against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 299. Joint resolution to aid and expedite the prosecution of the war effort by raising revenue through the sale of war-participation tickets, to be conducted under the supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. J. Res. 300. Resolution authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to rename 20 thoroughfares for the Pan-American Republics; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred, as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to suspend the 40-hour work-week for duration of national emergency; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. ANGELL introduced a bill (H. R. 6873) for the relief of Maude Leach, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2616. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco Kiwanis Club, adopted March 16, 1942, for the guarding and protection of facilities essential to the war effort; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2617. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 13 residents of the Twenty-sixth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and members of the Ladies' Auxiliary, No. 1044, National Association of Letter Carriers, favoring the passage of House bill 6486, to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2618. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of Mrs. Lena Martin, chairman of Local 3007, Corsicana, Tex., opposing Secretary Morgenthau's proposed legislation for tax on pension trust funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2619. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the California State Board of Agriculture, Sacramento, urging the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake careful studies of economic problems arising; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2620. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Kiwanis Club of Bayside, N. Y., that the new time recently enacted to speed war production, commonly called by the sinister expression "war time," be renamed "victory time"; and if further change is made during the summer months, to call that period "victory summer time"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2621. Also, resolution of 300 independent tire dealers of New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, that they implore relief from financial disaster under existing rubber regulations, and offer for consideration the fact that tire manufacturers, mass distributors, and petroleum outlets do not need their small share of new tire and recapping business in order to exist; conversely, the independent tire dealers of the Nation must receive all of the available new tire business and recapping tire service to continue in business; and that failure to direct the small amount of this business exclusively through the independent dealer will unquestionably result in the mortality of approximately 60,000 independent tire dealers; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

2622. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Youngstown, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 6750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, MARCH 28, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Clerk read the following communication from the Speaker:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 28, 1942.

I hereby designate the Honorable JERE COOPER to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN.

The House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore.

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

O Thou who art high and exalted, who hast promised to dwell with those who are of humble and penitent heart, we entreat Thee that we may be drawn to Thee by love and not by fear. Grant that we may be so consecrated to Thy service in mind and disposition, that the eyes of our hearts may behold Thy purity and the wonder of Thy creative power. The heart that knows Thy love is a sacred temple and all the babble of earth's confusion of voices is soon hushed into silence.

We praise Thee for the Christ, whose indomitable love and courage constrained Him to give His life for the redemption of the world. While the storms of rage and the thunders of hate were crashing over His head, His deepest promise was given: "My peace I leave with you, not as the world giveth, give I unto you." We pray that every throng may feel Thy presence, every cot of pain, the touch of Thy hand, and every endeavor realize in common life the brotherhood of man. Send forth Thy benediction, illuminating the minds of men, quieting their fears and hatreds and bringing them back to sanity and peace, confidence and faith in Thee. Almighty God, Oh bless America and may America bless God and most humbly realize that she will never be fit to rule until she is fit to serve. Do Thou help our President and all his counselors in their world-wide responsibilities, through Christ. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6483) entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes,' approved October 14, 1940, as amended," disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees 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. 6736) entitled "An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists on its amendment No. 2 to said bill, asks a further conference with the House on said amendment in disagreement, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. LODGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House, of the following titles:

H. R. 4557. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook; and

H. R. 5290. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider.

THE LATE RENÉ L. DEROUEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PLAUCHÉ].

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty to announce the death of my personal friend and immediate predecessor, the Honorable René L. DeRouen. Mr. DeRouen died suddenly yesterday morning in the city of Baton Rouge, La.

Mr. René, as he was affectionately known by thousands of people in the Seventh Congressional District of Louisiana, served in the House of Representatives with honor and distinction for about 14 years, voluntarily retiring at the expiration of his term last year.

At the time of his retirement he was chairman of the Public Lands Committee and a ranking member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

His able and conscientious services to the Nation, especially as a member of these two very important committees, are universally recognized and appreciated.

Mr. DeRouen was of a quiet and undemonstrative temperament. In his quiet way he had a great influence on his country and his fellowme.

When I came to Washington as his successor, I found that all those who knew him, not only recognized his ability, sincerity, and earnestness, but were all proud to claim him as a personal friend.

Mr. DeRouen was a person of great devotion to his wife and his children. The State of Louisiana and particularly the Seventh District has lost a respected and beloved citizen, one who could ill be spared, especially in times like these.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, sometime yesterday morning in the city of Baton Rouge, La., René DeRouen passed into the Great Beyond. The end came

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

as he slept, without pain and without anticipation.

Until the day of his death he always retained a most active interest in his fellow man and a most sympathetic interest in the problems of humanity. During the last 16 years of his life he served as Representative from the Seventh District of Louisiana in the House of Representatives, retiring because of ill health at the end of the last session of Congress.

Those of us who have served in the past remember the familiar figure of our friend as he presided over the Committee on the Public Lands of the House of Representatives. We remember him as he quietly moved among us, working always with some useful goal in view. His especial interest was devoted to reclamation and irrigation projects of such vital interest to the struggling masses of the people of the western part of the United States. Unselfishly he toiled, without hope of reward, save that of "duty well done," but the millions of our people out there in the great open spaces of the far West know that the life of René DeRouen was not in vain and they thank God that he was permitted to be with us.

Mr. Speaker, the State of Louisiana and the Nation has lost a tireless, useful, and beloved leader, and we have lost a friend. Our deep sympathy goes out to his devoted widow and four children, all of whom survive him.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. On behalf of the Mississippi delegation, I wish to join the Louisiana delegation in mourning the death of Dr. DeRouen, one of the noblest characters who ever served in this House. Personally I can say that he was my friend. All I can add is—

Farewell! if ever fondest prayer
For other's weal avail'd on high,
Mine will not all be lost in air,
But waft thy name beyond the sky.

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

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

Mr. RICH. I should like to pay my tribute to Mr. DeRouen. I served on the Committee on the Public Lands for several years during the time he was chairman. I thought he was one of the most honorable, honest, and conscientious chairmen of a committee I have ever had the privilege of serving under while I have been a Member of this House. He was likeable, and energetic in trying to do what he thought was for the best interest of this country I know of no one with whom I have been associated in the House of Representatives whose friendship and companionship I have appreciated more than that of Mr. DeRouen. He was a wonderful character, a fine man, and a real fine American citizen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I knew Mr. René L. DeRouen before I came to Congress. After I came to Congress I was thrown with him a great deal. He was the dean of our Louisiana delegation and was more than a dean to us. He was almost like a father to us. He was the grand old man of our delegation. We went to him for counsel. He not only had had many years' legislative experience but he had broad business experience which qualified him to correctly appraise most questions coming up. He and I had apartments at the same hotel. We saw each other every day. It is natural, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that I grew to have a very fond affection for this grand old man. The news of his passing, therefore, saddens me very much. We House Members who were so closely associated with him shall miss him. The people of Louisiana will miss him. We all deeply mourn his passing.

A striking feature of the life of Mr. DeRouen was his spirituality. He was deeply spiritual. He had an abiding faith in the God of all the earth. His quiet Christian spirit endeared him to all who knew him. I am sure that the realization of this fact is a comfort to his devoted companion, fine children, and host of friends. Our friend has gone from us, but the memory of his exemplary life, his deeds, his kindly acts will remain as a monument. He has left the heritage of a life well spent. In such a life there can be no regrets.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. As one who lives in a neighboring State and who served with the distinguished former Member, Mr. DeRouen, I concur in the beautiful tribute that his colleague from Louisiana has just paid him. No one could know him without loving and respecting him.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. In behalf of the Louisiana delegation, I thank the gentleman from Texas for that tribute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in mourning the passing of René DeRouen. I had the pleasure of serving with him in previous Congresses. He was a distinguished citizen of Louisiana, an able public servant. He represented his people in the Congress with energy, with ability, and with distinction. He was a man of singular poise of temperament, calm, not easily disturbed. He made friends easily and retained them. I was happy to call him my friend and am proud to have had the distinction of serving with him. I join with those who have expressed to his family the sympathy we all feel for them in this hour of their bereavement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress a little more than 9 years ago, one of my first assignments was on the Public Lands Committee. At that time I became acquainted with the gentleman from Louisiana, René L. DeRouen. I was immediately impressed with his keen insight and thorough knowledge of public affairs, especially those which had to do with the public land questions. I was also greatly impressed with the kindly disposition of this unusual character. Since that time and up until the time that he voluntarily withdrew from Congress, I was closely and intimately acquainted with him, and on his retirement I had the honor of assuming the position of chairman of the Public Lands Committee, which he so successfully held for a number of years.

My close association with him confirmed my first impressions, and I came to honor and respect him for his untiring efforts in behalf of his constituents and his splendid ability as a legislator. Due to his energy and hard work in this body, he has passed on to the Great Beyond many years sooner than he otherwise would. However, he has left with us and with the citizens of Louisiana and with the people of this entire Nation a splendid example of patriotism, of energy, and of fidelity to the cause which he espoused. A great man has gone to his just reward. We missed him when he left this House of Representatives. The people of Louisiana have lost a faithful servant, and this Nation has lost a useful, distinguished and courageous patriot.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow I read in the paper this morning of the passing of my former chairman of the Public Lands Committee, René DeRouen. For 8 years I served on that committee. He was such a splendid chairman, such a fine gentleman, such a genial friend, always courteous to the members of the committee, always courteous to the witnesses who appeared before the committee. He was efficient because he had for years studied public lands. He was fair because that was his innate nature. My good friend DeRouen met the summons yesterday morning in the spirit expressed by William Cullen Bryant in the beautiful poem called Thanatopsis:

So live that when thy summons comes
To join the innumerable caravan
That moves to that mysterious realm
Where each shall take his chamber
In the silent halls of death,
Thou go, not like a quarry slave, at night
Scourged to his dungeon,
But sustained and soothed by an unfaltering trust.
Approach thy grave as one who wraps the draperies
Of his couch about him and lies down to pleasant dreams.

So our good friend René has gone to his last sleep in that spirit. We will miss him here in the House and his friends in Louisiana and in the Nation will also miss him. We will all miss his smiling face, his genial greeting, his friendly handclasp.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned on entering the Chamber today that my good friend, one of God's noblemen, former chairman of the Public Lands Committee of the House, had passed away. I

refer to our noble friend, former Chairman DeRouen, of our Public Lands Committee.

I am one of the younger Members of the Congress. I was impressed deeply during my first 4 years here with the fact that Mr. DeRouen was always kindly in his presiding over the Public Lands Committee, always considerate, and always governed by intelligence and justice. As one who comes from the far West, I want to say right here that no man from any part of our country was better informed or more considerate of all parts of the country than Chairman DeRouen in his leadership of the Public Lands Committee of this House. I cannot adequately indicate our obligation to him.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEAVY. I concur fully in what the able gentleman says in the way of tribute to the memory of the late Mr. DeRouen, and what my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL] has said. I do not believe that with all the great men the West has ever produced and sent to this House it had a better friend than it found in Mr. DeRouen. The work he did for that great region will stand as a perpetual monument for all time. He was truly a great friend of the West. We knew him as our friend and appreciated him sincerely. We feel his passing is our loss, just as it is the loss of the State of Louisiana.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is correct.

As younger Members, my friend from Washington and I, as well as the rest of us, feel that in the National Capital, in the membership of this House, we may now properly apply to Chairman DeRouen the words of the poet:

Green be the turf above thee,
Friend of my better days!
None knew thee but to love thee,
Nor named thee but to praise.

CONCESSIONS AND SACRIFICES BY ALL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the 40-hour week, benefits, and subsidies, direct and indirect, came by law, and they can only be suspended by law. Voluntary action has never replaced selfishness and never will. Laborers, farmers, manufacturers, merchants, all groups, and all blocs must make concessions. Depression agencies must be abolished; nonessential appropriations must be eliminated; nondefense expenditures should be reduced so as not to cripple or destroy essential governmental functions. Experiments must not be repeated. The taxpayer foots the bill, and he knows it. All-out production means sacrifices by all citizens.

If benefits to labor are to be suspended, benefits to farmers, manufacturers, and industrialists should also be suspended. The labor profiteer and the war profiteer must go. For my part I am ready to call the roll.

JOINT INCOME-TAX RETURNS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have filed my protest as heretofore and always opposed to the proposed provision in the new tax bill requiring joint return by husband and wife.

As one admittedly somewhat familiar with the administration of tax laws, I insist that the provision to which I refer is violative of constitutional rights, destructive of domestic relations and felicity, and possibly prohibitive of those contemplated.

Practically and really it is an indefensible attempt to raise revenue through and by means of what is actually an attack on the home life of our people, though probably not so intended theoretically.

The zeal of revenue raisers and tax gatherers to get more money somewhere has led them astray and made them almost blind to the consequences, for certainly this provision of the bill will defeat itself, fall of its own weight, will not accomplish that which is sought as a revenue producer, but will do more damage than good.

The end does not justify the means.

ALLENE RUHLMAN AND JOHN P. RUHLMAN

Mr. McGEHEE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5473) for the relief of Allene Ruhlman and John P. Ruhlman:

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. 5473) entitled "An act for the relief of Allene Ruhlman and John P. Ruhlman," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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 figures "$2,721" insert "$4,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "$1,185" insert "$2,185"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
THOMAS D. WINTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
JAMES M. TUNNELL,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference of the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5473) for the relief of Allene Ruhlman and John P. Ruhlman, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The bill as it passed the House provided for the payment to Allene Ruhlman the sum of $5,221, and to John P. Ruhlman the sum of $3,185, for personal injuries and property damage sustained when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by an ambulance of the Civilian Conservation Corps on September 6, 1940, on the Harrisburg Pike, near Carlisle, Pa. The Senate amended the bill by reducing the amount payable to Allene Ruhlman from $5,221 to $2,721, and reducing the amount payable to John P. Ruhlman from $3,185 to $1,185.

At the conference a compromise of $4,000 was agreed upon for Allene Ruhlman, and a compromise of $2,185 was agreed upon for John P. Ruhlman.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
THOMAS D. WINTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill H. R. 5473.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EDNA B. CROOK

Mr. McGEHEE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4557) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook:

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. 4557) entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
Managers on the part of the House.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
LLOYD SPENCER,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
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 amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4557) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

This bill as passed by the House provided for the payment of $2,500 to the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook for personal injuries resulting in her death on May 6, 1940, when she was struck by a United States Army truck in Forest, Miss. The Senate reduced the

amount to be paid to the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook from $2,500 to $470.

At the conference it was agreed that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EDDIE A. SCHNEIDER

Mr. McGEHEE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5290) for the relief of Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider

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. 5290) entitled "An act for the relief of Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do ecommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figure "$5,000" insert "$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
Managers on the part of the House.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
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 amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5290) for the relief of Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

This bill as it passed the House provided for the payment of $10,000 for personal injuries resulting in the death of her husband, Eddie A. Schneider, when the airplane in which he was flying was struck by an airplane piloted by a student pilot of the Navy. The Senate reduced the amount to be paid to Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider from $10,000 to $5,000.

At the conference a compromise of $7,500 was agreed upon.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY KAHN

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4665) for the relief of Harry Kahn:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4665) entitled "An act for the relief of Harry Kahn," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "$2,500" insert "$3,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
THOMAS D. WINTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference of the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4665) for the relief of Harry Kahn, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The bill as it passed the House provided for the payment to Harry Kahn of the sum of $5,000 for personal injuries sustained as a result of an accident involving an Army vehicle near the entrance to Fort Humphreys in the State of Virginia, on April 16, 1931. The Senate reduced the amount from $5,000 to $2,500.

At the conference, a compromise of $3,000 was agreed upon.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
THOMAS D. WINTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. McGEHEE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the regular business of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a write-up by a friend of former Gov. Phil La Follette entitled "That's Phil La Follette."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "For Greater Unity," from the Washington Post this morning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent and an editorial from the Kansas City Star.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address delivered by Judge F. L. Henderson, of Bryan, Tex.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Boston Herald regarding the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I received from the Secretary of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED RECESS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, with several of my Texas colleagues and

other Members of the House, I agree that this is no time for the Congress to cease to be in session. The people of Texas and many sections of our Nation are demanding that both bodies of Congress immediately establish legislative policies with reference to excess profits and certain reprehensible acts of some industries, the 40-hour week, and delays occasioned by causes of any type. As one who has supported every measure designed to speed up our war effort, I am anxious that the Congress lose no time in acting on legislation pertaining to the problems mentioned.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Mr. Oberholser, editor of the Red Oak Express, of Red Oak, Iowa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, also I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED RECESS

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], who just said that we should remain in session and adopt some labor policy; but if the majority party and the administration will not permit us to consider any legislation to that effect, why stay here? I, for one, if they refuse to let us bring out any legislation, intend to go home and tell all of the folks I can see why it is that we are not doing anything to remedy the trouble and who is responsible for it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram I received from R. C. Middleton, secretary of the trade council, of Baton Rouge, La., together with my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address I recently delivered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LABOR LEGISLATION

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, some Members clamor for a recess so they can go home and find out what the people are thinking.

They can find that out by reading their mail; the people mean what they are saying.

When these Members go home they will find a rising tide of righteous indignation at the racketeering and profiteering now disrupting the country and slowing down our defense efforts.

If a Member is not willing to vote to amend or repeal laws that have virtually wiped out the Bill of Rights and that are now causing trouble throughout the country then he had just as well stay on here until his time expires—next January.

The highest right a man has in this life is the right to work for his daily bread—without having to pay tribute. That right has been taken away by these laws of which the people now complain.

Patriotic Americans are not going to let this country go the way of France.

Remember the House passed the bill to correct this situation on December 3—4 days before the Pearl Harbor disaster.

It is still pending in the Senate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PATRIOTISM OF THE BASQUES

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the House passed a bill authorizing the Attorney General to cancel deportation proceedings against 60 Basque aliens. At that time much interest was manifested by Members of the House in that particular nationality.

Yesterday I received a letter from a constituent at Twin Falls, Idaho, advising me that a group of 19 Basques in that community had sent a draft for $780 to the War Department as a voluntary contribution for the purchase of war materials. These Basques are in no way related to those whose names were contained in that bill, but I am happy to call this incident to the attention of the House as an exemplification of the highest type of citizenship, and to give you a better understanding of the Basque people, who come from a province in northern Spain. They are numbered among the most patriotic citizens of my district, and are loyally supporting our Government in the prosecution of our war effort.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LABOR LEGISLATION

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I never thought I would become jealous of one of my colleagues. I so express that jealousy now. Here is an editorial from one of my home papers. It is part of a letter from a soldier from my district now stationed in the far South, in an army camp.

Representative RANKIN, who is from Mississippi, the State which has taken legal steps to stop interference with any man's right to work at a lawful vocation, shows his resentment at such attempts to discredit protests to Washington by attacking their source and gives the proper answer to them. Declaring that he is tired of insinuations that letters to Congressmen on labor matters are inspired by ulterior motives, RANKIN insists that the American people have a right to be heard and that among those who have been writing are "patriotic Americans whose boys are bleeding and dying because of lack of materials."

Then he goes on to say:

The soldier thinks Congressman RICH might be interested in seeking enactment of a similar law by Congress.

I want to say that the gentleman from Mississippi, JOHN RANKIN, will not go farther than that boy's own Congressman to enact legislation to stop strikes in defense industries, and I hope that the gentleman from Mississippi, JOHN RANKIN, will keep it up so that Congress and the President will get an inspiration here and we will adopt such legislation, and do it now. Now is the time to do it. We should not put it off any longer than is absolutely necessary. We must furnish ships, guns, ammunition, airplanes, and all other items of warfare to aid and assist our soldiers to win the war, and we must not permit anything to stop production. It is imperative and necessary to the winning of this war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

COAL MINERS IN PENNSYLVANIA

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in the county in which I live, there are approximately 25,000 coal miners who work in or about the coal mines. A good percent of them are Poles, Slovaks, Hungarians, Czechs, and Italians whose fathers and grandfathers came to this country between 1890 and 1910. They are among our most stable citizens. Many of them and practically all of their children have completed a high-school course.

Several thousand of these young men from this county enlisted in the Army,

Navy, or marines long before selective service went into effect. No groups in all the country are more loyal and more patriotic to our institutions and to our way of life than these men who work in the mines.

Speaking of cooperating with the Government, the coal miners in my district really cooperate. They obey the rules and regulations; yes, even the suggestions relative to the war program. When the Government asked them to conserve tires, they organized. These miners have to drive 2, 5, or 10 miles, and some of them 30 or 40 miles to work every day. They got together and made arrangements so that four or five or six would go in Joe's car today, in Jim's car tomorrow, and Mike's the next day, and so forth, in order to save oil, rubber, gas, and so forth.

This is an example that thousands of Government employees here in Washington should follow. If you will observe the traffic on the streets in the morning between 7:30 and 9, you will find that three out of every four cars have just one person in them.

