed by W. P. A. men, but these unfortunate workers who were obliged to accept the aid of the Government have done their share and their part. They helped to construct projects, build roads, airports, and are working on a great many actually needed defense projects for the Government, thereby saving a great deal of money to the Government because they do not receive the higher union wages of which the gentleman from Michigan always complains.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I feel there is some justification for labor to demand a little increase in wages owing to the increased cost of living, and especially when they see shipowners and other large industrial corporations increasing their profits by millions and millions of dollars. Therefore it is no wonder that they seek to obtain a little increase of 10 cents per hour for the work they perform which has brought increased profits to the corporations employing them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, it will be interesting to Members of this body, and to many others throughout the country, to learn that on Saturday, May 17, William J. Donaldson, superintendent of the House Press Gallery, will complete 30 years of service in the Press Gallery. He was appointed as a page by Representative J. Charles Linthicum, of Maryland, later chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, on May 17, 1911, and was immediately assigned to the Press Gallery by Doorkeeper Joseph J. Sinnott because he was too large for service on the floor of the House. He was elected superintendent of the Press Gallery on May 1, 1913, by the standing committee of correspondents and has served continuously ever since.

He went to work in the Press Gallery in the special session when Champ Clark became Speaker. In the course of the years he has become almost an institution in our national life. In the performance of his duties he has attended every national political convention of the major

political parties since the historic convention in Baltimore in 1912. Beginning in 1916 he has been in charge of the press arrangements at all these national political conventions. Prior to 1920 all political party platforms were typewritten, but at the 1920 convention in San Francisco, William J. Cochran, brother of our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Accounts, then publicity director of the Democratic National Committee, had the party platform mimeographed on a hand-power machine. Since then the platforms of both parties have been mimeographed.

Mr. Donaldson had charge of the press arrangements at the Disarmament Conference here in Washington and for all events affecting the press here in Washington. For years he has cooperated in checking those admitted to the White House and State Department press conferences.

Besides knowing personally, for 30 years, all of the Washington correspondents for newspapers in all parts of the country, he has also known and been helpful to the leading newspaper publishers and executives, and has assisted at all meetings of the editors and publishers in Washington.

Mr. Donaldson has a host of friends in the Fourth Estate, and in political and official circles, who will be thinking of him day after tomorrow and wishing him much happiness in the years to come. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM].

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, there are three Members of this House who have the rather unusual distinction of having graduated from the press gallery to membership in this body. I refer to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] who has just preceded me, to the Honorable WINDER R. HARRIS, of Norfolk, Va., and to myself. The boys in the press gallery say that when we came down onto the floor of the House we were demoted instead of promoted.

I had the good fortune to come into the press gallery during the first World War. My good friend "Bill" Donaldson was then superintendent of the press gallery. There were two other boys in that gallery who worked with us and who are still on its staff. I refer to Anthony P. Demma, who was a messenger boy for me when I represented one of the press associations, and to Chester R. Thrift. The latter has been in the gallery for 24 years. I can testify from personal experience to the efficiency of these gentlemen and to the courtesy with which they have treated the newspaper profession as well as others who have had to do with matters connected with the press gallery.

I want to pay my tribute to "Bill" Donaldson. I never knew him to do anything wrong except on one or two occasions when he let me into a national political convention without a card of admission. He has a particular capacity for remembering faces and, confidentially, I will give you this tip: If you ever go to a national convention without a ticket of admission, find and locate our

friend "Bill" Donaldson and he will get you onto the floor if he has to take you up through the cellar.

I think he is deserving of the tribute our good friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] has paid to him as a highly efficient employee of this great institution of the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY].

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, last year, on September 26, I brought to the attention of this House a report prepared by Mr. Martin Sweeney, of New York City, which he sent to Mayor LaGuardia, outlining the facilities New York City had to offer to the Federal Government and suggesting that the mayor use his good offices to have some of the Government departments and defense activities transferred to New York City.

Today I received a letter from the mayor in which he states that he has had established a bureau, of one of our city departments, here in Washington, to assist the Federal Government solve its problem of office space. We have everything the Government needs in the way of services in our city. I hope every department and bureau chief in need of office space will remember that New York City is ready, willing, and able to do everything necessary to insure their comfort and efficiency.

I have read a number of articles in the RECORD containing offers from other cities to furnish space—for instance, Chicago and Pittsburgh. I think many of the departments now in Washington could very easily be settled in New York City. Moving them out of Washington would not only relieve the demand for office space but would also take away the employees and attachés.

We know the difficulty employees, as well as Members of Congress, have in obtaining proper housing facilities here in Washington at a reasonable rental. I also know that there are some committees working to bring about a solution of the housing problem, but up to the present time they have not been able to accomplish much good.

On behalf of New York City, I extend to the Federal Government our aid and assurances of cooperation. I understand that we have many buildings that are vacant and wish to rent to the Government departments at low rentals. As the mayor has indicated, this is no real-estate scheme, but a sincere effort to help the Federal Government obtain needed facilities promptly and cheaply. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries: Secretary of the Senate, including compensation as disbursing officer of

salaries of Senators and of contingent fund of the Senate, \$8,000; Chief Clerk, who shall perform the duties of reading clerk, \$5,500 and \$1,500 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; financial clerk, \$5,000; assistant financial clerk, \$4,500; Parliamentarian, \$5,000 and \$1,500 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; Journal clerk, \$4,000; principal clerk, \$3,780; legislative clerk, \$4,000 and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; enrolling clerk, \$4,000; printing clerk, \$3,540; chief bookkeeper, \$3,600; librarian, \$3,600; assistant Journal clerk, \$3,360; executive clerk, \$3,180; first assistant librarian, \$3,120; keeper of stationery, \$3,320; clerks—two at \$3,180 each, three at \$2,880 each, three at \$2,640 each, clerk in Disbursing Office, \$2,400, six at \$2,400 each, three at \$1,880 each, three at \$1,740 each; special officer, \$2,460; press relations officers—one at \$2,140, one at \$1,900; messenger, \$1,260; laborers—one at \$1,740, one at \$1,620, five at \$1,380 each, one in Secretary's office, \$1,680, one, \$1,560, one, \$1,260; in all \$144,540.

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

Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to say that I inquired regarding the condition that I mentioned earlier and was informed that a sufficient amount of money had been provided in this bill to correct the condition. For that reason, I shall not offer an amendment to increase the appropriation for that purpose.

The Clerk read as follows:

CLERK HIRE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

For clerk hire necessarily employed by each Member and Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, in the discharge of his official and representative duties, in accordance with the act entitled "An act to fix the compensation of officers and employees of the legislative branch of the Government," approved June 20, 1929, as amended by the act of July 25, 1939, \$2,847,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DONDERO: On page 21, line 12, strike out "clerk hire" and insert "secretaries to," and on page 21 in line 13, strike out "clerk hire" and insert "allowances for secretaries."

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I shall be forced to make a point of order against the amendment. I shall be very glad to reserve it, however, if the gentleman wishes me to do so.

Mr. DONDERO. I wish the gentleman would reserve the point of order.

Mr. O'NEAL. I reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in offering this amendment is simply to change the designation or terminology of those who serve us in our offices from clerk to secretary. This amendment will not cost the Federal Government one penny, but its ultimate objective is to give status to those who serve the Nation, serve our districts, and serve us in our offices, in a way commensurate with the responsibility and the importance of the positions they hold.

Those whom we select to serve in our offices, to take charge of our mail, meet the public, our friends and constituents

from back home, and take care of the business our offices have with the various bureaus, boards, commissions, committees, and departments of the Government, are important people. They hold key positions. They are our liaison officers between our office and every office of the Government. They are more than ordinary persons. We select them carefully for their ability and intelligence, their poise and dignity, their training and experience. Every person of any importance in the Federal Government has a secretary, particularly if he holds some key position. If a Member of this House dies, his or her district does not go unrepresented. That district is represented for 6 months, under present law, if no representative is elected to fill the vacancy sooner, by the secretaries of the deceased Member's office.

This amendment does not cost anything. I cannot see any valid objection to their being given the status of secretaries. At the present time we never hear any Members speaking of the clerks in their offices as clerks. We always speak of those who serve us as our secretaries.

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

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. While I shall be forced to make the point of order, I may mention that one valid objection to the amendment is that in the appropriation bill the basic law is quoted, and the gentleman's amendment does not change the basic law. These employees are referred to in the basic law as clerks and not as secretaries and therefore if you amend the appropriation bill which quotes the law and do not amend the law itself, you have a conflict between the law and the appropriation. It is even possible or conceivable that we might even affect their ability to draw their salaries if the language of the amendment were used. So it would be better to have the matter gone into a little more carefully, inasmuch as the basic law should be also changed. I make this statement simply to show why I am going to insist on the point of order. I think the matter should be corrected in the basic law as well as in the appropriation here, because otherwise we may have a very confused situation.

Mr. DONDERO. Beyond that, the gentleman would have no objection?

Mr. O'NEAL. I think that we should dignify as much as we can the position which these men occupy and to that extent I agree with what the gentleman is trying to do.

Mr. DONDERO. I have no pride of authorship, but I want to say to the House that in March of this year I introduced a bill to carry out the very purpose of the amendment which I am offering to the present bill.

May I say further that there are Members who are sitting on the floor of this House today who have served Members of Congress as clerks in their offices before coming to this body. I mention this simply to show that these people do not occupy ordinary positions. Their positions are positions of trust and responsi-

bility and they ought to be recognized by giving them a status commensurate with the importance and dignity of the office which they hold. I trust the gentleman will not insist upon his point of order and will let the amendment be adopted.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order, and I may state that the ground of the point of order is that this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

In view of the fact that in the basic law the employees in the offices mentioned are referred to as clerks, and in view of the fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] would change existing law and would therefore be legislation on an appropriation bill, it is the opinion of the Chair that the amendment is clearly out of order, and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

Furniture: For furniture and materials for repairs of the same, including not to exceed \$29,000 for labor, tools, and machinery for furniture repair shops, \$68,000, of which sum \$23,000 shall be available immediately.

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

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the legislative committee which considers legislation relating to the Congress, I have a duty to perform, and I may say that at times it is a very unpleasant duty.

I appreciate the interest of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] in desiring to change the designation of his office force. It so happens I am one of those to whom possibly he referred, as I served as a clerk to two Members of the House, also to a Senator, as well as clerk to a Senate committee. At no time was I ever designated other than as a secretary when I was employed by Members of the House or by the Senator or by a committee of the Senate, although carried in the legislative bill as a clerk. I have arranged on behalf of my committee a working agreement with the members of the Committee on Appropriations whereby I am required to protect our committees and make a point of order against any legislation on this bill which the committees have not considered and approved.

It is true that the gentleman from Michigan has introduced such a bill, and there are also requests before the committee to change the designation of the clerks of the committees as well as to remove the word "janitor" from the appropriation bill, substituting other titles. I can assure the gentleman that the matter will be taken up by the committee, but I want the House to understand that if I am forced to make a point of order against any amendment that might be offered to this bill, it is not done arbitrarily, and, as I say, it is an unpleasant duty sometimes, because it affects some people whom I had an opportunity to serve with myself many years ago. I hope the Members of the House realize that the legislative committee is, under the rules, required to

pass on certain bills and requests which ultimately might be carried in this bill if approved. No chairman of a legislative committee wants changes made in laws until his or her committee passes on the bills. As I said, ours is not a pleasant task, but someone must do it. Members are on our backs every day. We do the best we can; but what I want to impress upon you is, in objecting to any legislation that may be proposed to this bill, please realize that it is not from a personal standpoint, but is a duty or, I might say, an obligation that has been placed upon me. [Applause.]