You will find the coal miners in my district living up to the laws and suggestions of the President, Donald Nelson, and others who are in authority to issue suggestions in behalf of our war effort.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL of Washington. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article on taxes and loans and the war functions by Prof. Walter A. Morton, of the University of Wisconsin.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, one gentleman who preceded me spoke about the importance of getting at profiteering and racketeering. I think we could well focus major attention on these two things, and I think we ought to act about them without delay. There are some other problems that are also pressing and I want to point out one of them in particular.

Out in my State there is a group of men working for a shipbuilding company who have signed a petition, some thousand strong, asking to be permitted to work on Sundays without pay to themselves at all, provided only that their wages will be credited to them and paid by the company to the Government of the United States. Mr. Speaker, Members should think about this a little, because it has a lot to do with this question of the so-called 40-hour week, which really is a wage question and a question of who will get the benefit of the wages labor might lose, whether it is to be the companies or the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I have received from a boy in my district. It is one of the most exceptional letters I have ever received and it is the first letter I have inserted in the RECORD in 14 years. It has appealed to me to that extent.

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

There was no objection.

SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6868 making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes (Report No. 1956); and pending that I would like to reach an agreement as to time with the gentleman from New York. Would it be agreeable to the gentleman from New York if we had an hour on each side?

Mr. TABER. I believe we ought to have just a little more than that. I think if we had two hours and a half equally divided that it would take care of requests for time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that time for debate be limited to two hours and a half to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York and myself.

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

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARE. There are some members of the Appropriations Committee who will have to attend sessions of the committee during the consideration of this bill. Would it be possible for such a Member to file with the Clerk objections to certain sections of the bill on the ground they are not germane? And, if not, would it be possible to leave a motion to strike certain provisions from the bill and have that motion taken up in order regardless of whether the proponent were present or not?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Answering the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry the Chair will state that to present a motion the Member making it would have to be on the floor in person.

Mr. HARE. That is, he could not prepare his motion and leave it with the Clerk for consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Nothing in the rules of the House permits that type of procedure.

The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to two hours and a half, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York and himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

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. 6868, the sixth supplemental national defense appropriation bill, 1942, with Mr. BLAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the preservation of democratic government rests not merely on an intelligent electorate but upon an informed electorate. A people must be not only capable of self-government, but they must also be accurately informed.

Never has the Government labored under a heavier burden of misinformation and misapprehension than today—misapprehension as to the efficiency with which the war is being conducted, misapprehension as to the extent and success of our program of production, misapprehension as to the character and integrity of the service of the officials of the Government and of the Members of Congress in particular.

Under a barrage of propaganda the people are encouraged to believe that waste and needless spending are rampant and that fumbling inefficiency and abysmal stupidity are losing he war.

It is true that we are suffering heavy reverses—and will continue to suffer heavy reverses for some time to come—but that is to be expected. It is the result of conditions which should be apparent to everybody. We are attacked unexpectedly by two of the greatest military powers the world has ever seen. Under generations of compulsory military training they are inured to warfare and under carefully matured plans of conquest have accumulated through the last decade vast supplies of mechanized equipment while we have been lulled to sleep by dependence on international law and the assumption of continued peace. It would be absurd to expect instantaneous victories under such circumstances and yet there is in some quarters a national egotism which has always assumed that our untrained forces could spring overnight to arms which require years to manufacture and in 3 weeks subdue any nation which might challenge us. Now that the house of cards has fallen, partisans and professional sensationalists catering to the disillusioned resentment in these quarters have sedulously emphasized minor deficiencies and overlooked the notable accomplishments of the program until there is a widespread impression that the war is being mismanaged.

Of course, there have been mistakes and, of course, there has been profiteering. There always has been in time of

war and always will be. That is inevitable. We are spending the largest sum of money ever available in the history of the world. It is being administered by personnel aggregating hundreds of thousands. It is being dispensed in countless enterprises of gigantic dimensions and in activities which embrace every clime and touch every shore. Would anyone be so unreasonable as to expect 100 percent of accuracy and efficiency under such circumstances? Never before in any period of American history have there been so few errors and such integrity of administration in comparison with the magnitude of the task involved as there have been in the provision of men, money, and munitions for this war.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I am glad the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee is making the very excellent statement he is making. I believe the question I propose to ask him will lead right into his present position. The public does not seem to understand first that we were confronted with the task of converting a peace-loving nation from peacetime production to wartime production of all kinds of equipment. That is No. 1.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And in a very brief space of time.

Mr. MAY. Yes; in a very brief space of time. No. 2 is that this war has spread all over the world. Our supply lines are on an average of eight to ten thousand miles in length. The task is stupendous.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And one never before attempted on this gigantic scale by any people.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to suggest to the gentleman, following up his very excellent remarks, that in the first World War, although the United States sent approximately 3,000,000 men overseas, those men used almost altogether equipment, ammunition, and weapons which were made by other countries, including airplanes, whereas today the United States is called upon to supply not only our own armed forces but those of many other nations she is fighting with. So that our task is of tremendously greater consequence now than it was then.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman anticipates what I am just about to say and I am glad to have him emphasize it.

It is not a matter of any great concern, at least not of primary concern, that these indictments are being brought against those in charge of the war; but it is a matter of serious concern that the people of the country should be so far misled as to fail to understand the remarkable progress being made in the war program. Let me repeat that no legitimate criticism can be made of the manner in which money, men, and munitions are being provided for the prosecution of the war.

First, as to money, it should be a matter of gratification to every Member of the House and the Congress that we have provided every dollar required or which could be advantageously used.

Congress has provided every dollar required. Let any man rise in his place and point out a single estimate the denial of which has delayed or obstructed the program. There has been determined opposition—especially to the lease-lend appropriations which enabled us to get a 2 years' start in the development of production facilities. But be it said to the credit of all members of the committee on both sides of the aisle—the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] in particular—that the entire committee rallied at all times to the support of these crucial appropriations without which the Nation would today find itself in a tragic state of unpreparedness.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. May I offer this suggestion to the gentleman from Missouri: On the policy of lend-lease, there was, as he has stated, a great deal of controversy. But once that question was decided by a majority vote of the Congress, the gentleman is in error when he says that there was any particular controversy in regard to the appropriations to implement the lend-lease policy. I can remember of no controversy in that regard to speak of on either side of the aisle.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Throughout the country the policy was assailed even after it was approved. There was controversy on nearly every lease-lend appropriation that we presented to the House. Invariably amendments were offered to reduce the amounts in a way that would have seriously crippled the policy. But I repeat that the support of these crucial appropriation bills by all members of the Committee on Appropriations on both sides of the aisle, especially as viewed in the light of recent events, evinces the highest quality of statesmanship. Yet in all the flood of malodorous criticism sweeping the country today you find no mention of it.

Let us now consider the effectiveness with which these funds are being expended, first in the production of ordnance. When we went into the World War we were wholly lacking in high-powered artillery. And in all the 21 months we were in that war, we were never able to get any heavy artillery to the front. We had to depend throughout those 2 years upon the 75-millimeter guns supplied us by the French.

Let us contrast that with the situation today. Today our artillery is second to none in the field. And now in the fourth month of the war, as compared with the twenty-first month of the last war, we are turning out 90-millimeter and 105-millimeter guns at a rate and of a precision and efficiency that is gratifying to every man who is familiar with the situation.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. May I observe that even after we came out of the first World War, due to the clamor for peace, we demobilized our Army to the point where we had only about 165,000 men and officers in our Regular Establishment, with no military training, and when we entered upon this program we were confronted with the situation that we had no trained manpower in this country.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Today, the rapidity with which we are training personnel and the remarkable efficiency of our program of mobilization, late as it is in getting started, is in marked contrast and is a high tribute to those charged with its administration, not excepting the Members of Congress who made it possible.

Now as to tanks. In World War No. 1, notwithstanding an ambitious program for tank production, not a single American tank reached the front. Today modern tanks of the latest design are rumbling off the assembly lines in widely distributed centers of production by the thousand. While exact figures must be withheld, the War Production Board reports amazing increases in production and the President announces that the goal for tank production has been doubled. Donald Nelson, after witnessing exhaustive tests of both guns and tanks, expressed the opinion that they were the best in the world. That appraisal is more than borne out by the magnificent performance of these tanks in their baptism of fire upon the Libyan Desert.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I feel that this is one of the greatest utterances we have had since I have been in Congress. I was about to ask the gentleman if he would object to my suggesting the absence of a quorum. I think every Member of Congress ought to hear this speech.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I thank the gentleman and appreciate his cooperation, but time is of the essence this afternoon, and we have here the men who are to pass on this bill, and that is the essential consideration.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree with the gentleman from North Carolina that this is indeed a great address. I only regret that the Nation cannot hear the report the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is making.

I hope he will take occasion to take some of this information to the Nation in a Nation-wide broadcast of the facts that are being given here today.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The committee appreciates the gentleman's cooperation as we have appreciated his cooperation throughout the session, because he and every other Member of this House have had their indispensable part in this program of production.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman has correctly said that there are many things that we members of the Committee on

Appropriations who make these appropriations cannot say as far as numerical statements are concerned, but I wish the gentleman would include in his remarks as he goes along the statement that the amount of fighting planes we are producing today will send the fear of God into the hearts of our enemies.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to comply with the gentleman's suggestion as far as the military situation permits. Notwithstanding the charges that through inexcusable delay and parliamentary quibbling here in the House we are losing the war, as a matter of fact we are making a record in the production of all war equipment, and of planes in particular, that borders on the miraculous.

In the last World War, although we were already engaged in the manufacture of war planes for the Allies when we entered the war, with the exception of a few token machines, practically no American-built planes reached the front. In the twenty-first month of the war we were producing less than 2,000 planes a month, although the planes at that time were mere kites compared with the intricate mechanism which constitutes a plane today.

In the month of January, the second month of this war, in contrast with that record, we were producing vastly in excess of that rate, and production is rising at a rapidly accelerated speed.

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

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

Mr. HARE. Does not the gentleman, who is now the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, think that he should advise the House and the public that by reason of his position and by reason of the position of other members of the Committee on Appropriations he has been afforded an opportunity to obtain information from the military experts of the War Department that is not generally given to the country, and it is upon this information that he is today making general authoritative statements?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman himself is a member of this committee, a member who has rendered invaluable service in the development of the war program. As the gentleman has stated, very little of the testimony submitted to our committee could be printed. The hearings which we publish and which are released today are a bare skeleton. All statistical data necessarily have been taken out in order to avoid communication of confidential military information.

Eighty-seven of the 90 General Motors plants, all of the Ford and Chrysler plants, all Packard, Studebaker, Buick, Nash, Hudson, and Willys-Overland are now engaged in war production. Assembly lines have been adapted to mass production, and the number of planes produced borders on the miraculous. At full capacity 3 of the largest companies will be producing two and a half times the dollar value they did in the peak month of 1941. Day and night, from these rapidly moving assembly lines, we are turning out an ever-swelling stream of aircraft destined to win the war.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman knows very well that members of the Appropriations Committee and of the House Military Affairs Committee go down to the War Department every 2 weeks and get inside information and the graphs that are shown there show a gain in percentage of more than 100 percent in at least two-thirds of the items required to be produced as against 6 months ago.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As the gentleman has said, it is a very impressive showing. It is to be regretted that every Member of the Congress and every patriotic citizen of the country cannot have an opportunity to really understand the extent of the marvelous production which is being achieved through the efficiency, the hard work, the attention to duty, and the patriotism of officials in charge of the work, including Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, in both House and Senate, notwithstanding the calumnies daily uttered against us.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TERRY. I was very much interested in the very heartening statement the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has made in regard to the increase in production of our war munitions as reflected in the confidential communications made to the Appropriations Committee last week by the statistical officer of the War Department. I wish the people of the country generally could read the speech of the gentleman from Missouri, because I feel that the people of our country do not realize how the production program is increasing and gaining from day to day and month to month.

I feel, if they could hear the gentleman's statement, they would not have the jitters to the same extent they now seem to have them in regard to lack of production. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri to a pencil memorandum I found in my files in reference to the plane production of the other major countries of the world, which was given us at the time of the military hearings in the summer of 1937. We were asking the intelligence office of the War Department to give us, in round numbers, the number of planes the other nations had. According to this pencil memorandum, they told us that Great Britain had 5,633 planes, Russia 4,155, Italy 4,162, Germany 3,167, France 2,364, and Japan 2,292. This was in 1937.

Mr. MAY. Five years ago.

Mr. TERRY. When we speak now about 30,000 planes, and 60,000 planes, and 120,000 planes, the objective which we are trying to attain and which we will attain, it makes those figures of 4 or 5 years ago fade into insignificance.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad the gentleman has cited comparative statistics on American and foreign production. It may be of interest to note that the latest Japanese budget is one-tenth of our Budget for comparable expenditures, and that from information which we consider accurate, Germany's production of aircraft and ordnance has declined 15 percent. They have dropped to a production of 85 percent of capacity, due to matériel and personnel difficulties, whereas we are accelerating every day the production of war matériel of every character.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, your illuminating discussion of the productivity of this Nation as compared with other countries, from the standpoint of placing fighting craft in the air, brings to my mind a very interesting observation. I have talked within the last week to General Wong, who for many years has been a leader of the fighting air forces in China. He told me the disturbing news that China, as of today has only a few hundred fighting planes, whereas Japan, when it entered the conflict against the United States with an attack on Pearl Harbor, had approximately 6,000 fighting planes of all types. He made the further observation that had the Chinese Government possessed a few hundred additional fighting planes during these past few years, they could have more than held their own with the Japanese forces. Twelve to one was too great a ratio to overcome. The Chinese pilots are superior to Jap airmen, and they could have won battle after battle in the skies even though they had but 1 plane against 4 for the enemy.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, one of our first objectives is to supply our Allies with equipment. That is half the battle and, fortunately, our early provision of lend-lease facilities is contributing measurably to that end.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Briefly, if the gentleman will permit, as my time is limited.

Mr. KEAN. With reference to the splendid output the gentleman is speaking of, this would not have been possible, would it, without the splendid cooperation of labor?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true. It requires the cooperation of every group and every class. Every American citizen has his part in this common cause, and to the extent that any citizen does not attain 100-percent personal efficiency, to that extent we are failing to attain 100-percent national efficiency, and to that extent we are delaying the successful conclusion of the war. We must have 100 percent from industry, from labor, from agriculture, and from every group and individual in America.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I personally appreciate the splendid address the gentleman is making, and having supported all these appropriation bills and other bills for our defense program,

and believing that we are making splendid progress, and at the same time realizing there is a disturbing condition in the country which has been created by some effort, I wonder if the gentleman can tell us how they have given out the idea that our defense program is not moving along as it should.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is very simple. Undue emphasis is being placed on comparatively insignificant details, and no attention given of the magnificent progress that we are making in every line of war endeavor.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Is not the misinterpretation of the situation in the country by the people due very largely to the fact that this country has always lived upon the idea that we have never lost a war, and that we will not lose this war, and in the face of the fact we have been losing all of the battles so far, it has a tendency to create in the minds of the people a sort of hysteria which brings about the very thing with its flood of letters and telegrams?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is disillusioning to the average citizen who has been taught American omnipotence from the kindergarten up, to wake up to the realization that we cannot go out and lick the world in a couple of days. There are those who have capitalized that disillusioned resentment by fostering an impression of general failure and inefficiency not justified by the facts. All we have to do is to let the people know what is actually being done.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I join the gentleman from Missouri in giving deserved tribute to loyal labor, and to responsible unionism in this country. We have found these conditions in the aircraft industry and in other defense factories. I do feel, however, that we cannot escape the factual history of our aircraft production in this country during recent months. Although we want to look forward to a stepped-up industry, yet we must realize and recognize that at one time within the past year, one-fifth of our aircraft production was at a standstill, because of disastrous strikes. We must face that responsibility as Members of this body. Shame on those persons in management and labor who failed to cooperate for necessary production in our hour of need.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. NELSON. And may I just say that in my opinion this is one of the most heartening and helpful addresses that I have heard in this House. Reference has been made to the necessity for material, and I believe my colleague will agree with me that what we need today is to conserve all of our scrap for the use of our men on the fighting front, and to direct all of our scrapping against the common foe.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No better advice could be offered at this time. I trust the country will take it to heart.

Mr. Chairman, we are told that shipping is one of the bottlenecks, that it is useless to produce materials unless we can deliver them. I am happy to say that in the construction of ships we are more than keeping pace with the program. The merchant-ship tonnage program calls for the production of 8,000,000 deadweight tons in calendar 1942, and a minimum of 10,000,000 dead weight tons in calendar 1943, and I hope we can exceed that. The Navy is far ahead of its schedule in the construction of destroyers and all fighting craft, and materially in advance of the program laid down at the beginning of the war. The Maritime Commission is extending its program for the production of all cargo ships, and especially of oil tankers.

In every line of endeavor we are producing proficiently and expeditiously the mechanism of war and simultaneously we are training the men who are to use it.

Contrast the mobilization in the Spanish-American War, when we assembled a comparatively small number of men, and the huge hospital list of recruits in our home camps and the failure to provide fundamental necessities, with that of today, when we are nearing our objective of an army of 3,600,000 men in this calendar year, drawing young men suddenly from civil life and bringing them into new surroundings and strange conditions. There has not been one single justified criticism as to the ration, as to the clothing, as to the housing, or as to the training of this vast army of men so unexpectedly brought under arms. The mobilization of this great number of men, under difficult conditions, is proceeding with a smoothness and with a rapidity that is gratifying to every patriotic citizen.

Mr. NORRELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I would like to pay tribute to General Somervell, who is an Arkansas man, who has charge of the distribution.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I certainly join in the gentleman's commendation of General Somervell. In his line and station he is doing as great a work as General MacArthur in his line.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I appreciate the information the gentleman has brought to the House. He was speaking of the number of men who have been brought into training and under arms. Would the gentleman be divulging a military secret that he ought not to divulge if I should inquire the number of men that we now have in training in the various armed forces of the country, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. About 2,000,000 men.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman feel we will reach our objective of 3,600,000 in training in the Army during the present year?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The program is proceeding on schedule, and will be completed this calendar year.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The President a few months ago laid out in the Budget estimates a very ambitious and splendid program as to the number of planes, tanks, bombers, and so forth, that he had in mind to produce. Are we moving along so that we can reasonably hope that that schedule will be reached?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are not only moving along according to schedule but we are raising our sights. The President has just announced that he has increased his program by doubling the number of tanks which we expect to produce in a stated length of time. We are increasing the magnitude of our program, and every day we are making material progress toward its realization

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The country is tremendously interested in our program for planes and bombers. Is that moving along satisfactorily?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The statistics, if they could be made public, would satisfy anyone who has any doubt whatsoever as to the progress being made in the production of all types of aircraft.

Now, notwithstanding this magnificent record of unbroken success and progress, there is a spirit of criticism abroad in the land which is expressed by a letter I have received and which I will read. I am glad to say it is not from my district, and not from my State. It illustrates a state of mind found in the country, due entirely, I think, to misinformation. Here it is:

> DEAR SIR: We are getting a little tired of the shallow thinking and boondoggling inaction of some of you "saps" in Congress. Politics is controlling the Army and Navy. Selfish groups are sabotaging industry. Production is bogging down. In short, you are losing the war.
>
> We are paying out taxes, registering for defense duties, sending our boys to camp, and doing it cheerfully, but we would like to feel that we have leadership in Congress from honest men and not a bunch of cheap petty grafters who are taking advantage of the times to feather their own nests and dissipate the Nation's resources.

In answer to an all-too-prevalent frame of mind, of which this letter is an expression, I want to call attention to incontrovertible evidence of the integrity and self-abnegation of Members of Congress.

For more than 150 years congressional salaries have been exempt from State taxation. They would have remained so indefinitely had not Congress, of its own motion, without pressure from any source, voluntarily rescinded that exemption and subjected every Member of this House to taxation by his State.

Every Member of this House paid a vastly increased tax this year when he paid his State income tax, and it was done voluntarily. Yet, in face of that indubitable fact they charge that Members of Congress want to feather their own nests at the expense of the country.

Let me call your attention to another instance just as conclusive. Since the

establishment of this Government, at every census period, in order to prevent any State from losing representation and to save any Member of the House from having to run at large, Congress fixed the apportionment at a point where no State would lose Representatives. That has been going on ever since the establishment of the Government. There has only been one instance—in 1840—where they failed to increase the size of the House. We have at the present time only 435 Members in the House, whereas the British House of Commons, representing a much smaller constituency, has over 600 members. We could have gone along as usual amply justified in increasing the membership in order to protect the Members from expense and inconvenience at loss of seat.

The decision to reduce the membership and to increase the apportionment means financial loss and inconvenience to every Member and yet the vote on the change was practically unanimous. Oh, they say a Member will stoop to any venality; will sacrifice any principle in order to hold his seat in Congress. Why, this Congress patriotically, of its own volition, refused for the first time in a hundred years to increase the membership; and still we are charged with a desire to profit at public expense.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate very much the fine address the gentleman is making. I think it is something that should have been said by many of us perhaps before now. With reference to State taxes paid by Members of Congress, I think it has been the gentleman's experience, as it has been mine, that the people back home frequently think that Members of Congress are exempt from paying the Federal income tax. I think it should appear in the gentleman's remarks at this point that we also pay the Federal income tax.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And the amount of the Federal income tax paid by Members of Congress is considerably more than that paid by the average person with like income. Not only do we pay the income tax but we are allowed less exemption than any other citizen of the United States. Others are allowed to deduct legitimate expenses, but a Member of Congress cannot deduct the legitimate expenses of his service or his election.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Commander VAN ZANDT.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that members of State legislatures are permitted to deduct for income tax purposes the cost of living in the capital city of their State whereas we Members of Congress are not accorded the same privilege in regard to the cost of living in Washington.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true. Members of Congress have constantly denied themselves special privilege, and especially in connection with financial gain.