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4756, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

TRANSPORTATION OF MERCHANT VESSELS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 208 (Rept. No. 542)

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 4700, a bill to provide for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interests of national defense, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1½ hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

ACQUISITION OR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN AUXILIARY VESSELS FOR THE NAVY

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, also reported the following resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 205 (Rept. No. 541)

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 3783, a bill authorizing the acquisition or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4693) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman please explain the provisions of the bill?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the continuation of the program for the insurance of loans under title I of the Federal Housing Act. Title I of the Federal Housing Act provides for the insurance of loans for the construction of residences up to \$2,500 and for the modernization and renovation of homes. Under title I over 3,150,000 loans for a total amount of \$1,305,000,000 have been insured. These cover loans made by private lending institutions for the repair and modernization of real-estate properties. A small part of these loans—27,600 in the amount of \$68,500,000—cover the construction of new small homes authorized under the February 3, 1938, amendments to the act; the maximum of these loans under the act as now operated is now \$2,500. The average amount of all title I loans made to date is \$414.

That authority will expire at the end of the present fiscal year, and the bill would extend the authority to July 1, 1944. There is widespread demand throughout the country for continuation of this service by the Federal Housing Administration. The bill would permit an increase in the amount of the loans under title I up to \$3,000 on residential property and up to \$5,000 for modernization and renovation.

Claims for insurance paid as of March 31 numbered slightly over 127,000 for slightly over \$32,000,000, or less than 2½ percent of the total amount of insurance written under title I. Against this loss there had been collected in cash and repossessed property a little over \$11,300,000, making a net loss at March 31 of slightly over 1½ percent. Future collections will reduce this loss.

Prior to July 1, 1939, the F. H. A. was not authorized to make any charge for this insurance. The insurance of these loans represented a subsidy to encourage

private lending institutions to make these loans—mainly character loans—to people who wanted to repair or modernize their homes, thus putting people to work and aiding in the revival of the construction industry. The Congress amended the act, authorizing the F. H. A., on loans insured subsequent to July 31, 1939, to charge premiums for this insurance. Since that date, therefore, these operations have been mainly self-supporting.

Under section 203 of title II of the act—the section authorizing the insurance of small-home mortgages—1- to 4-family with maximum mortgage, \$16,000—the F. H. A. at March 31 had insured over 680,000 mortgages which had become premium paying in the amount of slightly over \$2,900,000,000. In addition, at that date the F. H. A. had firm or conditional commitments to insure outstanding on more than 100,000 additional mortgages in excess of \$500,000,000. Of the six-hundred-and-eighty-and-odd thousand premium-paying mortgages, lending institutions had foreclosed mortgages and turned over to the Administrator 2,616 properties, or approximately one-half of 1 percent of the number insured. Of these acquired properties, the F. H. A. at March 31 had sold 1,872 with net charges against the mutual mortgage insurance fund of \$1,145,490, or an average loss per property of just under \$612.

In the event a mortgagor wishes to prepay his mortgage before its maturity, the F. H. A. requires a premium of 1 percent on the principal amount of the mortgage in order to guard against undue depletion of the mutual mortgage insurance fund upon such withdrawal. These prepayment premiums amounted at March 31 to more than \$1,635,000, so that the insurance income from this source exceeded at March 31 the amount paid out on account of acquired properties sold by \$500,000.

The mutual mortgage insurance fund was started with a \$10,000,000 contribution by the Government authorized in the original act. In addition to paying, from the income to this fund, administrative expenses in the amount of just under \$32,000,000 the net assets of the fund had been increased by March 31 to approximately \$30,500,000. It is anticipated that there will be added to this fund by the end of the fiscal year between eight and nine million dollars.

The F. H. A., during the first 3 months of this year, has been receiving applications for mortgages covering homes to be built at a weekly rate of between four and five thousand. During the last 3 weeks around 6,000 of these applications have been received weekly. The increase in these new-home mortgage applications over the corresponding period of 1940 is around 26 percent. During the current fiscal year, from July 1, 1940, through March 1941, approximately 150,000 houses have been started under F. H. A. inspection.

Approximately 99 percent of the mortgages insured under section 203 are on single-family homes, and 40 percent of these mortgages are for amounts under \$4,000.

Three out of ten borrowers under the F. H. A. mortgage plan during 1940 had incomes of less than \$2,000, and there were as many borrowers—families—with incomes of less than \$2,381 as there were with incomes above that amount.

To amortize the principal of the mortgage and to pay the interest on their loans, three out of four of the borrowers are paying less than \$30 a month. More than half of the families are paying less than \$40 a month, including insurance premiums, hazard insurance, local taxes, and water rent.

Under section 207, which provides insurance of loans on large-scale rental or group-housing projects, the F. H. A., through March 31, had insured from the beginning of operations 274 mortgages for just under \$128,000,000. As of March 31, mortgages in the amount of \$9,700,000 had been paid off in full on 11 of the projects insured. Only 4 projects, with mortgages totaling \$6,355,000, had been acquired by the F. H. A. at that date after foreclosure. These are now being operated by the F. H. A. in such a way that it is not expected that there will be a substantial loss on any of these projects.

Under title VI the defense-housing fund amendment recently added to the act for the insurance of houses in areas designated by the President as defense areas, the F. H. A. has received applications totaling approximately \$31,000,000. The limitation under this fund is \$100,000,000.

At March 31, insurance outstanding under section 203 approximated \$2,600,000,000. In addition, at that date, the F. H. A. had firm and conditional commitments to insure outstanding in an amount exceeding \$500,000,000. Currently applications for insurance are being received in the amount of approximately \$140,000,000 monthly, and commitments are being issued at a rate of around \$100,000,000 a month. If insurance written continues at this rate, the F. H. A. will be approaching its \$4,000,000,000 limitation by the end of this calendar year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 2 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "July 1, 1941" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1944."

Sec. 2. The last sentence of subsection (a) of section 2 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by (1) inserting "and other sources" after the word "premiums," and (2) striking out "\$100,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$165,000,000."

Sec. 3. Subsection (b) of section 2 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by (1) striking out "exceeds \$2,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, or improvement of existing structures exceeds \$5,000, or for the purpose of financing the construction of new structures exceeds \$3,000"; (2) striking out "three" and inserting in lieu thereof "five"; and (3) striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting "": *Provided*, That any obligation with respect to which insurance is granted under this section on or after July 1, 1939, may be refinanced and extended in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe."

SEC. 4. Subsection (c) of section 2 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by (1) inserting after the letter "(c)" the figure "(1)", (2) inserting before the word "property" the word "personal", and (3) adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real property by the United States, the Administrator shall have power (a) to deal with, complete, rent, renovate, modernize, insure, or sell for cash or credit, in his discretion, any real property conveyed to him in connection with the payment of insurance heretofore or hereafter granted under this title and (b) to pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or otherwise, all claims against mortgagors assigned by mortgagees to the Administrator in connection with such real property by way of deficiency or otherwise: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of such property if the amount thereof does not exceed \$1,000. The power to convey and to execute in the name of the Administrator deeds of conveyance, deeds of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real property or any interest therein heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this title may be exercised by the Administrator or by any Assistant Administrator appointed by him without the execution of any express delegation of power or power of attorney: *Provided*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Administrator from delegating such power by order or by power of attorney, in his discretion, to any officer, agent, or employee he may appoint."

Sec. 5. The last sentence of subsection (f) of section 2 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after the word "charges" the following: "and all moneys collected by the Administrator as fees of any kind in connection with the granting of insurance as provided in this section, and all moneys derived from the sale, collection, disposition, or compromise of any evidence of debt, contract, claim, property, or security assigned to or held by the Administrator as provided in subsection (c) of this section with respect to insurance granted on and after July 1, 1939."

Sec. 6. Effective on July 1, 1941, the first sentence of section 1 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "\$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,000."

Sec. 7. Title I of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 7. Nothing in this title shall be construed to exempt any real property acquired and held by the Administrator in connection with the payment of insurance heretofore or hereafter granted under this title from taxation by any State or political subdivision thereof, to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed."

Sec. 8. Subsection (a) of section 203 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by (1) striking out "\$3,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$4,000,000,000"; (2) striking out "\$4,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$5,000,000,000"; (3) striking out of the second proviso "the effective date of this amendment and outstanding at any one time, shall not exceed 25 percent of the total amount of the principal obligations of mortgages with respect to which insurance may be granted under this title after such effective date" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 3, 1939, and outstanding at any one time shall not exceed 35 percent of the total amount of the principal obligations of mortgages with respect to which insurance may be granted under this title after such date"; and (4) striking out

of the third proviso "July 1, 1941" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1944."

Sec. 9. The last sentence of subsection (a) of section 204 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "July 1, 1941" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1944."

Sec. 10. The first sentence of subsection (d) of section 512 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "No individual, association, partnership, or corporation shall hereafter, while the Federal Housing Administration exists, use the combination of letters 'FHA', the words 'Federal Housing' or 'National Housing', or any combination or variation of such letters or words alone or with other letters or words as the name under which he or it shall do business, for the purpose of trade, or by way of advertisement to induce the sale of any article or product whatsoever, which use shall have the effect of leading the public to believe that any such individual, association, partnership, or corporation, or any article or product so offered for sale, has any connection with, approval of, or authorization from, the Federal Housing Administration, the Government of the United States, or any instrumentality thereof where such connection, approval, or authorization does not, in fact, exist."

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: Page 4, beginning in line 7, strike out all of section 6.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, my amendment strikes out the section which provides for increasing the salary of the Administrator of the F. H. A. from \$10,000 to \$12,000 a year. I know of no good reason why this salary should be increased. I know argument has been made that the present Administrator is especially competent, that he does very good work, and is deserving of this increase. From this standpoint I do not think the proposal has any merit whatsoever.

It has also been argued that the funds for the payment of this salary are not derived from the Federal Treasury but come in from the insurance premiums on the mortgages that are insured. I do not believe this deserves any consideration. After all, the Administrator of the F. H. A. is an employee of the Federal Government and he renders service to the Federal Government the same as any other employee of the Government. Therefore, I see no reason why from that standpoint his salary should be increased.

A far more serious objection to this proposed increase in the salary of the Director of the F. H. A. is the precedent that it may set. If the salary of this particular office is increased, I think reasons may be given for increasing the salaries of other similar Government employees. At a time like this, it seems to me that we should not be increasing salaries of Government employees, especially on a basis of this kind.

I therefore wish to register my protest against this increase in the salary

from \$10,000 to \$12,000 for the Administrator of the Federal Housing Administration.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Is it not a fact that Mr. Ferguson, as attorney for the Federal Housing Administration, received a salary of \$12,000?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Prior to having served in this capacity.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. And he was advanced to the directorship and he was cut to \$10,000. If he was worth \$12,000 as attorney for the corporation it seems to me it is not inconsistent that he might get it as director.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In answer to that proposition I believe it is fair to say that if this increase is proposed on the basis of compensating the Administrator for extra work that he does over and above the ordinary administrative work—that is, for legal work—then I think this proposed section should specifically state that. I do not believe we can consider it good legislation to assume that a certain extra function is being performed by the Administrator, without specifically designating that function.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. The gentleman will admit that the hearings reveal the fact that the attorney who took his place receives \$9,000. So there is a saving of \$3,000 there. Two thousand dollars of it was taken up in giving him this increase. We all admit he is a very efficient and capable man and it is conceivable that in addition to his work as director he will also have his finger on the legal aspect of it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. You understand I am not contending that Mr. Ferguson is not efficient and capable. That is not my objection to this increase. I am objecting on the ground that this is not good legislation. If it is proposed to increase this salary on any such basis, we should be specific and state it in the act itself.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this matter was thoroughly considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency. The present Administrator of the Federal Housing Administration was formerly Assistant Administrator and Chief Counsel for the Federal Housing Administration and drew a salary of \$12,000 a year. The Administrator of the Federal Housing Administration no longer serves in that capacity, but has become Assistant Federal Loan Administrator under Jesse Jones. The present Administrator of the Federal Housing Administration now serves as Administrator, and it would not be unfair to say that in practice still gives the benefit of his service as lawyer. His salary as Chief Counsel was \$12,000. The salary of the Administrator was \$10,000. The salary of the Administrator has been dispensed with by the retirement of Mr. McDonald as Administrator, and the work is now being done by the former Assistant Administrator and Chief Counsel. There is no addition to the legal staff since the present Administrator assumed that position. So that there has