Then, when the legislative appropriation bill came up, the bill that pays our household expenses for the legislative establishment, we voluntarily and with no suggestion from the executive branch reduced the amount by $2,000,000, as against comparable amounts of the current year. We are not only economical with everybody else but we have been especially economical with ourselves.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I am afraid the gentleman's remarks that we reduced household expenses may be subject to misinterpretation by uninformed people. The gentleman has reference to the expenses of the legislative branch, not our own personal households.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad the gentleman differentiates. There is a widespread belief that Members of Congress charge many items to the Public Treasury. We are supposed to get free service in the barber shops, free service in the restaurants, and many other emoluments, when, as a matter of fact, we pay for this service in full and at current rates.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is appropriately discussing the subject of membership responsibility in this House. There are mistaken ideas which are prevalent in our districts as to certain expenses the Government pays for us. I find in my district a great many persons believe that Members of Congress can take the phone and call back to their constituents 200 miles away, or 2,000 miles away, and that the toll charges are paid for by the Federal Government. Every such call that goes beyond the confines of the Nation's Capital is paid for by the Member himself, even though such call be on strictly governmental business.

I do not wish to make an unfair comparison, but I do feel that it is appropriate and important to state that thousands of appointive officers of the Government here in Washington and back in our districts freely use the phone in transaction of Federal business.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The point is well raised by the gentleman. You may call up anybody over long distance, but at the end of the month it will be on your bill and there will not only be the charge for the telephone call but you will pay in addition the Government tax on the call. As a further evidence of the economical attitude of Congress, I call attention to the retrenchment in nondefense expenditures effected in this session.

You would think from reading some of the mail that Members of Congress take delight in spending money on the least provocation or on no provocation at all when, as a matter of fact, we have decreased this year a number of these funds.

The reductions in 1942 nondefense appropriations on the basis of the regular annual bills as passed by the House so far this session, including the Interior bill as reported to the House, is approximately $600,000,000. In addition the sums to be advanced by the R. F. C. for loans for F. S. A., R. E. A., and Farm Tenancy are decreased by $165,000,000.

On the basis of the reductions submitted by the President in the 1943 Budget, which have not yet been considered by Congress, the decrease on nondefense appropriations (exclusive of statutory public debt and retirement fund requirements) will exceed $1,250,000,000.

The House at this session, on all appropriation bills (defense and nondefense), including the Interior bill and the Sixth Supplemental National Defense as reported, has reduced the Budget estimates by approximately $500,000,000. In addition to this sum there has been effected a decrease of $20,000,000 in the amount of the Budget estimates for funds to be advanced by the R. F. C. for loans.

In this connection, I want to read a paragraph from one of the many syndicated columns which go out every week, in which this statement is made:

> For a manifestation of the wholesome effect of this beat-some-sense-into-your-Congressmen campaign had, you need look no further than the RECORD of the House of Representatives in considering the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

Here is a complete misrepresentation of the action of the House on the bill. The reason for the cuts in this bill have been persistently ignored and overlocked or misrepresented in every report that has gone out from Washington. The fact is that the cuts made in the agricultural appropriation bill were made on the recommendation and demand of the agricultural organizations themselves. There was not a single cut in that huge bill that was not recommended and insisted upon by the Farm Bureau and other farm organizations. And on the other hand, there was not an item in that bill which they recommended be kept there that was not kept there in toto. That retrenchment was not in response to any beat-some-sense-into-your-Congressman campaign. It was done because the farmers of this country, with highest patriotism announced to us that they were satisfied with bare parity, and insisted upon the cutting of nonessential items in the bill.

And last, because my time is about to expire, let me call attention to the fact that the irregularities, errors of judgment, and instances of profiteering featured in the charges against Congress have without exception been uncovered by Congress itself acting through its committees of investigation. Instances of this character are unavoidable but Congress itself is taking every precaution to bring them to light and punish and eliminate them.

We are confronted by a prodigious job. It is everybody's job. We must have the cooperation of all to win. But let us take heart. The way is long and dark but it leads to victory—to enduring peace—the greatest heritage we can leave to those yet to come.

The bill before us falls into three categories, and is submitted in three titles,

one making provision for the Army, one for the Navy, and the other for general appropriations.

Under the naval title little may be said publicly. The total is $825,924,000, including $125,000,000 of contractual authority, the latter all being for ordnance purposes. Of the direct appropriations, the bulk of the money falls under the ordnance and aviation heads. Ordnance comprises many different projects, all of a material nature. The larger part of the aviation money falls under two projects, namely, radio equipment and the expansion of production facilities.

The military portion of the bill is explained in such detail as circumstances warrant, commencing on page 5 of the report.

The estimates amount to $17,579,311,258.

The need may be said to be responsive to five major factors, namely, personnel, aviation, maintenance and operation, storage and shipping facilities, defense aid.

The build-up has already begun of the enlisted strength The present objective is roundly 3,600,000 men by the end of the calendar year. That is about double the present number. By July it is hoped to have half of the increase in the service. That means additional amounts for pay, subsistence, transportation, and training to the end of the fiscal year, and it means provision to have housing available for the whole number as and when they enter the service. The cost for all is approximately $2,050,000,000.

You will recall that we provided for outfitting and implementing the larger force just a few weeks ago in the fifth supplemental defense bill.

On the aviation side, the estimates call for the second increment of planes looking to a peak production rate of 125,000 airplanes during the calendar year 1943. We provided for the first increment of 33,000 airplanes in the fourth supplemental defense bill. The next and final increment will come along in the regular 1943 bill.

This growing aviation program means a large organization expansion, additional ground facilities, more pilots, and hence more training facilities, and more mechanics and radiomen. It is a tremendous program. It means an outlay of around $10,670,000,000. The airplane part is $6,990,000,000.

For maintenance and operation incident to actual war participation and otherwise, including a number of miscellaneous projects, the allocation is approximately $2,050,000,000.

For storage and shipping facilities, and both are becoming increasingly difficult problems, the estimates call for $450,000,000.

Lastly, for Defense Aid, the allocation is $2,220,000,000. Seventeen billion two hundred and fifty million dollars has been made available heretofore for the transfer of defense articles, information, and services chargeable against War Department appropriations.

You will note on page 5 of the report that we have gone along with the estimates, insofar as money is concerned, in all but 4 instances. On page 5 we list the changes, and, commencing on page 7, we state the reasons I shall not dwell upon them. I might tell you, though, that the Army Specialist Corps is a new venture. It has not been authorized by law. The President has sanctioned its creation, but it needs funds in order to function. It was described to us as a corps of civilian specialists, from artisans and nontechnical specialists to scientists and professional men, who would serve at home and abroad in special fields as civilians. They would be provided with a distinctive uniform, or, at least, required to wear one. It would be a quasi-military group. The number might ultimately reach 150,000. The pay would range from $2,300 to $8,000.

We have eliminated provision for this corps. In the first place, we do not have jurisdiction. In the second place, the idea of a quasi-military outfit did not have much appeal. If they need such character of service, we felt that they should get it either by taking men possessing the qualifications required into the Army in the manner provided by law or by employing such persons as civilians, by contract or otherwise.

The truth is, this sort of a proposition should have been presented to the military legislative committee.

That covers, I should say, the salient features of the War Department title.

I should like to stress this point, Mr. Chairman. We had rather exhaustive testimony on and off the record. That part on the record has been painstakingly edited. Practically all of the meat is gone. We have a bare skeleton left. So, we must be careful about using publicly facts and figures which we may think are in the record, but which, for military reasons, the Department's agents have removed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is now just a little over 3 weeks since the Appropriations Committee has had pending a bill for the appropriating of funds for national defense. That is a little longer than the usual period—perhaps it is a little longer than we can expect in days to come—because the United States is engaged in a struggle, the like of which we have never known, and I hope we will never know again—a struggle for our very existence.

I appreciate the things that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has said about me and about the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS]. May I say that the gentleman from Missouri and many of those who have assisted him on his own side of the aisle have stood for all needed appropriations for national defense all along. There has been no partisanship in that matter; there has been nothing but a sincere feeling on the part of all of us that we must do those things which would protect the United States of America, and this we have felt impelled to do many times, regardless of what the political repercussions might be.

Before Pearl Harbor, however, there were three or four groups in this country: There were those who wanted to amend the Neutrality Act; there were those who wanted to pass the Lease-Lend Act and say to our people that those things would keep us out of war; there were those who felt that the passing of those two types of bills were bound to get us into war and that we should not tell the people something that we did not believe ourselves; there were those, on the other hand, who felt that it was possible to keep the country out of this war. Frankly, I belonged to that second group. I did not feel that it was possible to keep this country out of the war. I knew that the passage of those bills would not keep us out, and I never told my people that I thought we could be kept out of the war, because I did not believe it myself. I blame nobody for our being in. It took some people back home a little while to get out of their heads the idea that we were going to be kept out of the war, but now I think the whole United States is aroused to the necessity of prosecuting this war to the utmost.

I do think that there is a feeling on the part of a very large number of people that there should be better cooperation on the part of those in authority—on the part of the President of the United States himself—with the defense program. There are many people who feel that the retention of Madam Perkins in the office of Secretary of Labor is against the interests of national defense, and these people include members of the labor unions, as well as others. There are many who believe that some of the operations of the N. L. R. B. and the wage-hour outfit are against the interests of national defense. There are many people who believe that the tribute that is levied upon those who work in defense plants and on Government work, where they are obliged to pay a tribute of from $75 to $1,000 in many cases for the privilege of joining a union before they are permitted to work, is against the interests of national defense.

I am going to recite an instance that, to my mind, is absolutely against the interest of national defense, an instance that is typical of many of those that exist throughout the country, one of those that, to my mind, must absolutely be corrected.

A week ago Monday the Navy Department desired to ship from a place in Rhode Island to one of the embarkation points along the coast a very considerable distance, calling for travel through New York City, some very heavy things. There was a strike on that prevented the obtaining of a truck to handle the material. The Government finally commandeered a truck and loaded it with all this material to carry down to the embarkation point. They put a man on to drive, and accompanied him with uniformed men of the Marine Corps.

These men got down to the borders of New York City, and the union there would not let them pass through the city. They were obliged to unload that truck and put the material on another one before they were permitted to go on. As a result, hours and hours of the men of

the Navy were lost, and it was with the utmost difficulty that this material was delivered to the port of embarkation on time.

If those who represent labor unions think they are helping to clear up this situation and promote national unity by the promotion of such performances and such operations, it is time they wake up and begin to realize that the people of America want cooperation with the national defense program. Our production is better than it was; yes, but I wish that that production were double what it is today. I wish we could have the cooperation of industry and labor wholeheartedly and devotedly. The members of many committees of the Congress have been working for months and months many hours beyond what might normally be expected to be spent. I wish this spirit could permeate the whole of America and that we could rise to the point where we were supplying every tank and every plane and every ship that is needed for the prosecution of this war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I hope the President of the United States, this Congress, and those in authority will cooperate to get that situation in shape, so that we shall not have to hang our heads.

Regardless of how well we are going, regardless of what we are doing, we are confronted with the announcement of Prime Minister Churchill the day before yesterday that the battle of the Atlantic is not going as good as it ought to. What does this mean? It means that we must spur every bit of effort that is going on, we must drive it to the point where it is producing results and America is able to win the ultimate victory.

I am not going to spend much time on this bill. The deficiency committee, with reference to the deficiency items in the bill, has brought in here cuts that in almost every instance are deep enough to satisfy me, and that is going awfully strong. I have no excuse for coming out here and offering amendments to cut down these items. The committee did a good job on the bill.

As to the military and naval items, it was found necessary to cut out some of the recommendations for things that are not needed for national defense, like moving-picture cameras to put on shows for the civilian population. The civilian population does not need to have frills and extras to keep up their morale. They will do that by themselves. The committee was unanimous in cutting out such items.

With reference to the Army, it was estimating what we thought to be too large a figure on some of the post construction. We had estimates from the Coast Guard for about $1,000 a man on some of this post construction, and from the Army for $1,250 at the same time, and we thought there was a little inconsistency there. As a result, we made some trimmings on things of that kind, which I do not believe will hurt the Army but will improve their operations and construction.

No items have been cut that in my opinion militate against the successful development and prosecution of the war.

God knows there will be waste, there will be terrible waste in this thing; there will be waste, no matter what anybody does. There is no way to stop it. The figures are absolutely staggering, but what we are up against in the world is absolutely staggering.

The situation confronting America today is the most desperate in her history. We have to go down the line; we have to supply what is needed. I, for my part, propose to continue, as I have in the past, to supply the sinews of war for the boys who are fighting our battles, to see that they are not left to go into battle without the very best we are able to give them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PETERSON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, when the war powers bill was being considered by this body a few days ago an amendment to that measure was offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the effect of which was to modify the 40-hour provision of the labor laws for the duration of the present emergency so as to permit an employee to work over 40 hours a week, if he desired to do so, without charging any more per hour for the time he works above 40 hours than he charges for his services per hour under 40 hours.

As the law now stands, no laborer can do this without violating the law and making himself subject to the penalties provided for such violation of the law.

I was dumfounded when only 62 Members of this body voted for this amendment.

I am surprised that our President does not favor it.

At the time I stated that this vote of the majority in defeating this amendment did not reflect the sentiment of the majority of American labor or the sentiment of the overwhelming majority of the American people. I am even stronger now in that conviction.

The issue involved in this proposal is clear and elementary. And before we go any further with our war activities it should be definitely determined as to the course Congress, the President, and our country are going to adopt on this issue for the duration of the emergency.

This should be done in justice to our boys whom we, Congress and the President, are forcing, through compulsory military conscription laws, to fight and die on far-flung battlefields scattered throughout the four corners of the earth. It should be done in justice to the mothers and fathers, from whom we, Congress and the President, have not asked but demanded, through stern Federal compulsory military conscription laws, the gift of their most precious possessions, the crown jewels of their homes, their young sons, even before they have tasted the sweet fruits of mature manhood, to give their lives not for 40 hours a week but for every hour of every day of every year so long as the war lasts. To many thousands this demand will mean broken bodies and crippled limbs for the remainder of their lives. To many thousands more this demand will mean their lives not for the duration only but for eternity. To these the fruits of the war will mean nothing. The Members of this Congress and the President will have demanded that they die in order that we may live.

These boys are dying and fighting and serving because the majority of the Members of this body have by Federal compulsory military conscription laws, adopted by us, demanded that they die and fight and serve. A large portion of these boys could not even vote. They were not organized. They were innocent of the pressure practices of politics. Most of them are not old enough to even have any mature idea of the meaning of our complex form of government or the underlying economic issues which have brought on this dreadful war. And it is a dreadful war primarily because these boys are being killed and wounded.

If these boys had been as strongly organized as the C. I. O. or the A. F. of L. and if they had a John L. Lewis and a William Green as well as millions of dollars at their command and could have defended themselves against compulsory military service legislation as forcefully as organized labor is defending itself against modification of the 40-hour week and the other special privileges and benefits it is now enjoying during this grave period of national emergency I wonder how many of us would have voted for the Compulsory Military Service Act. I am wondering also what the attitude of the President of the United States would have been toward this legislation.

We likewise adopted the 40-hour law making it a crime for a man to work for more than 40 hours a week without receiving special compensation for such additional service. And the President approved it. We passed this law in order to help give jobs and comfort to American laborers and American families. We passed it to relieve unemployment, because there were more laborers than there were jobs. We passed it to remedy an economic condition that does not now exist and at a time when there was no great national emergency or grave threat to the very life of our Nation.

Now we are demanding of our American boys that they give their lives in military service. At the same time we are refusing to even permit, much less demand, American laborers to voluntarily give up any of the special privileges and benefits which we gave them in time of their need even though the necessity for such special privileges does not now exist. And from newspaper reports the President of the United States, who with us has decreed that our boys must if needs be die for their country, seems to strongly oppose any legislation which would merely permit laborers to voluntarily work for their country.

Mr. Chairman, how can Congress and the President justify before man and God this attitude?

I know that the arguments about profits of capital and huge salaries and private greed enter into the picture, but they are in this instance largely weapons of selfish groups to becloud the real issue.

Congress and the President did not bring forth these arguments when we

ordained through compulsory military service that our boys fight and die. And certainly the life of a young boy is as dear and as sacred to him as the 40-hour week is to the man laboring in industry.

Profit, greed, and avarice have always existed. They always will. There is plenty of time to pass laws dealing with these matters and I understand that the Naval Affairs Committee of the House is now holding hearings on legislation that does deal with these problems. I hope the Naval Affairs Committee will give us a bill that will remedy these undesirable conditions and include in their bill modification of the 40-hour-labor law for the period of the emergency.

The real issue, as I have stated, is plain and elementary.

Shall Congress and the President of the United States continue to demand compulsory military service of the youth of this country and at the same time continue to make it a crime for a man not in military service to voluntarily labor for over 40 hours per week without receiving special favors and benefits at the hands of the Government?

The membership of this body know what we should do. The truth is that we know our duty but it seems that some of us are afraid to do our duty. We know this law should be modified.

Suppose that the majority of our boys in the armed forces displayed the same degree of fear in meeting the enemy as we are displaying in meeting this issue?

Is our war effort a puny effort of cowardice? If so can we expect any more of the American boys who are fighting our battles?

This issue has been clearly presented in legislation now pending before the Judiciary Committee of this House of which the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] who is also an outstanding American citizen, is chairman. It is simple legislation and can be easily and speedily acted upon by that committee and brought before this body. This should be done without delay. And every Member of this body should have courage to go on record on this issue. Let your constituency know how you stand. Let the American people know how you stand. And let the boys who you voted to conscript and who even now are dying on battlefields in foreign lands because of your vote know how you stand. The American people are demanding action and we should act without delay.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, the final outcome of this war hinges upon our ability to produce and deliver to our fighting forces with the utmost speed and in enormous quantities implements, machines, and munitions of war. The duty to produce and deliver such equipment rests upon all of us and is one in the performance of which industry and labor share equal responsibility. To attain this goal without sacrifices on the part of every man and woman in this country is impossible. The job to be done is a monumental one, involving the creation of something like $150,000,000,000 of matériel, and one which must be completed during the next 18 months. Both war production and the supply of civilian necessities must be maintained. They add up to a volume of industrial production that has never before been approached.

To achieve this objective is more than a problem of creative technology; it is a matter of achieving unprecedented productivity with the men and machines we have on hand—

According to a recent study in the March 1942 issue of Fortune magazine.

The present program for war industry calls for production of something like $65,000,000,000 of matériel during the 18 months between January 1942 and July 1943. Translating this into man-hours, according to the common formula of $1 of production for each man-hour of work, this means United States industrial labor will be required to supply in this period 65,000,000,000 man-hours of work for the war effort. Making a very liberal estimate of all industrial labor now available, both in and out of jobs, we have 20,000,000 workers. If these were all to work 50 hours a week, 50 weeks a year, they could work only 75,000,000,000 man-hours in 18 months, which is only 10,000,000,000 in excess of the theoretical war-industry requirement, without taking care of any civilian industrial necessities. Actually, our labor force could not work that much in war industry for the period as a whole, because the change-over to new jobs now in progress is necessarily a slow and gradual job. To meet the war program, plus supplying civilian needs at the lowest level of the last depression, we must increase our industrial productivity by at least 50 percent. That is, we must achieve a man-hour that turns out $1.50 in goods instead of our present $1 man-hour.

In other words, with 20,000,000 men working, our production must be one and one-half times as great as it is in normal times. That is impossible under the 40-hour workweek; it is equally impossible under a much longer week if strikes are allowed to continue. The House of Representatives passed the antistrike bill early in December 1941 and sent it to the Senate, where it still remains. I wish that body would act on it, for now, more than ever before, we need and must have definite assurance that there will and can be no more delays in the production of articles and implements of war.

A few days ago some of us undertook to amend the 40-hour-week laws so as to suspend their operation in war industries during this critical time of national danger. Basic wage rates for normal working time were not involved in the amendment—only hours, days, and weeks, and the amendment applied simply to defense industries. When the vote was announced, however, we were able to secure only 62 votes in favor of this proposal, while the opposition received 226. All of us know the situation confronting the American people; we know that it is utterly impossible for us to secure the needed production unless men work longer hours. Naturally, I am disappointed that our proposal to permit the increase of man-hours so absolutely essential to secure such production failed of enactment. My only son is a corporal in the United States Army, drawing a small salary each month; my ony son-in-law is likewise in the Army. Each of them, like the sons of countless thousands of our citizens, will be expected to work unlimited periods of time and they will gladly do so—without complaint and without thought of normal working weeks. It seems to me that men engaged in the production of weapons and munitions of war, a job of equal importance with the work done by our armed forces, should not be unwilling—and I cannot believe they are—also, to make sacrifices by working longer periods than 40 hours a week, especially since they are well paid for their labor and do not have to face the dangers and horrors of battle.