been accomplished a saving of \$8,500 annually.

I want to say in this connection that this section was in the nature of an amendment incorporated by the Committee on Banking and Currency. It was not in the original bill which was prepared by the Federal Housing Administration and the amendment was incorporated in the bill at the instance of the former Administrator, Mr. McDonald, at present Assistant Federal Loan Administrator, and by Mr. Jones, Federal Loan Administrator, for the reason that it was highly desirable to retain the services of the present Administrator, who had assisted in the management of this agency of the Government since its foundation and whose place it would be exceedingly difficult to fill. As a matter of fact, he is serving now at considerable sacrifice, because as an attorney he could easily command a handsome salary in private life.

There is another thing that must not be overlooked—the Federal Housing Administration is operating at a profit. The Administration has taken care of all insurance losses down to this time and have accumulated something like thirty-one or thirty-two million dollars' earnings, and at the end of the present year that fund will be increased something like \$10,000,000 more. Not one dollar of this additional salary will come out of the United States Treasury, but will be paid out of the accumulation of earnings of the Federal Housing Administration.

In conclusion, let me say that of all the agencies of the Government that have rendered conspicuous and satisfactory service to the Nation and whose activities and management meet with universal approval and commendation, none has shown a finer record of management than the Federal Housing Administration, due largely to the experience and splendid service rendered by the present Administrator.

I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

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

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. Are not the heads of all other independent agencies paid \$10,000, and would this not be a precedent to increase the salaries of all heads of independent agencies?

Mr. STEAGALL. I may say to the gentleman that if we had proceeded upon precedent that would have happened long ago because there are several agencies of the Government where the salaries for the chief officials are fixed at a higher rate than that provided in the present Federal Housing Act for the Administrator. In many instance that, of course, is true of subordinates in various agencies of the Government—attorneys, experts, and others.

Mr. KEAN. Which agencies has the gentleman in mind?

Mr. STEAGALL. I would refer the gentleman to the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Reserve Board, and others which at the moment I have not at my tongue's end, but there are others.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 27, noes 39.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4691) to amend the Federal Credit Union Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph No. (7) of section 7 of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "and building and loan, savings and loan, and homestead associations, and cooperative banks organized and operated according to the laws of the State, District, or Territory in which such associations are chartered or organized, if the shares or accounts in which the credit union invests are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation."

AUTHORIZING FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS TO INVEST IN INSURED SHARES OF INSURED STATE BUILDING AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the sole object of this bill is to make what I consider to be a minor correction of a law heretofore passed. Under existing law credit unions can invest their funds in only certain securities, among them shares in Federal savings and loan associations. This bill is to allow them to invest also in State associations if the State associations are insured in exactly the same way as the Federal associations.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I make a statement at this juncture? The only controversy about this bill was whether the credit unions could invest in shares of stock in State and Federal associations which were not insured. The bill has been written in such way as to fully guarantee that the investments of the credit unions in these shares of stocks are fully insured.

Mr. PATMAN. The correction has been made in accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. That has been done.

Mr. PATMAN. The report of the committee fully explains this bill. It is as follows:

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4691) to amend the Federal Credit Union Act, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

This is a companion bill to S. 434, which was introduced in the Senate by the late Senator Sheppard, author of the Federal Credit Union Act, which had his wholehearted approval. Investments by Federal credit unions in the shares of Federal savings and loan associations have been found to be

desirable and satisfactory, and investments in insured shares of insured State associations should be equally desirable and satisfactory, and this legislation will be an accommodation to both types of local institutions. Furthermore, this bill will remove an existing discrimination.

The sole purpose of this bill is to authorize Federal credit unions to invest in insured shares of insured local building and loan, savings and loan, and homestead associations and cooperative banks which are insured by Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporations as they are now authorized to invest in Federal savings and loan associations. The authority to invest is limited to insured accounts and therefore the Federal credit unions are fully protected. Federal credit unions in defense industries and other industries affected by the defense program are having an unprecedented growth, and this bill will provide them with an additional means for safe investment of excess funds, which will at the same time promote the defense program by making such funds available for home building.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 2a of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (no existing law is proposed to be omitted; new matter is printed in italics; existing law in which no change is made is printed in roman):

"SECTION 7 (7) OF THE FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT

"(7) To invest its funds (a) in loans exclusively to members, (b) in obligations of the United States of America, or securities fully guaranteed as to principal and interest thereby, (c) in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Governor, in loans to other credit unions in the total amount not exceeding 25 percent of its paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus, (d) and in shares or accounts of Federal savings and loan associations and building and loan, savings and loan, and homestead associations, and cooperative banks organized and operated according to the laws of the State, District, or Territory in which such associations are chartered or organized, if the shares or accounts in which the credit union invests are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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

AUTHORIZING VESSELS OF CANADIAN REGISTRY TO TRANSPORT IRON ORE ON THE GREAT LAKES DURING 1941

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4632) authorizing vessels of Canadian and British registry to transport iron ore on the Great Lakes during 1941, with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That by reason of emergency conditions in transportation on the Great Lakes, notwithstanding the provisions of section 27 of the act of Congress approved June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 999), as amended by

act of Congress approved April 11, 1935 (49 Stat. 154), and by act of Congress approved July 2, 1935 (49 Stat. 442), or the provisions of any other act of Congress or regulation, vessels of Canadian and British registry shall be permitted to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during the 1941 season of navigation on the Great Lakes.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, strike out the words "and British registry."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND as a substitute for the committee amendment: Page 1, line 10, strike out the words "and British."

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore on the Great Lakes during 1941."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include a copy of a letter written to the President by the Sarsfield Club of Butte, Mont.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2074) to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the purpose of the bill?

Mr. BLAND. The only thing this bill does is to permit during the emergency additional operators on certain ships, and suspends the 6-month requirement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. V, title 47, sec. 353 (b)), is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or in lieu of such 6 months' experience, such training and experience as the Commission may by rules and regulations prescribe."

With the following committee amendment:

Beginning in line 6, strike out the words "or in lieu" and all of lines 7 and 8 and insert: "but during the emergency proclaimed by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist, but not after June 30, 1943, the aforesaid requirement of 6 months' previous service may be suspended or modified by regula-

tion or order of the Commission for successive periods of not more than 6 months' duration."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on the bill H. R. 4691 today, and to include therein a copy of the committee's report.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Philippine exports, and to include a memorandum presented by Mr. Vincent Villamain on the same subject.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

I AM AN AMERICAN DAY

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1 year ago, the President of the United States signed a bill introduced in Congress by myself, creating what is known as I Am An American Day. On the same day he signed the bill, he issued a proclamation in accordance with a provision of the law that he shall do so each year, designating May 19, 1940, as I Am An American Day. The time was very short for the public to become familiar with the law, but the day was observed quite generally throughout the United States.

After the bill had been signed and the proclamation issued, my colleague and good friend, Judge SUMNERS, and myself were invited to Hollywood, Calif., where we addressed an audience of more than 20,000 people in the Hollywood Bowl and where some 1,500 young men and women who had become of age during the previous year, and naturalized citizens, passed in review and received a certificate of citizenship issued by the organization in Los Angeles and Hollywood.

The law provides for the recognition of all young men and women who have become 21 years of age during the year previous to the third Sunday of May each year, as well as those who have become naturalized citizens during the same year.

This law further provides that the civil and educational authorities of States, counties, cities, and towns throughout the United States be urged to make plans for the proper observance of this day and for the full instruction of future citizens in their responsibilities and opportunities as citizens of the United States and of the States and localities in which they reside.

The law does not change, and shall not be construed as changing, or attempting to change, the time or mode of

any of the many altogether commendable observances of similar nature now being held from time to time, or periodically throughout the United States, but, to the contrary, such practices are praised and encouraged.

The law further provides that at the time of the rendering of the decree of naturalization or at such other time as the judge may fix, the judge before whom naturalizations are held, either shall himself, or he shall designate some other person to address the newly naturalized citizens upon the form of our government and the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship that go with it. It was the thought of your speaker that this law enlist the aid of the judiciary, in cooperation with civil and educational authorities, and patriotic organizations in a continuous effort to dignify and emphasize the significance of citizenship.

It is needless for me now to review the vicissitudes of countries overseas, the break-down of government in one country after another, or the struggle of one nation to conquer the world, or the unsettled conditions that prevail everywhere. We hear it daily over the radio, we read it constantly in the headlines of our newspapers, and it all becomes very depressing and disheartening.

It is needless for me to review the difficulties that we face within our own Nation, with many millions of people still unemployed, with a national debt of now over forty-seven and one-half billion dollars. It behooves us, as American citizens, to be calm and collected during a gathering storm, which may be fierce and unrelenting as it passes over us. We need not fear so much from without, but our greatest difficulty will be within our own Nation. It therefore behooves us to put our own house in order, remain at peace, if we are to make our best contribution toward stability of the world when this holocaust which now envelops most of the world has quieted down again.

As I am speaking today to both the native-born and the foreign-born, I want to call your attention to the fact that both those who are native-born and those who are foreign-born must alike experience the process of Americanization. In the case of natives, Americanization involves getting acquainted with the best American traditions and current standards and practicing and trying to improve the quality of these traditions and standards. In the case of the foreign-born, Americanization means giving up one set of well-known and, in part, precious loyalties for another set of loyalties, more or less new and unknown. To renounce one group of loyalties for another group involves a deep-seated and delicate readjustment of mental and social attitudes.

Americanization involves the rebirth of all our fundamental virtues, namely, liberty and initiative, union and cooperation, democracy and justice, internationalism and brotherhood. Average Americans should set the pace for new immigrants coming into this country. Whether the immigrants become social or antisocial Americans depends upon the examples which are set by average Amer-

icans; and if we do our part, I am sure these new naturalized citizens will contribute their share to the upholding of American traditions.

We live in one of the greatest transition ages of all history. We think of the dawn of history, the breaking up of the Roman Empire, and the reorganization of the world's life which followed the discovery of America as marking great turning points in man's existence. In my judgment, the change that is taking place in human life today is even greater than the change which took place in the middle ages or during the fall of the Roman Empire; it can be compared only with the dawn of history itself.

With all of the great nations at war, save only America alone, I believe that the world is entering upon a new epoch; that mankind has again come face to face with destiny; that it has reached a point where it can turn backward into the darkness and confusion of bygone ages or can move forward into a new period of light, self-government, justice, and beauty. Whether it shall do the one or the other may depend—indeed, is likely to depend—upon what happens in the United States of America. Here we have the conditions of life, here we have the level of education—and we are the highest civilized people of the world. We therefore have the background and, let us hope, the purpose to preserve human freedom and to perfect democracy until every man, woman, and child under the American flag and all civilized people throughout the world may enjoy the blessings of security and opportunity.