Basically, the 40-hour-week laws were passed so as to divide and distribute work in a time of economic depression, to make it possible for normal production to be done by a greater number of workers. The need for that is past. There is more work now than can be done, and for our success each individual worker is obliged to produce more than heretofore. Of course, men are not expected to work 24 hours per day each day in the week. The impossible is not asked; nor are factory workers asked to work so long as to endanger their health or reduce their efficiency. Continuous production each day in the week for an unreasonable number of hours each day would put foremen, supervisors, and workers under a dangerous strain. We cannot, however, falter in our duty to make the maximum use of each hour in each day for as many hours and days as yield advantageous and profitable productivity.

I am confident that every worker would be more than willing to work longer hours and to make every necessary sacrifice if he knew that victory depended upon greater efforts by him. The difficulties lie in the necessity for management to pay overtime after the 40 hours maximum have been worked each week. Labor can, if it wishes, hold out for better pay and larger pay envelopes; it can strike or slacken work, but it must not forget that fatter pay envelopes and slackened work will eventually yield poor returns. With the cost of labor high, the cost of fabricated articles will increase. With consumer goods scarce, prices will be pushed still higher. Standards of living necessarily will be reduced and in the end workers will not have been the gainers.

I was talking this week to a very dear friend—a friend I have known since his childhood; a flyer who, along with his brother, another flyer, has indelibly written his name in the history of aviation; they are extraordinary men, humble, brave, glorious—who has been fighting in a flying fortress nearly 50 hours a week almost from the beginning of this war, in Java, Bali, Celebes, the Straits of Macassar, and other Pacific waters. The first thing that this man said to me was, "Please send us more planes." He was not complaining of long hours nor of danger; all he wanted was the tools with which to work, tools that must be supplied by industrial workers in quantities sufficient to enable him and his brothers in arms to fight their best for us upon the field of battle. I assured him I would do my best to grant his wish, and I shall do my best. But we must not fool ourselves; we cannot secure maximum production until the workers in the factory give longer hours to the fabrication of the weapons that are needed. I am

not against labor. I have always been the friend of labor, and I am still the friend of labor; I want every man who works to secure a good wage, and I want him to work under good conditions, but I do believe that in times like these all of us should make every possible effort to bring into existence and deliver the ships, the weapons, the munitions, and the host of other articles that our boys in the field so sorely need in their fight to protect and preserve this Nation.

I believe, first, that every man within given age limits should be treated exactly alike, the well circumstanced married and the unmarried; of course, a man in an industry necessary to war production or to the support of the war effort should not be molested; and second, that no one should be deferred from armed service unless his occupation is one that is essential to war production, and there is no one to take his place on the production line. We have had several Members of Congress between the ages of 30 and 40 years who have relinquished the high position they occupied to take their places in the armed forces of the country, because they felt that men of their ages were needed there.

Hon. FRANCES E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania.

Hon. EUGENE WORLEY, of Texas.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington.

Hon. ALBERT VREELAND, of New Jersey.

Hon. FRANK C. OSMERS, of New Jersey.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas

A grateful people will always honor them.

We cannot win this war, and work, and live, and carry on our lives as usual. Self-sacrifice is necessary, and labor and industry alike must make it. Our boys in Ireland, Australia, the Philippines, and elsewhere, who are fighting and dying for this Nation, are depending upon us at home to give and deliver them the weapons, the munitions, and the equipment necessary for them to carry on. They are not bemoaning their fate nor bewailing the fact they are on the firing line, facing guns and superior forces of the enemy; they are not worrying about their standards of living; they do not strike; they are humbly, bravely making the sacrifices of the soldier. It certainly does not help their morale to know that there are those who are holding up production for bigger and more fabulous profits, and others striking for higher wages or protesting against an increase in working hours. It is high time that both labor and business give up some of their gains.

Congress too, must do its share. Our Constitution imposes upon Congress the responsibility of providing an army and a navy, and armies and navies that are not effective are worthless. Now of all times, Congress should have its own corps of independent experts to acquaint it fully with our military and naval necessities. Public opinion should force both House and Senate to provide themselves continuously with learned and capable men in the fields of science, industry, and military affairs to advise them upon questions of weapons, technique, and policy. Congress should know the military and naval weapons that should be produced in quantity and supplied to our sons in the field of action and do its part in seeing that they are produced and delivered.

We are at war—the greatest war of all time—a war of such scope and such proportions that no man can comprehend fully its final implications; a World War to which our War between the States and World War No. 1 were mere preliminary skirmishes paving the way for this limitless conflict—a war that will take the whole time and effort of every citizen to win—a war whch I fear will be fraught with many discouraging reverses on many fronts before we shall be able to bring our full industrial might to bear and crush those powers who have challenged the right of democratic peoples to live their own lives in their own way.

Victory with no unavoidable delay is what we should strive for, strive to the utmost, because I know you fear, as I do, not that we shall not be victorious, but that if this war continues many years our victory may be a hollow one with little left to salvage; with nothing much on earth but human misery and chaos. Our battle front is both at home and abroad; in every factory, in every office, in every home there is work to be done, sacrifices to be made by all of us. I am sure that the American people will rise to the occasion, cheerfully, courageously, wholeheartedly, that as surely as our brave men now fighting for us in the air, on the ground, and on and under the seas will eventually triumph on the battle lines, so we too shall fight and win the battle of the production lines.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries a total of $18,302,000,000, of which $145,000,000 is in contract authorizations. It compares with Budget estimates of $18,537,000,000, of which $150,000,000 is in contract authorizations, or a reduction over-all, as compared with Budget estimates, of about $236,000,000.

Of the total, about $17,376,000,000 is for the Army, about $821,000,000 for the Navy, and about $105,000,000 for other agencies.

This is the fourteenth appropriation bill to be considered by this House since December 4 last, those bills aggregating, including the present one, about $93,571,000,000.

The bill forms part of the picture which you will find on page 4 of the committee report. The table on that page indicates that for the 3 fiscal years commencing July 1, 1940, as of March 23, 1942, appropriations, contract authorizations, and pending recommendations for war purposes alone amount to the stupendous over-all total of over $160,889,000,000, exclusive of loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I am wondering if the gentleman would not get permission to put that table, which is on page 4 of the report, in the RECORD.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I shall be very glad, under leave to extend my remarks, to insert the table at this point in the RECORD:

The following table includes the amounts in this bill on the basis of the Budget estimates submitted therefor. However, the reductions effected in the Budget estimates for the bill by the committee do not equal an amount which would bring the round total below $160,000,000,000.

Appropriations, contract authorizations, and recommendations for national defense fiscal years 1941, 1942, and 1943 (as of Mar. 23, 1942)

	Army	Navy (including Coast Guard)	Other agencies (including Lend-Lease)	Total
Fiscal year 1941:				
Appropriations enacted	$8,483,708,258	$3,629,233,790	$8,338,531,608	$20,451,474,656
Contract authorizations enacted	5,006,589,651	871,769,817	389,000,000	6,267,359,468
Subtotal	13,490,298,609	4,501,003,607	8,727,531,908	26,718,834,124
Deduct appropriations included above to liquidate contract authorizations [1]	352,093,444	86,647,100	221,500,000	660,240,544
Net total 1941	13,138,205,165	4,414,356,507	8,506,031,908	26,058,593,580
Fiscal year 1942:				
Appropriations enacted	58,033,709,528	16,726,202,466	16,360,557,082	91,120,469,076
Contract authorizations enacted	183,145,695	687,818,894	3,791,000,000	4,661,964,589
Supplemental items:				
Appropriations	17,579,311,253	700,974,000	36,185,457	18,316,470,710
Contract authorizations		25,000,000	25,400,000	50,400,000
Subtotal	75,796,166,476	18,139,995,360	20,213,142,539	114,149,304,375
Deduct appropriations included above to liquidate contract authorizations [2]	4,276,580,695	615,453,690	354,111,226	5,246,145,611
Net total 1942	71,519,585,781	17,524,541,670	19,859,031,313	108,903,158,764
Fiscal year 1943:				
Appropriations recommended in 1943 Budget	[3] 5,468,091,747	[4] 14,047,891,674	[5] 1,323,161,955	20,839,145,376
Contract authorizations recommended in 1943 Budget		[4] 500,000,000	90,000,000	590,000,000
Supplemental items: Appropriations			2,913,417	2,913,417
Subtotal	5,468,091,747	14,547,891,674	1,416,075,372	21,432,058,793

[1] Includes liquidations of 1940 and prior contract authorizations, as follows: Army, $156,921,988; Navy, $58,087,100 other agencies—Maritime Commission, $144,500,000.

[2] Includes liquidation of 1940 contract authorizations for Army of $12,382,500, and for Maritime Commission, $95,981,258.

[3] Exclusive of $920,000,000 originally recommended in Budget for 1943 appropriation, now appropriated in Public Law 474 as 1942 to liquidate 1941 and 1942 contract authorizations.

[4] 1943 Naval Appropriation Act, Public Law 441.

[5] Includes items in 1943 independent offices, Department of Justice, State, Commerce, and War Department (civil functions) Appropriation Acts as passed the House.

Appropriations, contract authorizations, and recommendations for national defense fiscal years 1941, 1942, and 1943 (as of Mar. 23, 1942)—Continued

	Army	Navy (including Coast Guard)	Other agencies (including Lend-Lease)	Total
Deduct appropriations included above to liquidate contract authorizations	[3] $730, 365, 695	$825, 575, 021	$1, 085, 177, 184	$2, 641, 117, 900
Net total, 1943	4, 737, 726, 052	13, 722, 316, 653	330, 898, 188	18, 790, 940, 893
Net total, 1941, 1942, and 1943	89, 395, 516, 998	35, 661, 214, 830	28, 695, 961, 409	153, 752, 693, 237
Estimated appropriations required beyond 1943 to complete construction of the expanded Navy				7, 137, 021, 018
Total				160, 889, 714, 255

[3] Exclusive of $920,000,000 originally recommenned in Budget for 1943 appropriation, now appropriated in Public Law 474 as 1942 to liquidate 1941 and 1942 contract authorizations.

The Members will note that the over-all total of over $160,889,000,000 shows about $89,395,000,000 for the Army, about $42,798,000,000 for the Navy, and about $28,695,000,000 for other defense agencies.

I want to call attention also, Mr. Chairman, to a table appearing at page 49 of the latest lease-lend report of the President dated March 11, 1942, showing all appropriations made for lease-lend or defense aid purposes. Under leave to extend my remarks I also include this table at this point in the record.

RECAPITULATION

The amount of lend-lease aid that may be provided under the various acts is summarized in the following table:

Lend-lease appropriations to the President	
First Lend-Lease Appropriation Act	$7, 000, 000, 000
Second Lend-Lease Appropriation Act	5, 985, 000, 000
Third Lend-Lease Appropriation (fifth supplemental)	5, 425, 000, 000
	18, 410, 000, 000
Value of goods that can be transferred	
War Department:	
Third supplemental	$2, 000, 000, 000
Fourth supplemental	4, 000, 000, 000
Fifth supplemental	11, 250, 000, 000
Navy Department:	
Naval Appropriation Act (ships)	3, 900, 000, 000
Naval Appropriation Act (articles)	2, 500, 000, 000
Maritime Commission:	
First supplemental	1, 296, 650, 000
Fifth supplemental (appropriation funds)	1, 500, 000, 000
Fifth supplemental (contract authorizations)	2, 350, 000, 000
Other departments: Third supplemental	800, 000, 000
Total	29, 596, 650, 000
Maximum amount of aid that can be provided	48, 006, 650, 000

The Members will note that the table shows a total of $48,006,650,000 available for lend-lease purposes. This bill raises that figure by $2,238,000,000, giving a total over-all of about $50,244,650,000. The over-all total constitutes what may be called a ceiling for lease-lend purposes. Any or all of it may be used, of course, either for the purposes of our Allies or for our own purposes, according as we may determine from time to time.

Actual appropriations for war purposes, Mr. Chairman, as the committee report points out, must run far ahead of actual expenditure. It is hard to know just how far ahead they should run. I should suppose that at present they are running about 12 or 18 months ahead of anticipated expenditure. Actual expenditure for the fiscal year 1941 was about $6,000,000,000, estimated expenditure for the fiscal year 1942 is about $24,000,000,000, estimated expenditure for 1943 is about $53,000,000,000, a total of $83,000,000,000.

We have the assurance from the War Department, the Navy Department, and other war or defense agencies that with the exception of certain long-time items, all commodities requested to date may be expected to be turned into finished goods not later than the end of the calendar year 1943.

The bill is in three titles. The first provides for the Army about $17,376,000,000, a decrease as compared with the Budget estimate of over $203,351,000. The second provides for the Navy about $820,751,000, a decrease of about $5,172,000, as compared with the Budget estimate. The third provides for various other agencies about $105,236,000, 67 percent of which, the report states, is connected with the war effort, or about $27,680,000 less than the Budget estimate.

Like the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I am reasonably satisfied with the cuts which have been made by the committee in charge of this bill. I have not the time to go into the individual items. The principal items are admirably covered, it seems to me, by the report prepared by Mark Sheild and John Pugh, our able clerks for the Appropriations Committee. I have time only to make two or three comments on matters which have developed in connection with the hearings.

First, I want to refer to the matter of unit costs. We all know what has been developed through the Truman committee and through the Military and Naval Affairs Committees of the House in terms of gross waste in the construction of cantonments, for instance, in terms of enormous excess profits and other matters.

We know that to date, generally speaking, unit costs have failed to come down.

I call attention in this connection to the testimony of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, pages 338 to 352, part I, of the committee hearings, page 19 of the committee report. There you will find an item of $1,200,000 representing solely increases in cost of materials, equipment, and supplies, increases all the way from 22 percent to 126 percent, increases apparently due solely to competition between this and that Government agency. In the absence of explanation these exorbitant increases just do not make sense.

We are told that contractors and subcontractors are being asked to furnish explanation in the matter. It must be gone into thoroughly. Profiteering must cease. Unit costs must come down.

I want to refer also to the matter of training for war or defense purposes. You will find two items in the bill for training courses. I understand that there are no less than 11 different Government agencies operating in this field at the moment.

If I am correctly advised there is the Department of Labor program, there is the Office of Education with five programs, there is the W. P. A. with two programs, there is the N. Y. A. with two programs, there is the C. C. C. with its program, there are the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission, and the C. A. A. programs.

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

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There is the War Production Board with two programs; there are, I am told, two programs under the public vocational schools.

We have seen, Mr. Chairman, in the past no less than 8 different agencies operating in the field of priorities, and the enormous confusion that resulted. We have seen some 12 different agencies in the field of defense housing. The hearings indicate that some effort has been made to coordinate this training picture through the War Production Board. I submit, however, that some committee of the House, probably the subcommittee in charge of labor and social-security appropriations, should go into this picture thoroughly with a view to eliminating any of those programs which do not justify themselves, and to assuring coordination of the entire picture.

During the past 9 years we have seen the creation of an unlimited number of commissions, boards, and other Federal agencies. Recently the demand has become insistent for the elimination of all nonessential expenditure. Yet to date, we have seen almost no indication of the elimination or suspension for the period of the war of any of the agencies referred to. Attention is called in this connection to the testimony of the Public Buildings Administration showing that the Federal Government in Washington alone today owns office space to the extent of 19,790,000 square feet and rents additional space to the extent of 5,975,000 square feet as compared with a year ago when the owned space amounted to 17,316,000 square feet and the rented space to 4,842,000 square feet, the space for both years being apparently far in excess of the peak during World War No. 1.

Many Members were much concerned recently by the action of the Social Security Board in taking over, under doubtful legal authority, the employ-

ment offices in several States; a step apparently preliminary to the subsequent step contemplating complete federalization of the unemployment compensation work throughout the Nation, recently defeated by the Ways and Means Committee after the almost unanimous protest of the Governors of all the States. Attention is directed to the fact that the request of the Social Security Board included $1,500,000 as a result of the taking over of the employment offices.

My time is very short and I can only speak briefly.

This bill allows 99 percent of the Army requests and 99½ percent of the Navy requests. It slashes the total for other requests by about 20 percent. It sets a good example and indicates the road that we must follow.

The situation confronting us demands 100 percent cooperation in everything contributing to the war effort, in order that victory may be achieved at the earliest possible moment. It demands also 100 percent opposition to every force, whether inside or outside of Government, prejudicing that result.

One destructive force is the force represented by waste, by extravagance, by nonessential expenditure. That force must be eliminated.

I have an editorial, Mr. Chairman, sent me by a friend, appearing in an unnamed Massachusetts paper. It reads, in part, as follows:

THIS IS THE KIND OF CONGRESS WE NEED NOW

By tradition Congress is a deliberative body. In ordinary times that is what we need. But these are not ordinary times.

These times demand, not a deliberative Congress, but an enraged, determined, fighting Congress which will forget votes, forget parties, forget elections, forget social experiments, and slap down everyone who blocks the war program for even 15 minutes.

We need a Congress which will see red when an American boy is killed or wounded because a ship, or a plane, or a bit of war material reached him too late on account of some delay at home, whether that delay was caused by a strike or by someone's incompetence.

We need a Congress with guts enough to say to everyone: "Either you are for winning this war or you are against winning the war. There is no halfway position."

We need a Congress which will stop pussyfooting, stop trading the lives of American soldiers and sailors for the feelings of some incompetent but politically powerful Government official.

We need a Congress which isn't afraid of man nor devil, a Congress that is hell-bent for victory, a Congress that will make history instead of letting history write its epitaph.

We need a Congress of aggressive leadership. We need it badly.

I offer the editorial as evidence of what public opinion expects of us.

Public opinion throughout the country has become aroused, Mr. Chairman. Personally I thank God that it has at last become aroused. Personally I think it is a tragedy that it did not become aroused years ago.

The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has emphasized the fact that production is improving. That is true. I do not believe, however, that he would state that he is satisfied with production today. I know that I am far from satisfied. I do not believe the Army, the Navy, the Maritime Commission, the War Production Board, or anybody else primarily responsible for production is satisfied today. We must have maximum production at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing, in my judgment, that can contribute more to maximum production, to legislation essential in the interest of victory, to the elimination of all forces impairing an all-out national effort than an intelligent and aroused public opinion through the length and breadth of this Nation of ours. I welcome it.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Is the gentleman familiar with the lend-lease funds now appropriated?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The total appropriated to date is $43,006,650,000, of which, according to the last lend-lease report by the President dated March 11, 1942, about $12,272,000,000 has been allocated, about $8,459,000,000 obligated, and about $1,411,000,000 actually transferred.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. I would like to ask the gentleman if my figures are approximately correct. I have here figures indicating that the lend-lease amount, including the amount in this bill, would be something like $50,206,000,000; that on February 28, of this amount, $2,560,000,000 has been actually spent. Of that, $1,100,000,000 has been transferred; also of this $1,100,000,000, 25 percent was for war materials, or actual defense materials. Are those figures comparatively correct?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think they are not far out of line. Including this bill, the figures I have show total appropriations of about $50,244,000,000. According to the President's report of March 11, 1942, the amount obligated as of February 28 was about $8,459,000,000; the amount transferred was about $2,570,000,000, including articles in process, and about $1,411,000,000, excluding articles in process.

Mr. STEFAN. Then my figures are substantially correct?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think so.

Mr. STEFAN. That is, as of February 28.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. Now, if it is true that only 25 percent of this amount is for war materials, what became of the other 71 percent?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. A large part of it was for agricultural commodities, and other expenditures. I think the gentleman will find the details in the report referred to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself in accord with much that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], said at an earlier hour today. With some of his statements, however, I must take issue.

It is to be regretted that he left the impression that either the press or the radio is not living up to the best traditions as molders of public opinion. I believe the press is trying to do an honest and a fearless job. I believe the radio is being used in an effective way. I believe any effort to stifle either the press or the radio would be a dangerous move today.

I am not unaware of the fact that in wartime much must be withheld, much must be left unsaid that can very properly be said in times of peace. But, on the other hand, there is considerable danger if any effort is put forth by those in authority to establish themselves, as Felix Morley has well said:

The keepers of the national conscience and the moralistic arbiters of our destiny.

So I plead today for a public opinion, an informed public opinion, an intelligent public opinion. I plead for a freedom of speech and a freedom of the press which will make possible the formation of an intelligent opinion. I object to any suggestions which might mean suppression of the means at hand for the dissemination of information and the formation of honest opinions and the reaching of reasoned judgments. I think some answer should be made to what I interpreted on the part of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri as an optimism. I think there is danger in a false optimism. I think there is considerable to be said in favor of Mr. Churchill's forthrightness and frankness when a day or two ago he told the people what the conditions were. I am delighted that progress has been made in production, but I am extremely concerned lest we assume a false optimism, which might contribute to our undoing. France was lulled into a sense of security by an optimism. This must not happen here.

The record of the hearings discloses from the lips of one of the naval officers what I have in mind, Admiral Towers, under examination, admitted that we were under the estimates as they had been projected, in plane production. He was honest and forthright. The job to be done is a big one, a gigantic undertaking. Nothing less than our utmost will complete the task.

Let us cease fooling the American people. Let us avoid misleading the American people by an optimism that may prove disastrous. Words will not win this war. An optimism, illusory hopes, idle dreams will not win this war. We must work more and harder to win.

My distinguished friend from Missouri took occasion to draw a comparison between the conduct of this war and all other wars in our history. He dwelt at some length on the competency with which this war is being managed and that which prevailed during the course of other wars. I shall make little comment

about that. I am not in hearty accord with the blanket whitewash that my friend attempted. I will let the record speak for itself and what the future will disclose time alone will tell.

From unimpeachable sources we have the records at hand which indicate that all is not well on the Potomac. There is little advantage to be gained by wrapping ourselves in any cloak of contentment, if this war is to be won. Irregularities have been shown. Favoritism should and must be eliminated. Let us make the record by deeds rather than writing it in words.

The gentleman referred to the information that should be available to our people. I am in hearty accord with the statement he made. But my suggestion is that that information should be uncolored and undistorted. Let this information be honest and factual, free of the pressure of propaganda purposes, and free of political persuasiveness. Let both of those conditions be attached to the dissemination of information. Let it be broadcast, the information at hand. It must not disclose military secrets. It must not disturb our military successes. It must not discourage our forces. But, oh, let it be information that does not have the pressure of propaganda or political advantage behind it. Give the people the cold, unvarnished truth, unadorned by the efforts of skillful publicists in the Government employ or by the deft touches of propaganda specialists. An honestly informed people is our surest security

One thing disturbs me greatly. I have seen entirely too much evidence of a stubborn and unyielding unwillingness to admit mistakes; a refusal to admit that there could be any possible fallibility. God knows this is a human effort. God knows the frailties of human nature. Let us cast aside this mask of omnipotence, of infallibility. If there are mistakes, instead of being stubborn and unyielding let us be willing to admit them and try to correct them. Unfortunately, this same spirit of stubbornness prevails, as honest men, as well-intentioned men, as patriotic men, devoted loyally to their country, attempt to direct constructive criticism as to the means or the ways of conducting the war. In my humble judgment the road to progress, the road to improvement, has always been the road where constructive criticism is not only permitted but where it is invited. Retrogression comes where the barriers are placed against those who may make calculating, constructive criticisms and honest appraisals. This war is to be won. It will be won. To win it there must be a singleness of purpose not only on the part of the people throughout the country, but a singleness of purpose here in Washington—yes, in this Congress. This singleness of purpose must be divorced from any plan to protect political power or to perpetuate a political philosophy. This war will be won by permitting the light of noonday to get into every nook and corner of public life. It will be won by a fearless forthrightness which will challenge the devotion of a free and a courageous people. America is not afraid. America knows no fear. But one thing can defeat us, disunity.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today an appropriation bill carrying the sum of $18,157,187,148. An enormous sum of money, and I do not know where we will get all the money we are spending. We received this bill in the Committee on Appropriations yesterday morning about 11:15. At 12 o'clock the committee reported it out of the full committee for your consideration. This appropriation is in addition to those already made at this session, which began the 5th day of January. On January 22 we passed the fourth supplemental appropriation bill amounting to $12,566,000,000 for airplanes. On the 26th of January we passed the Naval Department appropriation bill carrying $26,500,000,000. Then we had the fifth supplemental deficiency bill amounting to $32,762,739,900 for the Army. With this bill the total exceeds $90,130,922,000. Since the 22d day of January, including this bill, we will have appropriated, so far as the House is concerned, for this country's participation in the war one of the most tremendous sums the Nation has ever appropriated in such a short time. No country in the world has ever done more to win a war.

Our first duty as American citizens is to win this war, because this Nation will not be fit to live in if we do not, and it behooves each and every one of us to do everything we can to bring about the ultimate end of a successful conclusion and winning of the war. In our zeal to make appropriations for national defense, however, we should also be careful that we do not permit powers that belong to Congress to pass out of the hands of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. We have our responsibilities to the people, we have our responsibilities to the country, and we should see that our form of government is maintained and that our financial structure is secure in granting these powers under this bill.

I tried to find who wrote the bill, but all I could ascertain was a statement by the chairman of the committee that it was sent here by the Chief Executive and the Army; that they made the suggestions. Our Subcommittee on War held hearings for 3 days. The fact of the matter is that we are furnishing money to the Chief Executive and the Army so fast we are beginning to hear stories that do not sound so good about the kind of contracts that have been made, where contractors have made 200 and 300 percent profit. This is wrong. I realize that income and excess-profits taxes are going to level them to a greater or lesser degree depending on the bracket in which the income falls, but that is not sufficient; we should not permit contracts of this kind to be let in the first place. No contract should bear a greater profit than 10 percent.

It makes no difference what it is for or to whom the contract might go. That is your responsibility and mine, and it seems to me that when we are passing out this money so fast that greater waste and greater extravagance will certainly follow the wake of these rapid appropriations. I am not in sympathy with such speed that leads to waste.

If we give the power to the Army and Navy and to Government officials to let these contracts, certainly they must be more responsible for looking after every detail of these contracts. They must investigate and find out what it costs to manufacture a certain article, then they will have a better idea of how to award a contract so that they will not yield such great profits to any manufacturer. That responsibility is yours and mine to see that they do not; I want to assume it; do you?

Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to page 29 of this bill which provides a deficiency appropriation for the Interior Department and to this proviso:

> *Provided*, That for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property persons may be employed for periods of less than 60 days and be paid salaries or wages from this appropriation without regard to citizenship and without regard to membership in an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, that is wrong; it seems to me that when we bring in a bill here so rapidly that it permits a proviso of that kind to remain in it, there is something wrong with our Americanism, there is something wrong with our citizenship, and as far as I am concerned personally, when this proviso "without regard to membership in an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government" appears in here, I will not support it. I am going to make a point of order against that particular section of the bill. It must be struck out.

Mr. O'NEAL. Will the gentleman yield? I will explain that because it seems to me the gentleman will not take that position if he understands it.

Mr. RICH. Let me finish my statement. If you will turn to page 36 of the bill you will see the proviso that we have placed in practically every appropriation bill we have passed:

> *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

That is the proviso that we write in every appropriation bill, and it is a good proviso. When we permit this other proviso I read on page 29 to remain in the bill, one is diametrically opposed to the other.

I know what the gentleman has in mind. They are going to take these

people that are placed in concentration camps and use them for fighting forest fires and things of that kind. We should put anyone who advocates overthrow of our Government behind the bars and keep him locked up, and I do not care who he is, where he comes from, or what his name is.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. O'NEAL. When a fire starts in a forest, the Forestry Department immediately secures as many helpers as it can to put out the fire. There may be 50 in one village, 5 over here, and others over there. This provision that the gentleman is seeking to strike out is put in here so that they will not have to ask these people who are asked to fight the fire to file citizenship papers showing that they are citizens, or to take an oath and to go through all the necessary things that they must go through, to put a man on the pay roll. Would it not be ridiculous, if you had to stop, while a fire is burning, to make a man prove the fact that he is a citizen, take an oath that he is not a Communist, and go through all the minutiae they now have to go through before they get on the pay roll? This waives those provisions in case of fire so that they will not have to go through all of these details in order to put a man to work putting out a fire.

Mr. RICH. May I say to the gentleman that at a time like this, when there is a fire, you have not all these opportunities to take affidavits, but I do not want to put anything in this bill that is going to permit any man who advocates the overthrow of this Government of ours to work any place. Why, he would do more damage because he would do everything to start fires if he had the opportunity. I say, put that fellow in prison and do it now.

Mr. O'NEAL. Does the gentleman understand that you could not take on perhaps 200 people when the fire started, because you would have to stop and make them all take an oath? You would have to investigate all of them, you would have to have all of them present their citizenship papers and other details. The gentleman wants the fire stopped, but he seemingly does not want to have anybody fight the fire.

Mr. RICH. No; that is not the case at all. I do not want to agree to let any person be at large who would overthrow the United States of America. I am willing to give my life for my country and I will not permit any person at large who would overthrow our Government.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman does not understand it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the measure before us calls for $18,302,187,148, and the President, the War and Navy Departments say that this appropriation is necessary for our national defense, and have asked Congress to appropriate this sum. I am supporting the bill. I assume that if there is a roll call that every Member of the House will be recorded for it. There is no opposition.

Our Nation is now engaged in its longest, costliest, and bloodiest war. The one great desire of all loyal Americans is to win this war at the earliest date possible. I am sure that every loyal American is willing to do whatever he or she can that is necessary to bring success to American arms.

The report of the Appropriations Committee filed with this bill shows that this brings the grand total voted by Congress at the request of the President, the War and Navy Departments, to the amount of nearly $161,000,000,000 since July 1, 1940. This does not include many, many billions voted for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to loan to various industries and agencies to aid in our war efforts. I think it can be truthfully said that the total amount voted by Congress since July 1, 1940, for war purposes alone exceeds $164,000,000,000. This vast sum is more than one-half of the estimated national wealth of the country and is more than six times the direct and total cost of the first World War of $25,729,000,000 from April 6, 1917, to July 2, 1921, when that war officially closed. This sum does not include the $10,000,000,000 loaned to the Allies in the first World War. This $161,000,000,000 is four times the assessed value of all the farm lands, the improvements, livestock and poultry thereon in the United States, according to the Federal census of 1940.

The leaders of labor and the heads of industrial plants generally, throughout the Nation, have been working wholeheartedly to prevent strikes or stoppage of work in our defense plants. I regret, however, that there are some workers in some of our defense plants who have obstructed production, and then there are some of those engaged in industry who, according to their own statements, have been receiving unconscionable profits. Such individuals or groups render themselves a great disservice. The American people will not tolerate such conduct.

I wish to commend the high purpose and patriotism of those workers and their leaders and those in industry who place the welfare of their country above their own personal interest and welfare. Let us not hastily condemn all of labor or all of industry because of the selfish acts of a few. When the American people see their money honestly expended for our national defense and see that our production and our war efforts are commensurate with the money expended and they can see that their country is being defended, I am sure that the American people will willingly buy bonds and saving stamps and pay their taxes. With these tremendous sums of money being spent the American people have a right to expect results.

Congress has voted to the President, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, extraordinary powers. These great sums of money and these powers voted by Congress because of the demand on the part of the President, the Navy, and War Departments that they were necessary for the defense of our country and to enable us to win the war, and therefore it can be truthfully said that Congress has provided the money and the power to carry on this war successfully. There may be ground for just criticism that Congress has been too liberal in granting funds and power, but every other Member of Congress, like myself, would not want it said that we had obstructed in any way our war production or our war efforts. We desired only to see our heroic men thoroughly equipped and armed to defend our country and bring victory to the Nation.

The plans of the administration are to train, arm, and equip at least 10,000,000 men for the Army, Navy, and Air Service. In a short time Congress will pass another tax bill. The Government will then collect from the people annually thirty billion in taxes. Our armies, Navy, and Air Forces are now in every land and on every sea. The American people must begin to realize what a stupendous task is before them. I believe the patriotic American people are willing to make the sacrifices and for the Government to spend every dollar that is necessary to insure victory, but they have the right to demand that their bond money and their tax money be judiciously and honestly expended and their bond and tax money must not be squandered and wasted for fan-dancing, boondoggling, profiteering, to carry on rackets or racketeering, or to promote the interest of any selfish group or individual. They demand that this money be translated quickly into ships, planes, bombers, tanks, guns, and other war materials and supplies, and in such quantities as will mean victory. The dangers to our country are such that they have a right to demand that there be no strikes or stoppage of work in our defense plants by either capital or labor.

UNITY AND VICTORY

We have heard much about V standing for victory. The letter U precedes the letter V and stands for unity. In order to make sure of victory, there must be unity of the American people.

This war cannot be won by capital, by labor, by the farmer, by the Congress, by the administration, by the Army, Navy, or by the air force, or with money, or by one political party; it can only be won through the unselfish, patriotic efforts of all of our people and all of our agencies and resources.

This great war will tax to the utmost the manpower, the industrial, economic, mental, and spiritual resources of the whole Nation. It will finally reach the pocketbooks of the rich and the poor, and every heart and home in this broad land of ours.

There is considerable discord in the Nation; one group is claiming another group is promoting its own selfish purposes. In order to have unity Congress and the administration must see to it that justice is done to our defenders, to those who produce on the farms, to those who toil on the railroads, and in the factories, shops, and mines, and those engaged in industry. All these groups must contribute their share of the sacrifices, but each one of them is entitled to fair and just treatment.

Many bills have been introduced in the House and Senate relating to the question of labor and profits. The Naval Affairs Committee of the House is holding hearings, and will continue these hearings for some days yet. This committee will then report a bill to the House about the middle of April. No one knows in what form the bill will be presented or what provisions it will contain. Consideration of this bill should be approached by the Congress in a spirit of justice and fairness, keeping constantly in mind that the first and greatest task of our people now is to give to our defenders the weapons and equipment with which they can make an heroic and successful defense of our Nation.

As millions of American boys are, and will, offer their lives for their country, no Member of Congress should hesitate to take such action and cast such vote as he honestly believes will promote unity, expedite production of our war equipment, and give the greatest assurance of victory.

After all, if we should be defeated because of action taken or votes which we honestly believed were to the best interests of our country, it could mean little compared to what our defenders give, or the sacrifices that will be made by the mothers and fathers, the wives and children of these defenders.

I did not agree with the foreign policy of the President in the repeal of the neutrality laws, or in providing guns, planes, bombers, ships for other countries. I sincerely believed such a policy would involve us in the European and Asiatic wars, and I knew our country was unprepared. I believed that we should keep some of this equipment for the defense of our own country and the Western Hemisphere, and I believed it was our duty to build up first the greatest air force, the best mechanized army, and the best two-ocean navy in the world, primarily to defend our own country and the Western Hemisphere, and then give such aid as we could to other countries. That was the policy that was then being followed, and is now being followed, by Britain and Russia.

When we pass this bill today, Congress will have voted over fifty billions that the President and his administration can use under the so-called lend-lease policy. Of course, since we have entered the war, we must all hang together or hang separately, but our administration should insist that these other nations, with which we are united in this war, do what they reasonably can to help win the victory.

We are now in the war, and however, sincere or right one side or the other may have been, we must, for the period of the war, forget the things that are behind us, and unite together to bring success to our American forces, even though Mr. Flynn, the National Democratic chairman, calls upon the people to elect only Democrats, and the President intimates his desire that only New Dealers be elected, and Democratic newspapers are urging that Democrats or New Dealers be elected. Neither the Democrats nor the New Dealers alone can win this war. We must have the united effort of all of our people.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the average Member of the House has many questions in his mind when a bill like this comes in, because the hearings of necessity are censored. The printed hearings occupy 205 pages. However, throughout these 205 pages you will find frequent lines that read:

Here was a discussion off the record.

If my memory serves me right, there was considerably more said off the record than on the record during the time we were working on this bill. I feel, however, that in spite of the censorings and the omissions, Members will find considerable information in the printed hearings. It is my purpose merely to give you a few references to some points that I think will be of interest to you. First, may I call your attention to the item in the bill that provides funds for the Army to guard and protect enemy aliens. This is not to be confused with the evacuation problem.

The President by Executive order recently established a new work corps for the handling of some of the people of alien descent being evacuated from the west coast. That phase of the problem is not covered in this bill. The other problem deals with prisoners of war and enemy aliens covered by international agreement and funds in this bill go to that purpose.

It was of interest to members of the subcommittee to learn that the obligation on the part of belligerents to look after officers and persons of equivalent status who are prisoners of war is the subject of a multilateral convention which was entered into in 1929, ratified by the United States, and also ratified by Germany and Italy. Japan also was a signatory and we were told that as far as is known Japan as well as Italy and Germany are abiding by this convention.

This convention is reproduced in full text on page 47 of the hearings. You will find information on the same subject on pages 32 and 33. I think reading it will help you to answer some questions that Members will be asked back home.

Another subject that is under considerable discussion at the present time is the payment of time and a half for work after Friday night and double time on Sundays. In response to a question by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS], we were advised that, regardless of whether a man had worked 40 hours prior to Friday night or not, pay on Saturday would be time and a half and pay on Sunday would be double time.

The testimony on this follows:

Mr. COLLINS. You do put in all of your contracts a provision that from 5 o'clock Friday afternoon until 7 o'clock Monday morning every man who works is paid overtime, even though that is the only time he does work?

General SOMERVELL. Yes, sir (p. 19).

Mr. CASE. Referring to the question which Mr. Collins asked you relative to the clause in the contracts which requires payment of overtime or double time for work between Friday night and Monday morning: Where is the responsibility for that clause being in the contract?

General SOMERVELL. The act of Congress, which requires us to pay overtime and the rate of time and a half.

Mr. CASE. It is the responsibility of Congress, if it requires a change in the act.

General SOMERVELL. That is in the law (p. 32).

So this places squarely before Congress the question of whether or not that provision with respect to time and a half or double time should be changed.

In this same connection I think it will be of interest to the Members to know that of the forty-six-million-and-odd dollars carried in this bill for pay of civilian field employees of the air forces, over $19,000,000 in this particular bill is to pay time and a half by reason of the fact that they are instituting a 48-hour week in the field. Under the law employees of the Government, civilian field employees of the War Department, have a 40-hour week. By instituting a 48-hour week in the field it will require for the period covered by this supplemental bill an additional appropriation of $19,273,292.

You might say the committee might have denied these funds if they did not want to pay this. On the other hand, under the ruling that has been applied to the Ramspeck Act by the Comptroller General and the General Accounting Office, with that being the law, the employees would have a cause of action and a just claim against the Government if the funds were not provided in the appropriation bill. So the committee included that $19,000,000 for overtime on the 8 hours added. It is mandatory under existing law.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Does the gentleman mean to say that all the employees of the War Department get time and a half for overtime?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not mean to say that all of them get it. It depends, of course, on whether or not that time is reported and accounted for. In the justifications on this bill an item of $19,273,292 was specifically included to take care of overtime for field employees of the Air Corps under the act of June 3, 1941.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For contingencies of the Army, including necessary personal services and the purchase of lawbooks, professional books of reference and subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals, and such other expenses as may be necessary, and payments from this appropriation may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be made on his certificate that the expenditures were necessary for confidential military purposes, $1,578,180.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, to what paragraph does this request refer?

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph ending in line 5, on page 2. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to mention that on June 15, 1941, I made a speech advocating doubling of the base pay of every soldier and sailor in the armed forces of the United States. It has been my great satisfaction to see that action taken in another body and also to see the very provisions of the Hall bill now before the Military Affairs Committee of the House, and, according to information which I have, it will soon be brought to the floor for our consideration.

I need not say it is particularly gratifying to me to see such action taken. I feel that the day is way past due when we should consider, in view of the other benefits that have been paid to other groups of this great war effort, benefits to the soldiers and the sailors who are keeping the enemy at bay in the Pacific and throughout the world.

I want to express my satisfaction today that before very long this subject will come up. I regret that in this bill there is not an opportunity to take such action today to increase the pay of the soldiers and sailors, but I want to express the desire and the hope that such action will be taken immediately.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I commend the gentleman from New York for preparing and presenting to this body such legislation. It seems to me that every excess in the operation of Government here at home lessens by just that much what we give to our soldiers at the fighting front. There is certainly much merit in the gentleman's proposal.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I want to thank the gentleman from West Virginia for his observations. I also want to thank the members of the committee for the consideration they have given me at various times when I have presented this amendment.

Another proposal which I made long ago and which will be remembered was to give free transportation home to members of the armed forces on furlough.

Some of the Members felt that such action was not necessary, but on the other hand I have received letters from many boys in the training camps, and they have stated flatly that they have been unable to take advantage of the furloughs that have been granted because they did not have the funds sufficient and heir families did not have the funds sufficient to make the trip home. This, in many instances involved traveling a long distance. Although it is out of order in this bill to offer amendments for pay increases to soldiers and sailors, nevertheless I hope that such a thought can be injected into this debate and action taken as the result of it. At this time I think it only fair to mention the subject of insurance and benefits to the families of the men in the service. This subject has also received wide consideration. It is with all sincerity that I stand before the House today and advocate that not only the base pay be doubled for every man in the armed forces and furloughs granted him when he is able to go home, but also provision should be made for insurance and benefits to those members who may be among the casualty list in the great battles for freedom which are to come. We must all be prepared to strip our essential needs to the bone. Yet I am sure there is not a member of the committee or a citizen of the United States who will not agree with me when I say that there is nothing too good for the men who are fighting the battles to preserve this great Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

For Signal Service of the Army, $748,149,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I see my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] is present.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. I had anticipated, as I saw the gentleman making notes during the course of my own address to the House, that he would have something to say and therefore I felt in duty bound to be on hand to listen to the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's powers of deduction are keen, and they are correct. I have taken the floor to compliment my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania upon the constructive speech he made this afternoon in his plea for unity. It is one of the finest speeches that I have ever heard, and I was very much moved by it. Every one of us agrees with him in his statement that criticism should not be destructive, but should be constructive. Particularly in these trying days should the very able and constructive suggestions of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania be carried out, that all of us should discipline ourselves to the extent that we should not make any utterances that would not serve the Nation's benefit. That applies not only to ourselves but to the great agencies that exist in the country that create public opinion. During his remarks the gentleman said in substance that no effort should be made to stifle the press or radio, that such an effort would be a dangerous move. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman in that respect. I think everyone else agrees with the gentleman, and I think my friend will agree with my observation that the press with its constitutional freedom, and the radio with its privilege should do everything in their power to make their criticism and observations constructive. We want constructive criticism. It is through constructive criticism that human frailties which result in errors will be corrected, and my friend from Pennsylvania ably referred to the human frailties of which we are all victims. It is constructive criticism that will correct those errors and which will prevent those errors from occurring in the future.