We have many problems for new citizens to help solve, problems involving relations between capital and labor, problems having to do with our economic condition today, problems involving the housing of our people, problems of education, in the conservation of our natural resources, and our greatest problem is to adjust ourselves and our institutions to the new conditions as they occur from day to day.

I have heard much said about there being so few opportunities in the world today. To me there are more opportunities than there ever have been in the history of our Nation. The great trouble is to find time to study and help solve the great problems that confront us today. The problems that we face in our country today, and throughout the world, cannot be solved overnight. Our present generation will leave plenty of problems to be solved.

Although we are appropriating and spending millions of dollars for relief, no permanent, basic solution for our economic ills has yet been found. We are living in an age of real challenge. The opportunity and the need for making worth while civic contributions have never been greater. What the world needs today is men and women who are prepared for meeting these emergencies, and solving these problems as they come up for solution day by day.

It is for young people coming of age and new naturalized citizens to understand the difference between a dictatorship and a democracy. Under a dictatorship, the individual exists for a state. In a democ-

racy, a state exists for the individual as a means to an end, and the welfare of the individual is of supreme importance. It is the claim of the Nazi, Fascist, and communistic dictatorships that the people will be better fed, better clothed, and have less worries if the dictator does all the thinking and planning. But in a democracy we would all rather share in the worries and responsibilities of state, and have something to say about how we are to be governed, fed, and clothed. In the past we have always felt that we have attained life above the mere level of food and shelter.

My sincere hope is that new citizens will all realize that their education in citizenship is really just beginning and that it will never be completed, no matter how far they go.

Young Americans should be taught to love America, and to support our Constitution and our laws, and at the same time learn that to violate these laws and the Constitution is to trample upon all that is good and distinctive in the high ideals fought for by the forefathers of our Nation.

Our country was founded on certain great principles fundamental in character. It seems to me in times like these through which we are passing it is imperative to consider these principles and see to it that we shape our lives in accord with them. Too frequently these activities of Government are left in the hands of a few who have made such matters more or less their life work, when as a matter of civic responsibility we, too, should give them our own consideration. America more than ever before is looking to her younger generation to carry on her great principles and ideals.

This is a peacetime service comparable in urgency to that required in time of war, and this service is the first obligation of citizenship. A good citizen, mindful of his country's traditions and welfare, should uphold a proper respect for constituted authority and assist in preserving and advancing the integrity and prestige of his Government.

We are now passing through a great emergency, and may I ask of you that you look proudly to our country, revere its traditions, fight for its prosperity and future, and, above all, live that life, whatever be its intrinsic reward, which will cause us to know that we have been honorable citizens, appreciative of the privileges our country affords, jealous of its integrity, and alert in its defense. Be not afraid of patriotism; it is the soul of citizenship. Be not afraid of service; it is the road to contentment, and it is a thing we all can give.

We need not minimize the bewildering complex of human life and the puzzling intricacy of its unfoldings to history. We need not shut our eyes to the tragedy of it all, but in the slow, painful years the splendor of achievement has far outweighed the tragedy. If we keep our ideals clearly before our minds, we shall yet survive and continue our civilization. The powers of mind and matter ready in this age to be organized toward high and worthy objects are of unprecedented scope and content. The present-day economic and intellectual revolution has

opened the door of human possibility wider than it ever was opened before.

In these days that so distress and disconcert us it is preeminently fitting that we pull ourselves together and anew submit to the crucible of thought our estimate of the human achievement, the validity of our ideals for humanity, and of our notions as to what constitutes human progress.

The noblest end of human effort is the development and elevation of men and women.

There is an urgent cry for the improvement of the human race.

In these distressful days, when each one of us at times feels that the way of life which we call civilized may be lost and forgotten, it is imperative that we take stock of the forces which we can employ to perpetuate it among men.

We all owe a positive duty to our community, the neglect of which we cannot excuse on the plea of duty to our private affairs. We should follow understandingly the course of public events. We should then endeavor to act intelligently and efficiently in support of the principles we believe to be right.

The world must not fail in the present crisis. I think our real purposes may be accomplished. But surely not unless God shall give us men and women cast in heroic molds; men and women endowed not only with the understanding heart which feels and appreciates the condition of the present, but with the philosophic mind which weighs with just discrimination the accumulated experiences of the past; men and women who can withal lift up their eyes in abiding faith to the hilltops of the future, which even now are touched and glorified by the light of the approaching day.

Always realize that the present hour is the only hour that you really possess. It is best illustrated in these few lines:

Behind me is infinite power;
Before me is endless possibility;
Around me is endless opportunity;
Why should I fear?

And these words from the beautiful poem *Salutation to the Dawn* should inspire everyone:

For yesterday is but a dream,
And tomorrow is only a vision;
And today well lived makes
Every yesterday a dream of happiness,
And every tomorrow a vision of hope.

[Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] may be permitted to revise and extend the remarks he made on the floor of the House today and to include a newspaper article pertaining thereto.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the *Record* and to include an article by the Alabama Highway Users Conference.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BOLAND, indefinitely, on account of illness.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 16, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will hold an open hearing on Friday, May 16, 1941, at 10:30 a. m. in the committee room.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold public hearings on the following private bills:

H. R. 439. Martha Pace, by Mr. ROESION of Kentucky.

H. R. 477. Cora Arlena Ballard, by Mr. ROESION of Kentucky.

H. R. 1932. Willard Fulk, by Mr. CLAYPOOL.

H. R. 1994. Capt. Victor Gondos, Jr., by Mr. McGRANERY.

H. R. 2063. William H. Shanklin, by Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky.

H. R. 3312. Grizelda Hull Hobson, by Mr. JARMAN.

H. R. 3560. Jeannette W. Moffett, by Mr. RIVERS.

The hearings will be held Tuesday, May 20, 1941, at 10:30 a. m. in room 247, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold a public hearing at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, May 21, 1941, for the consideration of private bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary will hold public hearings on H. R. 4394, to amend the Bankruptcy Act (respecting referees) on Monday, June 2, 1941, at 10 a. m. in room 346, House Office Building, before the Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

540. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act approved June 6, 1940

(54 Stat. 234), entitled "An act to authorize the acquisition by the United States of lands in Manchester and Jackson Townships of the county of Ocean and State of New Jersey for use in connection with the naval air station, Lakehurst, N. J.," which the Navy Department presents to Congress with a view to its enactment into law; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

541. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire Floyd Bennett Airport and certain lands adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

542. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to require examination and laboratory tests for syphilis, gonorrhea, and tuberculosis of all applicants for marriage licenses before the issuance thereof in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

543. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Executive Office of the President, Executive Mansion, and grounds (H. Doc. No. 212); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. O'NEAL: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4756. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 34. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a revised edition of the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government: What Is It? How Does It Function?"; without amendment (Rept. No. 540). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 205. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 3783; without amendment (Rept. No. 541). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 208. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4700, a bill to provide for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interests of national defense, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 542). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 4757. A bill to provide that the Navy ration shall include canned or powdered or concentrated fruit juices; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4758. A bill to establish a civilian air reserve, to be organized and trained by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 4759. A bill for the extension of admiralty jurisdiction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 4760 (by request). A bill to amend section 2 of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. R. 4761. A bill to strengthen the national defense and promote the general welfare, through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in meeting financial emergencies in education and in reducing inequalities of educational opportunities; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 4762. A bill to extend the time within which taxpayers shall be allowed a credit against certain taxes imposed by the Social Security Act and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act for contributions paid into unemployment funds under State laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the founding and in aid of the historical restoration of St. Augustine, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution providing for the decentralization of nondefense departments, bureaus, and agencies; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. Res. 209. Resolution providing for the decentralization of nondefense departments, bureaus, and agencies; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 11, with reference to the Hawaiian Organic Act; to the Committee on the Territories.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 4763. A bill for the relief of J. S. Kirby; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 4764. A bill for the relief of George H. Adams; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 4765. A bill for the relief of Victor Schneider; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 4766. A bill readmitting Elsie deWolfe Mendl to citizenship; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 4767. A bill granting a pension to Samuel M. Booth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1074. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 37 members and friends of the Plain Grove United Presbyterian Church of Slippery Rock, Pa., urging the enactment of legislation to rid our camps of alcoholic liquors, houses or places of ill fame, and all drugs and narcotics be entirely banned for at least a 10-mile area, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1075. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the New York Electrotypers' Union, New York City, concerning the Culin bills (H. R. 123, 125, 126, and 132); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1076. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, requesting the President and the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Chief of the Bureau of Reclamation to take such steps as are necessary to provide that the brush, debris, and other materials be cleared away from the site of the new Shasta Dam before the dam is flooded for the first time; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1077. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolution of Harmony Pomona Grange, No. 9, favoring a law that anyone striking while the draft is in force shall immediately be taken into the Army or given work under Army supervision, regardless of previous classification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1078. By Mr. TIBBOTT: Petition of sundry citizens of Indiana County, Pa., favoring the adoption of a uniform national system of old-age pensions embraced in the Townsend bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1079. Also, petition of Harry Long and others of Punxsutawney, Pa., favoring the adoption of a uniform national system of old-age pensions embraced in the Townsend bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1080. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, El Paso, Tex., Post, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to conveying; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1081. By Mr. SABATH: Petition of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, urging the amendment of the Social Security Act in such manner as to prohibit the Social Security Board from disapproving any State plan for aid to the blind on the ground that such plan permits and encourages the blind to contribute to their own support by earnings and income in addition to the State grant, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1082. By Mr. ROLPH: Memorial of the State of California, asking consideration of Senate Joint Resolution No. 23, relative to the United States officials having jurisdiction of the matter in connection with the removal of brush and debris in the area flooded by Shasta Dam; to the Committee on Flood Control.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 16, 1941

The Reverend Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Lord of all love and power and wisdom, who in Thy Holy Word hast taught us to love Thee with all our heart, and with all our soul and with all our mind: Grant, we beseech Thee, unto us, who in our generation have served Thee fully with our mind in wrestling from Nature a greater knowledge of the secrets Thou hast imparted to her than the world has ever known, that we may serve Thee likewise with our hearts by using this wisdom not for the destruction of others, but for the advancement of all mankind in the arts of peace; and that our souls may be so consecrated to Thee, that the power which comes from such knowledge and wisdom may become the power of creative love for the rebuilding of our world to Thy honour and glory. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Thursday, May 15, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting several nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2074. An act to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended;

H. R. 4632. An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore on the Great Lakes during 1941;

H. R. 4691. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act;

H. R. 4693. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4756. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by a Senator, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A memorial and papers in the nature of memorials from sundry citizens of the United States, remonstrating against involvement in war and the use of United States armed ships to convoy vessels through war zones; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the Council of the City of Chicago, Ill., favoring the permanent location of the Department of Agriculture and the Interstate Commerce Commission at Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A corrected copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 11 of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing Congress to amend section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act so that the section will apply to the setting aside of lands for the uses and purposes of the United States; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

(The resolution above referred to was heretofore printed in the Record.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

"Senate Joint Resolution 23

"Relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States and the United States officials having jurisdiction of the matter in connection with the removal of brush and debris in the area to be flooded by Shasta Dam

"Whereas there now exists in the area which will be flooded by the water impounded by Shasta Dam a great quantity of brush, debris, and other loose material; and

"Whereas the water to be impounded by Shasta Dam is to be used as a water supply for urban and other areas in the portion of the State in which the dam is situated and the presence of the brush, debris, and other material in said waters would impair the water-distribution systems involved and