However, I am inclined to think that my friend from Pennsylvania unintentionally misinterpreted the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], because certainly there is no one in this country who will fight more to preserve the freedom of the press or the privilege of the radio than our distinguished friend from Missouri, the able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I feel also sure that every one of us, without regard to party and those little things that move us, as we look at the broader implications of our way of life, in which we believe, and which we see threatened, must have a feeling of consolation that our Chief Executive and Commander in Chief, our President, is a man who is an intense lover of our form of life and an intense believer in preserving the freedom of the press. I refer only to one act on his part. We are at war and yet once a week, sometimes twice a week, he holds his press conference. These men who represent the papers, the special columnists, are men of great capacity.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, we all admire the correspondents who represent the various papers and news services in the House gallery and in the Senate gallery. I do not mean to flatter them, because I do not curry flattery. I do not like to receive it and I do not hand it out, but, to give credit where credit is due, the men and women who represent the journalistic profession are men and women of great capacity. Yet in war we see the President of the United States, the only country in the world where it has happened, still holding his press conferences. Not so many years ago, because of the ability of the members of the press to ask disturbing questions, we have had Presidents refuse to answer questions, but insisted that the members of the press submit their questions in writing a week ahead, and then the Chief Executive would select such questions to answer. I cannot criticize those Presidents, but, on the other hand, we have the spectacle of our President today holding his press conferences, meeting the galaxy of brains, subjecting himself to the questions that are suddenly shot at him. That is freedom of the press at its greatest height. So long as we have President Roosevelt and men of his type we need not worry about the great principle of freedom of the press being preserved, and as long as we have men of the outstanding ability of my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

But I also had another reason for rising in addition to expressing the profound effect that the thrilling utterances of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] made upon me.

Few realize the tremendous difficulties our Army and Navy have faced in their operations in this war.

In this first phase, garrisons have been sent to guard our outlying bases and

strategic islands along our line of communications. Each of these garrisons has presented a different problem. Few have gone to places where the size of the garrison was not so great that the local utilities were entirely inadequate. Many garrisons have gone to localities where local utilities are nonexistent. The air forces, the Infantry, and the Artillery have to be supported by utility operating organizations called service troops—few of which existed, except on paper, before the emergency. The American forces in Iceland, for example, took with them 25 different types of service units, among which were:

An ordnance medium maintenance unit for repair of weapons. Such a unit cannot only repair weapons but can even manufacture complicated parts in its mobile machine shop.

A quartermaster refrigeration unit, which operates a portable refrigeration installation, so that fresh meat and vegetables which are shipped in can be preserved.

A medical battalion, which constantly watches over sanitation and health, and which provides immediate medical care to the sick and wounded. After initial treatment, the medical battalion arranges for transportation to the rear for complete and continued care in hospitals.

Other types of service units included a signal construction unit, an air-field construction unit, a field baking unit, a field laundry unit, and even a mobile shoe and textile repair unit.

An added complication in garrisoning islands not already heavily populated has been the lack of unloading facilities. Here cargo must be discharged with the ship's own cargo-handling equipment, frequently onto wharves which have no facilities for removing or storing the cargo as it is unloaded—sometimes into lighters, from which it must be removed by hand.

Unusual equipment and supplies required in unusual places vary all the way from salt-water stills, for providing drinking water from sea water, to typhus and cholera vaccines—which are seldom used in the continental United States.

The great bottleneck in the American effort is lack of shipping. The problem of transporting troops and their supplies has increased greatly since the World War. Distances are so great that only the bombers can fly and other types of aircraft must be shipped by water. Many divisions are armored or motorized. Even in the Infantry divisions most of the supplies and equipment are carried in trucks. This is because, in order to provide protection against modern mechanized units, it has become necessary to increase the weight and caliber of many of our guns and automatic weapons. This change has increased the amount and weight of ammunition requirements, and also requires motor vehicles and fuel to move these weapons to meet rapidly changing tactical situations. As a result, whereas in the World War the pounds of supplies required per man per day averaged 34, they now average 45; and whereas the cubic feet required per ton were 57, they are now 80. The combination of the two have reduced to one-half the number of men which can be supplied by any given amount of shipping. A second factor of one-half must be inserted, because, whereas in the World War we secured more than half our supplies from Britain and France, delivered in France, we now have to use much of our shipping assisting our Allies. Finally, the distance from our west coast to Australia is well over twice the distance from our east coast to France, which doubles the time required for each complete voyage. The product of these three factors, each of one-half, indicates that the amount of shipping which could have supported eight divisions in France in 1918 will support only one division in Australia in 1942.

In spite of these difficulties, much has been accomplished. Within the continental United States the railroads moved 1,904,000 troops between December 7 and March 15. This does not include thousands of soldiers who went home on furloughs The troop movements were required partially in moving troops to our shores for protection against raids, partially in moving troops to our ports for movement overseas. All were made without confusion or delay.

From our ports, since December 7, millions of ship tons of cargo have been transported to foreign destinations; thousands of troops have sailed overseas. These movements, too, have been made without confusion, and with such secrecy and under such vigilant protection from the Navy that not one transport loaded with troops has been lost.

I think this information is important to the American people as a means of assisting them in understanding more clearly the trying problems tha confront our naval and military leaders. I think that more information of that kind should be given to the American people because, with the information given to them that the military exigencies will permit, we in the long run can rely upon the sound judgment of the American people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I shall not detain the Committee but for a moment.

I would be remiss were I to fail to acknowledge—and very gratefully acknowledge—the kind words of my distinguished friend the able majority leader. Suffice it to say that, in my opinion, he has rendered today a splendid service for that liberalism without which free institutions cannot hope to live.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, the testimony of Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold before the Truman committee relative to the withholding by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey of patent rights in the manufacture of synthetic rubber and gasoline indicates that some corrective legislation should immediately be passed.

At the time the first and second war powers bills were considered by the Committee on the Judiciary inquiry was made into the question of whether the Government had a right to take over and use during the period of the war patents held by citizens or corporations of the United States for the purpose of prosecuting the war effort. It has been generally understood that this right existed, and therefore titles were not included in either of the war powers bills dealing with this question. Title 35, section 68, of the United States Code provides for the payment of compensation to a person or company whose patent is used by the Government of the United States. This section also fixes the method for arriving at just compensation. It was assumed that by dealing with the matter of compensation the Government, for its security and protection, had a right to use patents owned by citizens of the United States. Since there seems to be some doubt about the matter I have filed a bill affirmatively giving the Government this right and invite your earnest consideration to this proposal. I hope the bill may be passed without delay. The Government certainly must not be curtailed in manufacturing the sinews of war. The Government must, for war purposes, be able to use any patent, whether foreign or domestically owned. It would be well for us to have affirmative legislation on the subject.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, I would like 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I modify the request and make it 10 minutes. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HARTER. Reserving the right to object, I would like to know how much this section includes? Where does the section end?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I should have said paragraph, Mr. Chairman; we are reading the bill by paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph ends on page 5, line 18.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I want it clearly understood that my remarks are not to be interpreted as in disagreement with what our majority leader just said. I want it clearly understood that I have no intention to deprecate or take anything away from the acclaim that his remarks merit. I, too, as much as any-

one in the Congress, believe in complete unity in advancing our war effort; but when I picked up the morning paper and learned from the press that the leadership had decided—notwithstanding that in my judgment Congress has plenty of work to do—not to do any work for about 2 weeks. I felt that there were grounds for disunity in that plan itself. I certainly cannot condone that program. I am not in accord with that plan. I do not care if the leadership or who it is that does not approve of what I have to say in opposition to a recess. I rose here about a year ago and objected to a recess of the Congress because I felt that then was the proper time for us to enact legislation to curb labor practices, especially strikes, that were hampering our war effort. We still need to act on that and other problems.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BOREN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. And I say on my part in discussing this, that no matter what my friend's views are I have a profound feeling of respect for him. The gentleman and I seldom disagree, but even in disagreement I respect his views.

Mr. BOREN. I regret if from what I have said any inference of criticism of our distinguished majority leader is drawn. I have no such intention. I only want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am in full accord with everything we can do for unity, which means unity of work toward the winning of the war; but I am opposed to anything that might even tend to slow up our war work.

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

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

Mr. RICH. The House passed the Smith amendments that would prohibit strikes. It now lies dormant in the other body.

Mr. BOREN. The gentleman is absolutely correct, but we have other work that needs to be done, and I feel that we ought to be expeditiously about our country's business.

This is no time for a recess. We cannot afford any lost motion. Delay, dilatory tactics, interference by racketeering such as exacting exorbitant fees as a condition of employment or exorbitant profits on war contracts are throwing our war effort out of gear. These evils must be dealt with now. Now is the time to stop the sabotage of our war efforts.

There will be no better opportunity 2 weeks from now than the opportunity that exists today.

The pendulum of the clock swings on and with every stroke it chimes a clarion warning now, now. Two weeks of wasted time may be the margin of difference to change that "now, now" to "too late, too late," my colleagues. Do you not remember that Bible story of old that stands as a monument of challenge to people everywhere—that story of him who lost his life when he said, "Go thy way, and when I have a more convenient season I will call thee unto me"?

My colleagues, there will be no more convenient season than today. It was only a matter of hours that the Austrian coup was effected. Czechoslovakia was crushed in a few days. Poland did not have weeks to wait. Two weeks would have meant a great deal to Singapore, to the Dutch Indies, and even now to Australia. Japan will not wait 2 weeks.

How can any citizen of the Nation that has experienced Pearl Harbor, Wake, Guam, and Manila close shop for 2 weeks?

Mr. Chairman, America is the last lighthouse in the surge of the world's storms, and I, for one, cannot sleep with things undone that should be done, that must be done, that can be done, even in 2 weeks.

It is not possible for me to be on all the battle fronts of the world at this hour, but I want every soldier on Bataan, in Iceland, in Australia, on the high seas, and at every point of conflict to know every minute, every hour, every day, I am dedicating my every energy toward the work that must be done to keep the life lines to them intact and thus insure the liberties of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I must say frankly from an earnest and anxious heart that I am bitterly opposed to any recess, formal or informal. Uncle Sam can use these 2 weeks of our endeavor.

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

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to call the attention of the House to what I think is an historic, a significant action by our Appropriations Committee on this bill, one which will soon be ratified by this body. I think this is the first time since Pearl Harbor that there has been any reduction of an appropriation for military purposes.

We are told there is a reduction of about 1 percent in the Army and Navy portion of this bill, and a reduction of 20 percent in the nondefense activities. Let me point out that the 1-percent reduction in war appropriations represents a cash reduction in appropriations of about $208,000,000, while the 20-percent reduction in nondefense activities represents a cash reduction of about $22,000,000. It is not my purpose to discuss the wisdom of either of these reductions. The nature of the reductions have been described. What I wish to point out is that here is an instance where, in my judgment, the Congress is ahead of public opinion. Public opinion is talking about the reduction of nondefense expenditures. Congress knows that the important thing, if we are to make any substantial reduction in expenditures, is to watch our war expenditures. We should make all possible reductions in our nondefense spending, but the total so saved will not amount to much, compared to the volume of our war spending, and we can make great savings in our war spending without hampering our war effort. The Committee on Appropriations must be practically the sole judge on the question of military expenditures because much of the testimony is in secret, and the rest of the House must rely almost exclusively upon their judgment. The Appropriations Committee, in going through the defense-offense expenditures—the war expenditures—which we should make, is, we hope, holding those down as best it may. I believe they should investigate the astounding failure to reduce the unit cost of arms as production rises. This reversal of the whole trend of American production just does not make sense. Only a small reduction in the war expenditures will far exceed any possible reduction that could be made in nondefense expenditures. As I say, the significant thing is that while there is no disposition here to retard or hamper our war effort on the part of this committee, and while I understand that part of these expenditures in which the $203,000,000 is involved have been postponed, or are to be further considered; the reduction shows that the Congress is attempting to hold down as much as it can with efficiency and propriety the defense-offense—the war expenditures. These are, for the 3 years covered in this report, 1941, 1942, 1943, more than 10 times the nondefense expenditures. So that if we were to wipe out all of our nondefense expenditures it would only amount to a reduction of 10 percent in our total expenditures. I hope that this is a sign that the Congress, acting through its Appropriations Committee, will attempt to preserve proper control over the amount that we pour out for our war effort, and that this sign, no bigger than a man's hand at this time, a 1-percent proposition, may give promise of what is to be done from now on. This will need to be done if we are to make bearable the money burden, and money is here only a measuring stick for human effort—the human effort for carrying through our war effort to a successful conclusion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For Air Corps, Army, $8,515,861,251.

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

Mr. Chairman, according to this section that has just been read, something over $8,000,000,000 is being appropriated for the Air Corps of the Army and I understand the bill also carries some money for the C. A. A. I am glad to see this expansion in our air program, I am for it, and I think it is long overdue. Airplane production is rapidly moving forward. We will soon obtain mass production of planes. The experience of many other nations would indicate that we need about 50 men well trained in the different and various branches of aviation for each plane, hence an air force of about 50,000 planes calls for a force of manpower of two and a half million trained men.

I have taken this time that I might inquire of the committee just briefly something about what is contemplated in the way of expansion in our air force, and I direct my questions to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I would like to know what this bill provides by way of more flying schools? Does it anticipate the establishment of more of them?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. These amounts cannot be segregated, but the bill provides for the establishment of

very many more schools and for extension of existing schools for this purpose throughout the country. For reasons which are obvious, the site and location of the schools cannot be designated, but provision is made to insure the training of sufficient men to handle the equipment as rapidly as fabricated.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman know something of the type of these schools? Are they additions to our basic flying schools of the Army?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is the usual flying school, up to the advanced course stage, similar to those already in operation.

Mr. CURTIS. What does the program call for in the way of schools for airplane mechanics?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are making ample provision for the training of mechanics and ground men. We are providing facilities for additional technical schools and for the instruction of about 10,000 men in private schools in addition to those under instruction at this time. I am speaking of aviation mechanics only. We also are providing for the radio side of it.

Mr. CURTIS. Of course, I do not want the chairman to divulge anything that should not be stated. I am sure we are all agreed upon that. I wonder if any plans are under way to extend any type of aviation training to students in high schools?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no provision in this bill for anything of that sort.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TABER. The aviation schools for the young men are very largely under the control of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. There is a very considerable expansion there, more expansion than heretofore. The Army itself can hardly go into the question of taking boys in high schools and training them. They would have to be handled by the civil units.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman make that 4 o'clock in order to give me 2 minutes?

Mr. CURTIS. I will yield to the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think it is highly appropriate that the gentleman call attention to the need for mechanics and technicians to maintain our flying aircraft as well as our civilian planes. May I say at this point for the RECORD that earlier this week the House unanimously passed an amendment to the Civil Pilot Training Act to include mechanics and technicians. I trust the Senate will give speedy consideration to the bill and pass it at an early date.

Mr. CURTIS. I recall that bill and I appreciate the gentleman's activity in connection with it.

May I say in regard to high-school students in connection with our aviation program that I realize the impracticability of the Army doing this, but it seems to me if we are going to win the war, we will have to have supremacy of the air, and we are going to have to have it in a large way. We have countless thousands of American high-school boys who will be great aviators, but they have never had a chance to even ride in a plane. Something ought to be done to harness that ability early so that it can be developed. Where we have heretofore trained 50,000 pilots, we must train 500,000. We need more fields, more mechanics, more schools, and more of everything. I think we should start this training in our high schools.

What does this bill provide in the way of increasing our Army fields in addition to the schools that may be provided?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will say this, that it provides for expanding personnel instruction in complete harmony with the airplane program, but I regret that I am not in a position to disclose to the gentleman the exact information.

Mr. CURTIS. I appreciate that.

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

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

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman from Missouri just mentioned that 10,000 additional mechanics might be required. I may say to the gentleman that if we are to have a 50,000-airplane program, since the Army requires not less than 20 mechanics and technicians for each airplane, this means a total of 1,000,000. In order to supply this very large number, we shall have to use every available training facility in the United States.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I rise a second time to say that what the gentleman observes about the need for training in aviation for high-school students is very important. Here in the District of Columbia we have started this year courses, optional to be sure, for high-school students. I think that should be done all over the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CURTIS. In order to obtain mastery of the air we must expand our air program and do it now. We must think in terms of millions of pilots, not thousands. This program should be carried to our high-school boys.

The Clerk read as follows:

Military posts: For construction of buildings, utilities, and appurtenances at military posts, $4,358,118,283.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARTER: On page 6, line 13, strike out "$4,358,118,283" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,341,701,283, no part of which shall be used for increasing the facilities or area of Stewart Field, West Point, N. Y., including outlying areas."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 21 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to delete from the total sum of this item of military posts some $16,400,000 for the development of Stewart Field, adjacent to West Point, N. Y., which is included in the item with the view to undertaking voluntary flight training at the Military Academy and qualifying cadets as pilots prior to graduation.

Let me preface my remarks by saying there is no one in the House, I believe, who is more fully conscious than I of the value of military air power and the necessity for this Nation to acquire supremacy in the air in the several theaters of war in which we may be engaged, but the inclusion of this amount of money in this deficiency appropriation bill comes without any specific legislative authorization whatever. This matter has not been laid before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives to determine the policy and the advisability of making this change, a most radical one from the present curriculum of the academy.

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

Mr. HARTER. I am not ready to yield right now. My time is very limited.

Under this provision, as I understand from the reading of the hearings relative to this particular item, the present plans are to have the flying training given to the cadets who volunteer for that training during the last 2 years of their course.

We must understand that at the time the Government will have a great investment in all those young men in the Military Academy, who will have completed 2 years of their training before volunteering for this flight training.

What is the situation with reference to weather conditions in and around West Point? All of us know that that territory is subject to a great deal of fog and cloudiness. The terrain is mountainous and rolling. It seems to me we should give consideration to the safety of these young men. After years of experience in building up a very substantial air force, we have found that certain localities in the Southwest and South and west coast areas furnish the best climatic conditions under which Air Corps pilots can

be trained. Now we are going to take the cream of these cadets and subject them to flying training in a part of the country most unsuited for such operations.

It will be argued that we must have a larger air force, we must have more pilots. What proportion do these West Point cadets constitute of the total number of men we are going to have as pilots? We are training pilots at the rate of nearly 30,000 a year now. We expect to raise that number to 50,000 a year before this year is over. Yet the men in West Point at the present time number 1,831. If half of that number elected to take the pilot training, you would have about 400 in the upper two classes at the academy taking this particular training. In other words, you would graduate about 200 cadets each year from the Military Academy who had pilot training.

This is a radical departure from our system of training heretofore. It appears to me that it is far more democratic to follow the system that is in existence at the present time of graduating these men from the Point, then letting them go to the Air Corps training centers, where they are infiltrated among the young men who come from the schools, colleges, and the universities. The number of graduates from the Military Academy is small, but the advantage of them mingling with the youths from civil life after their 4 years of military training, I believe, is of great value to both groups. You must have a leavening of cadets in each of these classes so that they may get the spirit of the young men who come from the colleges and universities in order that we may have to the fullest extent a really democratic Air Corps.

The Military Affairs Committee has been completely bypassed in the consideration of this legislation. Why have legislative or policy-making committees if they are to be ignored by the War Department and the Appropriation Committee?

The reading of the hearings upon this item leaves one more confused than ever. Are these men to be sent to civilian schools for their primary training, as are all other aviation cadets, or are we going to set up a special primary school at West Point for these cadets alone?

At one point in the hearings a Colonel Weikert, on page 160, says:

> During his first stage he is living with aviation cadets and should draw the same pay, because we have to pay for his board and quarters at that place.

This would indicate the primary training would be with other aviation trainees and at a place other than West Point. No details are available as to the type and extent of the facilities at Stewart Field which the sixteen million plus is to provide.

It may be that a full and careful inquiry will show the Army correct in its request for these funds for such training at the Military Academy, but Congress and the people, even under present conditions, are entitled to have these matters properly and fully considered.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO].

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides for eliminating over $16,000,000 from this bill. If you read through the hearings, all you will find on this subject is that $16,000,000 is included to construct buildings on an air field some 12 miles or more north of West Point. There is no explanation of the character of the buildings or the necessity for the construction of $16,000,000 rather than $10,000,000 worth of buildings, or any other amount. For $16,000,000 you can build one of the largest Air Corps flying bases in the country. March Field in California or Maxwell Field in Alabama originally did not cost over $10,000,000, yet to train approximately 200 or 300 pilots a year out of West Point you are going to spend $16,000,000.

What effect, I ask you, is that going to have on the regular training course at the academy? You are going to take the students there out in the morning by bus and run them out to this flying field and have them fly. Some will be there one day and some another. How this is going to affect the course of studies at the academy was not directly inquired into. You are establishing a new policy of making every cadet at West Point go through a very definite and a very elaborate program of training in aviation, far more comprehensive than the present course in aviation which he is already receiving, far more than you give him regarding infantry, cavalry, or coast artillery. The program at West Point provides for a general course and right now they are getting flying training. Whether it is necessary to provide for 2 years of training in which they go out and fly every day has not been looked into. The advisability of this program is certainly subject to question. Moreover, what is the weather condition up there? You are putting this field in a long, narrow valley, 20 miles wide, with rolling mountains and hills on all sides of it. It is a very dangerous country and yet you are proposing to put a flying field there, to train young inexperienced cadets. The wisdom of this program has not been considered. The justification of the $16,000,000 cost has not been made.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the amendment will be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] for 2 minutes.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the Army upon its very early realization, after what has been going on in Europe, Asia, and the Far East in air warfare, of the advisability of establishing a flying school for cadets at West Point. We have men there who are learning to be artillery officers, infantry officers, cavalry officers, and engineer officers. By the same token we should develop some of these men as flyers. It is contemplated that the flying course will be the last 2 years of the 4-year West Point course. For the first 2 years the students will be given observation training and after 2 years those boys who wish to take the course in flying may do so.

They have at West Point or near there Stewart Field. It was originally a municipal field that was owned by a city in that neighborhood. This has been turned over to West Point as a landing field, and one million and a half of W. P. A. money has been spent on it. They contemplate acquiring 100 additional acres of land there to extend the flying field, and this acreage will cost $150 an acre, or $150,000.

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

Mr. TERRY. I am sorry, but I only have 2 minutes.

In addition to that, there will be $16,000,000 for the flying facilities there—the garages, the administration building, the runways, and other extensive equipment and facilities that have all been figured out by the West Point authorities. This flying program for West Point is urgently asked for by General Marshall, the Chief of Staff, and by General Arnold, the head of the Air Corps. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the inclusion of this item is an effort to modernize our Army. Unless officers are trained to fly, and unless they know how, they are no good to the Army of the future. If you are going to abolish West Point and move it somewhere else, that is one program; but unless you are going to establish this flying field up there, you have no hope of modernizing your Army and having the men who are going to head our Army in the future be of any use to us in organizing it and perfecting it.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON]

Mr THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I think there is merit in this proposal to have some aviation activities at West Point. I think the course there is a little outmoded and ought to be brought down to date, but the thing I do not like about this is the way you are trying to do it. I am a member of the Board of Visitors to West Point and much interested in its success. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] whom all regard as one of the strongest and sanest men in this House, probably knows more about aviation than anyone in the House, because he has made a special study of it. This House is always safe in following his leadership. It seems strikingly peculiar to me that this matter should be tacked onto an appropriation bill with $16,000,000 to provide one of the biggest air fields in the Nation without hearings before the legislative committee.

I am beginning to wonder what is the use of having legislative committees such as the Committee on Military Affairs. The Committee on Military Affairs, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], has had hearings on many matters of national defense for months. Yet this

item has never been presented to the committee. Now some of the Members are talking about recessing for 2 weeks, to which I am opposed, because there are plenty of matters with respect to national defense just like this one that could be considered. The Committee on Military Affairs will meet next Tuesday, and the subcommittees of that committee are in almost daily session. A matter of this sort could be considered by that committee and reported out after reasonable and proper hearing and then brought to the floor of this House for fair and just action by the House. This is no time for adjourning or recessing, and I am opposed to either. The Committee on Naval Affairs should report out their 40-hour bill and let us vote on it. We will send it to the Senate whether they act on it or not. We will at least have done our duty.

Randolph Field is called the West Point of the Air, and then there is March Field, in California, and Maxwell Field, in Alabama. These different schools are turning out 30,000 pilots a year. Now overnight they say they need a great air school at West Point. The United States Military Academy is the greatest school of its kind in the world. I am its friend, and I want to see aviation there. But I do say the Committee on Military Affairs is entitled to some courtesy and consideration in the matter. We ought to appoint some more cadets to West Point. We ought to fill up the vacancies there. The school could accommodate 550 more boys by putting 3 in a room. I am going to sponsor and urge some legislation on the subject.

Mr. COSTELLO. And the cadets at West Point are now getting aviation training at Mitchel Field each year.

Mr. THOMASON. Of course, and they are getting it at all the fields. We must do everything possible for aviation. I have for years urged such a program. This war will likely be won or lost in the air. I want us to have the finest planes of any nation in the world, and more of them. This means we must have pilots who are qualified and well trained. Any such program will have my active support. I am only objecting to the way you are doing it and not in keeping with the rules of the House.

Mr. POWERS. Mr Chairman, very seldom do I find myself in disagreement with the able membership of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, but let us be frank and honest and mean it. The War Department should have gone to the legislative committee, and the War Department should have justified this expenditure, or at least this change of policy, at West Point, and then have asked to have the money put into the bill, but the money is in the bill now, and it has been urgently requested by General Marshall, and urgently requested by General Arnold, and also it has been justified by General Wilby, the Superintendent of the academy. This is what it does It is not a mandatory proposition. It is a proposition to allow any cadet in the academy to take this air course. If that is allowed, and this amendment is defeated—and I hope it is—it will mean that every year infiltrating into our air force will be a certain number of graduates of the Military Academy. It will mean that every year a certain number of these men will go directly into the air force, who have a basically rounded military career, a basically rounded knowledge of field artillery, of infantry, of cavalry, of every other branch of the Army.

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

Mr. POWERS. Yes.

Mr. TERRY. It has been stated by those in favor of this amendment that there were no hearings on this subject. There are 10 pages of hearings.

Mr POWERS. Yes; there are 10 pages of hearings, and it has been testified that it is the greatest forward step taken by West Point in 100 years.

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

Mr. POWERS. Certainly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Reference has been made by the gentleman from New Jersey, and also by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] to this being earnestly requested by Generals Arnold and Marshall. I have read the hearings and I do not find where either one appeared before the committee in connection with it, and while everything that the gentleman says may be true, yet these are matters that ought to have been passed upon by the legislative committee.

Mr. POWERS. Oh, I cannot argue that with the gentleman. General Wilby, of the Military Academy, justified it, and General Arnold spoke to every member of the committee, with the exception of myself; General Marshall called the committee while it was in session, and General Marshall is a non-West Point man.

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

Mr. POWERS. Certainly.

Mr. MAY. As chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs I say if given the opportunity I will call the committee next Tuesday morning, and it will pass this legislation out, if it is required, but I do object to any such proposition as this.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, that is a matter about which I cannot argue with the gentleman.

Mr. ELSTON. Was any reason given by the Committee on Appropriations as to why they should not go before the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. POWERS. The question was asked, "Is not this a change of policy?" And the answer was "Yes."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, no longer than this week we tabled a bill that the Committee on Appropriations should have handled, in order to give them a chance to do so.

Mr. POWERS. I cannot argue that fact with the gentleman. I want to be fair and truthful, and I am telling you that General Marshall and General Arnold urgently requested the appropriation, and I hope that the Harter amendment will be voted down.

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

Mr. POWERS. Yes.

Mr. HARTER. I do not know whether the gentleman was in attendance at the hearings of his committee or not.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman was there every day and well into every night.

Mr. HARTER. One of the members of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], made the suggestion on page 163 of the hearings—and I read from the hearings:

> Mr. STARNES. That is going to bring about additional cost. I am afraid you are embarking on something here that ought to be considered by the military legislative committee of the House and discussed very fully.
>
> Colonel WILBY. What we are trying to do, really, is to bring the Air Corps closer to the Army than it would be if we do not do this, Mr. STARNES; that is what it will bring to the Army; because we are going to get well-rounded cadets in the Air Corps, which this large expansion of the Air Corps today has prevented.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER Mr. Chairman, let me repeat what my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] just said. There is no question but what this should have been brought before the Military Affairs Committee, so we will not talk about that any more. We agree with you 100 percent. But things have changed in the past few months since Pearl Harbor. I do not think, if we had not had Pearl Harbor, that this would be in this bill at all. I am sure it would not be

How many have been to West Point and have been up to Stewart Field? It is about a 15 minutes' ride above West Point. There is a small airfield there now—so small that you could not get down on it with a modern bomber.

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

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Did you develop in the hearings how long it would take to construct this field—to get it ready to train at West Point?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. MAY. How long?

Mr. SNYDER. Just let me come to it, will you, please? The only logical place adjacent to West Point where an expansion could be made for an airfield is at Stewart Field. They can and will within the next 8 or 9 months, if they get the money, have this field sufficiently completed for pilot training.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Not just now, if you please. The inference I got from the previous discussion was that the boys at West Point would not continue to get the same type of training that they are getting now. This is all extra. They will get the same course, academically speaking, that they are getting now. The flight training will be entirely extra.

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

Mr. SNYDER. Not just now. I told you I would not question the right of you men to get mad about the matter of jurisdiction. I want to say that General Arnold called me up about this proposi-

tion and said this was one thing he was interested in, above all. This is the first time General Marshall ever called me about any pending proposition. He called me personally during our hearings and he said:

If there is one thing that is of vital importance, it is that pilot training matter at West Point.

Mr. HARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. HARTER. Does the gentleman remember the statement he made in the hearings at page 132 in reply to General Robins:

It just makes me sick to look at these figures. What type of construction, as a general rule, is contemplated at all of these places?

You were talking about this expansion at Stewart Field. What disturbed you over the figures that morning? What did you not like about them that made you sick?

Mr. SNYDER. At Stewart Field?

Mr. HARTER. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. I was referring to the whole construction matter, not to any specific project.

Mr. HARTER. I do not see any explanation here about the buildings except $16,000,000.

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

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that at innumerable places throughout the United States we are spending more than $16,000,000 on construction projects?

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

Mr. MAHON. And is it not true that we were told this would be the most forward-looking step adopted by our Army in a hundred years?

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that those who are looking toward the future security of this Nation should think twice before voting to eliminate air training from West Point?

Mr. SNYDER. I agree with the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARTER) there were—ayes 39, noes 56.

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN [after counting]. Fifteen Members have arisen, not a sufficient number. Tellers are refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction and repair of hospitals: For construction and repair of hospitals, $775,000.

In all, $5,306,163,883.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, we now have under consideration a national-defense measure. Upon the passage of the pending bill many of us are looking forward with pleasure to a brief visit home. We are going home to face criticism, criticism which is generated by a general unrest which exists in the country today. All of us have received numerous communications all of which indicate the great unrest which exists in America today. I am conscious of this situation and I am quite sure that you are. I have today listened with great interest to many very fine speeches which have been made by able and distinguished Members of this House during the general debate on the pending measure. Many speakers have referred to the paramount importance of an all-out war effort and many of them have referred to the deplorable situation which exists in the world today. I know that I need not tell you that we are living in an unhappy world and that a belligerent spirit and a reckless and rapacious tide of violence is sweeping across the earth, crushing out the ancient institutions of freedom. I know that I need not tell you about the intriguing schemes and imperialistic ambitions which have caused men and women in other parts of the world to renounce their belief in the soundness of democratic government and to lose their faith in the ability of men and women by their own good judgment to govern themselves. The revelations of each hour and of each day and of each night give rise to solemn and disturbing thoughts and reflections.

I know that you understand the complexities of our present situation, but I rise for the purpose of propounding certain questions to the membership of this House.

Is any Member of this House conscious of anything that this House of Representatives has done which has resulted in impeding the progress of the war effort? Is any Member of this House conscious of anything that this body could have done which has not already been done? I pause for an answer.

I know and you know, and it is time for the membership of this House to let the country know, that every bill which has been reported by the Naval Affairs Committee, the Military Affairs Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and, for that matter, every other committee of the House, which had for its purpose the building of a war machine sufficient to crush the Axis forces, has been appropriately considered and very promptly passed by this body. If there is anyone present who challenges the accuracy of this statement, I pause for the purpose of permitting the Member to stand in his place and point out wherein the membership of this House has failed.

I know—and I want the country to know—that this Congress is earnestly anxious to do everything within its power to expedite the all-out war effort, yet the country seems to feel that Congress has been guilty of dereliction and on account of a lack of information a general and unjust indictment has been leveled at us. We appreciate just as much as some of our critics appreciate the fact that the time for dynamic action is at hand and that the national defense program is of great and paramount importance. We appreciate the fact that upon a prompt and proper solution of the great problems of production will depend the ultimate success of our war effort, and upon the success of our war effort will depend the survival and the perpetuity of our system of government. We likewise appreciate the fact that this is no time for selfish gain. This is no time for racketeering or profiteering, and this is no time for strife and strikes in vital industries.

Eighteen months before Pearl Harbor the House passed and sent to the Senate amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. This bill died a natural death in a pigeonhole in that body.

On December 3, four days before Pearl Harbor, we passed and sent to the Senate the Smith bill which was a bold effort on the part of the House to solve some of the problems growing out of labor disputes. This bill has been pending in the other body since December 8 but for some reason, no action thereon has been taken.

The House Naval Affairs Committee is now considering another bill dealing with the subject of labor disputes and controversies but we are advised by the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee that this bill will not be reported to the House before April 13.

The laboring men of America must be inspired by a patriotic zeal and they must furnish the tanks and guns, the battleships and bombers, and all of the other instrumentalities of defense and death which are needed by the fighting men of America and our gallant allies. It is neither the force of law nor the fear of punishment that causes the sons of America to fight and to bleed and to die in the cause of freedom. It is their love of their country and their country's cause that inspires them to heroic deeds. We cannot by the mere enactment of laws win the conflict in which we are now engaged. The laws we here enact will not in themselves bring victory to those who are dying in the ranks of freedom on the ramparts of the world. It will take the all-out effort of every union, bloc, and group in this country to bring the present conflict to a glorious consummation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY and Mr. KEEFE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] a member of the committee.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to permit me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 13 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I was greatly impressed by the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina who just left the floor.

We are about to pass a bill which involves over $18,000,000,000 and will bring the total appropriations and authorizations for national defense up to over $160,000,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal of the criticism directed by the people of this country toward the Congress and the administration is justified. A great deal of the uncertainty in the minds of businessmen and others arises, however, not as a result of actions of Members of Congress but from the administration and disbursement of these funds. I want to call your attention to a situation that is developing throughout this country that ought to command the immediate attention of those in charge of the expenditure of these funds.

I will give you an illustration of what I have in mind: One concern operating in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area has firm contracts today to build items for the Navy amounting to $140,000,000. In figuring a wage scale applicable to the units involved in the production the Navy did not take the wage scale that prevailed in that area but took the wage scale prevailing in naval establishments in Philadelphia, Brooklyn, and Washington, D. C. The result is that that concern is receiving a unit price for its product which enables them to pay wages that amount today to $1.28 an hour for night work and $1.16 for day work when the prevailing wage rates through that midwestern area is perhaps 75 to 90 cents an hour for the same class of work.

They are offering a contract of employment that will permit their employees to work on a basis of 75 hours a week, the employees receiving 92½ hours' pay or $118.40 per week for night work and $107.30 for day work. On a 50-week year this is $5,920 per year for semiskilled labor for night work and $5,365 per year for day work. Many of the men working in this plant are permitted to work as high as 84 hours a week and up to 92 hours a week, all receiving overtime over 40 hours. What is the result? The firms engaged in the war effort in my territory have secured their business as a result of competitive bids and they have been required to figure labor in their unit cost at the prevailing wage rate stipulated under the provisions of the Walsh-Healey Act.

The result is that these concerns up in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area are siphoning away the skilled labor from down in our area, and attracting that labor up to the St. Paul-Minneapolis area where they are able to offer these attractive wage rates.

Mr. Chairman, that situation is growing up all over the country, and I have before me now confirming evidence from one of the manufacturing plants in my city that is devoted 100 percent to war work, making marine motors for the Navy, in which it is stated that if they lose a few more of their men they will have to shut down their plant. What is the Government doing about it? They have negotiated a stabilization of wage rates in the shipyards industry, but we have this situation going on in many other industries. In the Minneapolis area we find that the International Harvester Co. is seeking 2,500 additional men, the Minneapolis Moline Co. wants to hire 4,000 additional men, the Minneapolis Ordnance Plant, 18,000 additional men, and the Northern Pump Co., the company I just referred to in these remarks, is jumping their employees from 600 to 6,500.

This problem should attract the attention of those who are letting these contracts and not destroy the effort in the communities that are compelled to pay the prevailing wage rate. The head of one concern clearly put the problem before me in the following language, and I quote:

> In other words, if this situation is allowed to continue; in fact, if the present situation is not corrected, it apparently will become necessary for business to pay wages of five to six thousand dollars a year for semiskilled labor, and up to and over $9,000 a year for skilled labor and departmental foremen. In my opinion, that is no longer a start toward inflation—it is just about the peak.
>
> What the solution is I don't know. But, among others, it might be advisable to restrict all defense manufacturers to employ all of their labor through the United States employment bureaus throughout the country. If this were done some control over pirating could be put into effect.
>
> Personally, I wish that all prices would be frozen, not only material prices, but salaries, wages, profits, farm prices as well, right down the line. If this can be done, still leaving room for some bonus or incentive for increased production, such as a certain percentage of profit on all war business regardless of the volume, the bonus for salaried employees and wage earners for increased production, plus a cost-of-living bonus as the cost of living increases, I think we would solve a great deal of our problems.

Mr. Chairman, pious expressions of hope and intentions from the contracting officers of the Army and Navy will not correct this evil—determined, offensive action is necessary on this front if we are to achieve necessary production.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, but for the fact I was precluded from addressing the Committee on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER], which proposed to strike out the $16,000,000 appropriation for the Steward Field near West Point, I would not have asked for this time to speak to the Committee

May I say that for more than 2 years before the Congress declared war, the House Military Affairs Committee had anticipated the needs of this country and had started programs of legislation on its own accord, as illustrated by the strategic raw materials bill and other bills, which the War Department did not sponsor. In the 2½ years that have passed, there has never been a time when the War Department asked for legislation that it did not get it promptly.

While I am not here to throw rocks at my colleagues or to take issue with the Appropriations Committee, I do intend to say that I resent the acts of the Appropriations Committee and the War Department in completely ignoring the House Military Affairs Committee, in view of the fact that no later than last week, when we were notified that the Appropriations Committee had decided not to appropriate money for the purchase of any further real estate other than that absolutely essential, we tabled a bill that proposed to buy real estate to go along with the House Appropriations Committee. Notwithstanding the fact that we passed legislation 2 years ago to authorize the construction of an Army medical library and museum, where there are $30,000,000 worth of the most valuable books in the world, and notwithstanding the fact that there had been appropriated only $150,000 for engineering and architectural work, they disallowed that item this time and would not appropriate it. We made no complaint, although the Budget had authorized $500,000 for the purchase of the real estate. I think in good conscience the Appropriations Committee ought not to put this legislative committee in the attitude of having to come up here and oppose something that the War Department through the back door asked for.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am not in sympathy with items of this character, and have always opposed carrying them in appropriation bills; only the exigencies of the situation and the insistence of the Department that this was an emergency matter prevailed upon us to include this paragraph in the bill.

Mr. MAY. I am sure the gentleman has stated his position correctly.

Mr. THOMASON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. THOMASON. If that is the attitude of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I am sure it is, and I accept it at its full worth, and if the Committee on Military Affairs is an important legislative committee, does not the chairman of that committee who now addresses the House feel that the War Department, through its proper officials, owes the legislative committee the courtesy of presenting these matters to the legislative committee in order that full and adequate hearings looking to authorization may be had?

Mr. MAY. I agree absolutely with my colleague, who is my right hand or right arm on the committee, a very wise leader; I would not be surprised, however, if the War Department does not have some hearings on this proposal next Tuesday, notwithstanding the action of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. As chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, may I ask the gentleman if his committee has not promptly considered and reported to the House every national de-

fense measure that has been recommended by the administration, and if the House has not appropriately considered and very promptly passed every bill which the gentleman's committee has reported?

Mr. MAY. Every word the gentleman has stated is the truth, and, in addition to that, may I say that no later than last week the War Department found itself haltered, hobbled, and string-tied for a little piece of legislation that had been reported by my committee. I came to the floor of the House, got it passed by unanimous consent, had it messaged to the Senate, followed it over there, and insisted it be passed the same day, and it was passed. In the face of all that has been done, the responsible officials of the War Department, whoever they were, that bypassed the Military Affairs Committee on this matter, ought to have an awakening of conscience, and I hope the high ranking military gentlemen in the gallery go down and tell their superiors every word I have said, and if they do not, the gentlemen can read the RECORD

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the question which we have been discussing is whether or not we shall provide money for Air Corps training at the United States Military Academy at West Point. Of course, for years we have provided for Air Corps training in a limited way for the men after they graduate from the Academy. We have trained the cadets in the arts of cavalry, engineering, and other subjects but not aviation. Our enemies must have smiled at the failure of this great Nation to incorporate aviation training in the basic course at West Point years ago.

I quote the following from the testimony of General Wilby, superintendent of the Academy, as shown on page 165 of the hearings:

Mr. MAHON. When was West Point established?

General WILBY. In 1802.

Mr. MAHON. And the methods of warfare have changed considerably since that time?

General WILBY. Methods change with the weapons.

Mr. MAHON. If West Point is going to keep pace with modern warfare it has got to be tops in the air?

General WILBY. Yes; it has.

Mr. MAHON. And if West Point graduates are going to have a dominant part in running the Army some of them have to be in the air and be Air Corps officers?

General WILBY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAHON. And the best way to get them in the air is to train them at West Point while they are going through their regular training?

General WILBY. That is what I believe.

Mr. MAHON. You think this is one of the greatest forward steps proposed to be taken in a number of years?

General WILBY. For 100 years.

Mr. MAHON. I think you are right.

Mr. Chairman, as one of the members of the subcommittee which originally considered this item about which the gentleman from Kentucky has been speaking may I say that I agree with him somewhat in his statement that the item should preferably have been first considered by the Military Affairs Committee; but we were not confronted with a theory in procedure, we were up against a proposition which required action. We were authoritatively told that this would be one of the most forward-looking steps taken in a hundred years by the War Department, and that immediate action was absolutely required. Therefore, we brought in the item and, under the circumstances, I think the gentlemen are justified in some of their criticism, but, on the other hand, I think the Appropriations Committee is justified in the position it took under the circumstances. And the House of Representatives is to be commended for its position in trying to get West Point out of the "horse and buggy" days, so to speak, and into the field of modern warfare where victories are won.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to pay my tribute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who I think has rendered the country a distinguished service today. He pointed out a short time ago that the testimony of Mr. Thurman Arnold has revealed the fact that there is some doubt whether or not the President of the United States and the Government have the unquestioned right to make use of any patents that may be in existence today, to break the hold of those patents, and to see to it that such processes can be used any place, at any time, and to any extent for the production of the necessary war materials.

The gentleman from Tennessee has introduced a special bill which, if passed, would clear the situation once and for all, and decisively. I just wanted to say that I believe he has rendered a real service and indicated a kind of leadership on matters of this type that is very good and constructive.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

ORDNANCE SERVICE AND SUPPLIES, ARMY

For ordnance service and supplies, Army, $543,721,283.

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

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time to point out to the Members of the House the fact that the subcommittee on military expenditures oftentimes adds to the amount the War Department is allowed by the Director of the Budget to ask for. I was interested in this particular item because it totals $543,000,000 for the weapons with which we are supposed to win the war, while the cost of construction in the United States of buildings and other installations is about 10 times that amount, or more than $5,000,000,000.

Sometimes Members of Congress are chided on the fact that they have cut appropriations which have to do with either naval or military expenditures, but I think the Members of the Committee would be interested in knowing that back in 1938 the situation was exactly the opposite. The War Department needed money with which to manufacture Garand rifles. At that time the total amount of money that had been appropriated and which would be expended up to October 1, 1938, slightly over 3 years ago, for Garand rifles would produce only 7,500 of those semiautomatic rifles; yet early in 1938 the Army was told by the Budget that the amount they could have was only a certain limited amount, less than it had asked for through the Bureau of the Budget. As a result, because these weapons were in the fourth priority, as the records show, it was necessary to cut the production of these semiautomatic rifles to 2,500 a year, and that would have been all that would have been produced of those rifles between July 1, 1938, and July 1, 1939, 2 months before this great war broke out.

As a result, I went before this subcommittee, and I am interested in telling the Committee here today that that committee unanimously, laying aside all questions of partisan politics or whether a person was a member of the Republican or the Democratic Party, said that they would see to it that funds were available to increase the amount for rifles by 400 percent, and would provide $1,800,000 for new tools, dies, and equipment to make the Springfield Armory, where these rifles are manufactured, a first-class, modern institution.

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

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

Mr. MURDOCK. As a new Member in that Congress, I recall that on February 18, 1938, I was in the committee room at the same hearing, having gone there to present two other matters pertaining to preparedness. I compliment the gentleman now in the Well of the House on making one of the best presentations I have heard since becoming a Member, in favor of this new semiautomatic rifle. Not being a military man, I knew little about it then, but I was convinced that day, and almost forgot the items I came to speak for in my enthusiasm to support his request. I can confirm what the gentleman is saying about the attitude and action and the apparently unanimous consent his eloquence at that time brought forth in the committee in regard to the need for this remarkable new rifle.

If I may go a bit further, I have been glad to be informed by the highest military authorities that that rifle has long been in mass production and it has played a very important part recently, especially in the Philippine Islands in recent days. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts has had a remarkable part in bringing about that impetus in production which has led to such fine results.

Mr. CLASON. I thank the gentleman for his very gracious statement.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. May I point out also that as late as October 1, 1938, only 7,500 of these rifles had been built in a period of years, yet today they are manufacturing that entire amount in a single week at Springfield. This shows what was accomplished by reason of the subcommittee on military expenditures seeing to it that funds were made available to carry on the work which was then being advanced.

Even as far back as May of 1938 that rifle was on maneuvers in small numbers. A commander of a battalion on maneuvers reported to Major General Tschappat, then Chief of Ordnance, that some of these rifles on maneuvers fell overboard in a stream, were clogged with sand and, although the men had hardly any way of cleaning them, they were yet serviceable and were used throughout the maneuvers without apparent damage. Of course, I was particularly pleased when General MacArthur brought out the fact that while they are being used in the fox holes in the Philippines they often go more than a week without lubrication and render excellent service

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. Chairman, a moment ago I propounded a question to the very able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. ANDREW J. MAY, and I should like very much now to propound a similar question to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia. I think the entire membership would be interested in the answer to the question, since it appears that there is a likelihood that some of us will go home this afternoon.

May I ask the distinguished gentleman if his committee has not promptly considered and reported to the House every bill that has been recommended to the Congress by the Commander in Chief of the armed forces?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In response to the inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, I desire to advise the House that the Committee on Naval Affairs has promptly considered and made recommendation on every bill before the committee, except a bill I introduced today, and one yesterday, and we will take those up just as soon as we get to a committee meeting.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like further to ask, Mr. Chairman, if the measures reported by the gentleman's committee have not received prompt consideration and passage at the hands of the membership of the House.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The House has cooperated 100 percent in the speedy enactment of every naval-affairs bill that has been brought before it.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask one other question of both the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee and the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee and of the entire membership of the House. Do any of you know of any one thing that any one Member of Congress or any group of this House or even a majority of this House can do at this moment which would expedite the war effort?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me a moment?

Mr. COOLEY. I pause a moment for an answer and not receiving an answer, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I would like to say in answer to the query of the gentleman from North Carolina that I do not know of any single item of legislation that has been presented either by the House Military Affairs Committee or by the House Naval Affairs Committee that has not been considered very promptly and passed by the House.

Furthermore, I make this statement, subject to the approval of the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, and that is that as to the legislation that is now pending for hearing before his committee, the gentleman and myself have made an agreement that in order to expedite the early disposition of such matters we would consider the hearings of one committee—namely, the House Committee on Naval Affairs—without the necessity of duplicating them before the House Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman from Kentucky is correct. May I say that there can be no valid criticism against the House of Representatives with reference to any legislation relating to the speedy and successful prosecution of the war.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank my friend from Georgia.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], of course, is too modest to admit it and much too modest even to say so, but the fact is, however, that so far as the naval program of the United States is concerned, the gentleman from Georgia began that program in the Naval Affairs Committee long before he ever had any requests from the Navy Department or even the Commander in Chief. Some of the most valuable naval legislation that has been reported out of that committee was over the protest of the Navy Department itself. This is naval history. So, instead of being behind, the gentleman from Georgia is years ahead even of the Navy in the work of our Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I approve heartily of all this "back patting" that has been going on here, because, as one Member of the House, I think I have taken about as much criticism as anybody else has in the last 60 days.

I went home last week and spent 6 days down in my district and made six speeches and talked to a lot of people. I do not agree with my friends who oppose a recess. I would vote tonight for a resolution requiring every Member of this House to spend 1 month out of each 4 months in his district every year in order that he might counsel with the people he represents and find out what they want to know and tell them the truth, because they are not getting the truth anywhere else. All of this talk about what the House has done in the way of expediting legislation is fine, and it is true, but the people are not hearing about it. All they are hearing is when they are sitting there with one ear glued to the radio listening to Mr. Kaltenborn say that the industries of this country are only working half time. What he meant, of course, is that they are only working 12 hours a day, but what my people thought he meant was that they were working only 4 hours a day, and they were very much upset about it.

I found out another very interesting thing. When I referred to that broadcast, a lady rose in the audience and said to me, "Why, Mr. RAMSPECK, you have a censor up there who passes on everything that is said over the radio and everything that is printed in the newspapers. I understood that because it was censored it had to be true." Of course, you and I know that they are not censoring anything that is said over the radio or anything written in the newspapers. Certain rules have been made as to what is considered military secrets, but no one passes on the matter in advance So I want to make the suggestion to you gentlemen who are going home that you have the courage to meet your people face to face and tell them the truth.

Tell them only three one-hundredths of 1 percent of the seven and a half million people in war industries have been out of employment due to labor disputes since Pearl Harbor; tell them that you have three times as many people at work now as a year ago producing war equipment, and take with you that wonderful address made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] today, and give them some encouragement. They need it. They are discouraged, they are despondent, and they do not know the facts, because they are not getting them from the critics, who are day by day misleading the people of this country about the conduct of this war.

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

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I am scheduled to make an Army Day address in my district on the 6th day of April, and I propose to tell the people the truth from the ground up, and I am going to tell them what Congress has done.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I hope every other Member who goes home will do that. I am not concerned about whether or not the people in my district have lost faith in me, as an individual, but I say to you that if they have lost faith in the Congress, as a coordinate branch of the Gov-

ernment, that is a serious matter, and you know that some people in this country are trying to destroy the faith of the people in their Congress. They are also trying to destroy the faith of the people in the President of the United States. I am not talking now about the individual, but I am talking about the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy. He is your elected leader until January 1945, and whether you like him or not, you ought to stand behind him and defend him and help him, and we ought to give our people the truth about this situation.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, $166,000: *Provided*, That all funds heretofore and herein appropriated for the fiscal year 1942 under the titles "Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga.," "Instruction in Cavalry activities," "Instruction in Field Artillery activities," and "Coast Artillery School, Fort Monroe, Va.," shall be disbursed and accounted for as one fund under the title "Special service schools."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, our colleague from Florida, the Honorable LEX GREEN, has a record of achievement which is worthy of our commendation. The value of a Member of Congress rests largely in his understanding of the needs of his people and of the Nation; his vision to foresee the needs of the future and to meet these needs by appropriate action. His value is tested not by the number of bills introduced but by the importance, directly and indirectly, of such bills, and their bearing upon legislation finally enacted.

His more than 17 years of service here have given him power and influence. He has most efficiently served as assistant Democratic whip for more than 12 years. I, as chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee, know the value of his seniority here and his worth to the country as a whole. I feel that our administration here in Washington owes him a debt of gratitude for his splendid work and outstanding achievements.

During his services in Congress, Mr. GREEN has sponsored many bills. Of great importance among these measures are the following:

NAVAL AIR BASE FOR JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

On March 25, 1938, Congressman LEX GREEN introduced H. R. 10031, which provided for the construction of an air base at Jacksonville, Fla. In 1938, pursuant to special legislation, Secretary of the Navy Swanson appointed a sites inspection board, composed of Rear Admiral A. J. Hepburn, Rear Admiral E. J. Marquart, Capt. J. S. Woods, Capt. A. L. Bristol, Jr., Capt. Ralph Whitman, and Commander W. E. Hilbert. Upon the urgent request of Congressman GREEN, close inspection was made of the Jacksonville, Fla., area.

On January 3, 1939, this board reported to the Congress its recommendations, among which was that we would have a southeastern air base and that it would be located at Camp Foster, Jacksonville, Fla., together with carrier piers at the mouth of the St. Johns River and auxiliary base at Banana River. On January 4, 1939, Congressman GREEN introduced H. R. 1654, to carry out the Hepburn board's recommendations insofar as a southeastern air base was concerned.

My committee made two official inspection trips of the proposals offered in the Southeast including places in South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida. Hearings were held by the committee and due consideration given to the various sites available in the Southeast. On March 28, 1939, my committee by a vote of 15 to 7 designated Jacksonville as the place for the air base. This bill was promptly passed by the House and Senate and signed by the President.

In this connection let me say that in my opinion the citizens of Jacksonville, Duval County, and as a matter of fact the entire State of Florida are under lasting obligation to their able and distinguished Congressman, Hon. LEX GREEN, for the valuable aid and assistance he rendered, not only to the committee but the Hepburn board in the selection of the site.

I measure my words when I say that during my 28 years service in the House, I have never seen efforts more diligent or successful as Congressman GREEN's efforts in behalf of this establishment. The then Acting Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Lewis Compton, strongly praised him for his diligence in the location and establishment of this station when he said in part, as follows:

You knew as well as we did that it was the proper strategic location and you were determined that Jacksonville would not lose this large Federal establishment. You represented Jacksonville with great credit and you assisted the Navy in carrying out its recommendations.

We are confident that this base will be a great pride to Jacksonville and the surrounding counties as well as Florida and the Nation. I want to thank you for your valuable assistance in helping the Navy locate another line in its defense of the Panama Canal and the southeastern United States.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, this, the Southeastern Naval Air Station at Jacksonville, Fla., is one of the finest war establishments in the country, and it stands out as a lasting tribute to Mr. GREEN's outstanding accomplishments to our war effort.

OTHER NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS IN FLORIDA

The Navy Department has made great expansion in its establishments and its development in Florida. Many auxiliary fields in connection with the air station at Jacksonville, the largest of which is at Banana River, Key West, Pensacola, Miami, and other places, are developing in a strong ring of naval defense around the entire State of Florida.

The War Department has greatly augmented its defense facilities in the State of Florida through several establishments. Fort Barrancas, Eglin Field, Appalachicola, air field at Marianna, Tallahassee, Orlando, MacDill Field (Tampa), Miami, and Camp Blanding are among those of greater magnitude. Mr. GREEN has been most active and aggressive in his efforts for national defense and in support of the war effort. It is noteworthy that the largest of these military establishments is situated in his district at Camp Blanding. He conferred with War Department officials; they inspected possibilities at Camp Blanding and found it to be a most suitable location. It was constructed with speed, and within a few months after decision by the War Department to establish Camp Blanding some 50,000 men were in training there. In this connection and in connection with our defense program, the following letter from the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is significant:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1942.

Hon. LEX GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LEX: Further reference is made to my conference with you concerning H. R. 6243, a bill introduced by you to authorize the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Capt. Colin P. Kelly, Jr., deceased. I have referred the matter to the Secretary of War for his recommendation. I appreciate your diligence in this cause so worthy.

I desire to take this opportunity to express to you my appreciation for your full cooperation with the House Military Affairs Committee in the passage by the Congress of our national defense legislation. You have supported and voted for all defense and war measures reported by my committee since, and before, Pearl Harbor.

The military establishment at Camp Blanding best demonstrates your successful interest in our war effort. This is one of the greatest military establishments in our country and will go down in history as a lasting tribute to your outstanding achievements in connection with our war effort.

Your long experience and seniority has enabled you to serve effectively, and I hope the people of Florida will contribute to our war effort by returning you to Congress.

With very kind personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

A. J. MAY,
Chairman, Military Affairs Committee.

RIVERS AND HARBORS IMPROVEMENTS

Owing to our colleague's seniority, he is now chairman of the Territories Committee, a member of the Immigration and Naturalization Committee, and of the Committee on Flood Control, and stands near the top of the powerful Rivers and Harbors Committee. The Rivers and Harbors Committee assignment is of tremendous interest to all States, but particularly to Florida, which has some 1,300 miles of seacoast and numerous navigable rivers. He has been most active and successful in bringing about approval of such outstanding projects as the harbors of Fernandina, Jacksonville, St. Augustine, Fort Pierce, West Palm Beach, Cedar Keys, Port St. Joe, Pensacola, Okeechobee flood control, and many others. On April 13, 1936, he introduced H. R. 12253, which is a bill to provide for Federal cooperation to prevent erosion and destruction of beaches and water fronts throughout the country. This problem is gaining the consideration of the Congress.

SOLDIERS' HOME—VETERANS' LEGISLATION

On April 15, 1929, Mr. GREEN introduced a bill for the establishment of a national home for disabled soldiers in the State of Florida. This bill was passed and actually led to the establishment, not only of the home in St. Petersburg (Bay Pines), Fla., but of similar

institutions in Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina. It was one of the most important pieces of soldiers' relief legislation ever passed.

Mr. GREEN has been instrumental in obtaining numerous appropriations for the enlargement of United States veterans' facility in Lake City, and the one at Bay Pines, Fla.

On December 1, 1930, he introduced a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to return to Florida the silver service set donated to the U. S. S. *Florida* by the Florida people. The legislation was passed.

H. R. 1440, introduced by him, is now before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. This bill would give disability pensions to all disabled World War veterans for 10 percent, $12 per month; 25 percent, $20 per month; 50 percent, $30 per month; 75 percent, $40 per month; total permanent disability, $60 per month. This bill would also give automatic increase of 10 percent in service-connected compensation.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 10, 1936, roll call No. 3, shows he voted to pass the bonus bill, and the RECORD shows on January 24, 1926, roll call No. 11, he voted to pass the bonus bill over the veto of the President.

He has been a consistent supporter of legislation for the benefit of veterans and their dependents and was in 1933 given the Legion distinguished service award of the American Legion post of his home county.

After a Member has served here for several years, the question is sometimes asked: What has he done? This is very easy to answer in the case of our colleague from Florida, Mr GREEN.

FARM RELIEF

Mr. GREEN has been a consistent supporter of farm relief measures, including electrical current for farms. On March 10, 1933, he introduced a bill providing for extension of time on Federal land bank loans, and for other purposes. This bill gave impetus to the administration's legislation extending time on loans and permitting additional loans by the Federal land banks throughout the country. On January 3, 1935, he introduced H. R. 3020, providing for funds for the control of screwworms in livestock and for the continuance of the tick-eradication program. Funds for both of these necessary farm causes were provided in the 1935 appropriation bill.

He supported and voted for legislation which was passed to guarantee and insure the bank deposits throughout the country.

In 1937 he introduced a bill to refund to tobacco growers taxes paid under the Kerr-Smith Act. Legislation for this purpose became a law and claims were refunded to the growers.

MEDITERRANEAN FRUITFLY CLAIMS

In 1930 Mr. GREEN was the first to introduce a bill looking toward survey of fruitfly eradication damages in Florida and for payments therefor. His efforts and those of his other Florida colleagues have been so persistent in this cause until recently the House Claims Committee reported a bill looking toward the appropriation of $10,000,000 for refund of these damages. On March 23, 1942, he addressed the House at length on this subject and urged prompt passage of H. R. 5950 for payment of claimants.

UNLIMITED SUGARCANE PRODUCTION IN FLORIDA

Mr. GREEN has opposed the continental United States sugar-quota laws insofar as they applied to sugarcane production. He has appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture and also addressed the House on numercus occasions in an effort to bring about unlimited cane-sugar production, particularly in the Florida Everglades area. On February 5, 1942, he introduced H. R. 6541, which is a bill to suspend sugarcane restriction quota laws within the United States. On February 5, 1942, he addressed the House on this subject, calling for unlimited and continuous sugarcane production in Florida, and pointing out the eminent need for more sugar in our country, particularly during the war period.

TURPENTINE EXPERIMENT STATION

On December 21, 1929, he introduced a bill directing the establishment of a naval-stores experiment and demonstration station on the Osceola National Forest in Florida. The legislation was approved and the station established at Olustee, Fla., and is giving untold benefits to the naval stores and pine tree industries. It benefits not only Florida but the entire South.

FEDERAL AID FOR ROADS

He has supported all legislation for Federal aid to roads, including the national defense highway program. His district and his State have shared most liberally in the general construction program of roads, Federal buildings, and other Federal establishments.

PENSIONS

Mr. GREEN has been a consistent supporter of pensions for the aged and has frequently addressed the House, contending that the matter of security for the aged was a Federal responsibility and that straight Federal pensions should be paid to the aged without the required State matching as now under the social-security law. He has voted for liberalization of civil-service laws for all Federal workers except Congressmen and Senators. He did not vote for retirement (pensions) for Congressmen and Senators, neither did he participate under it, and on February 24, 1942, on roll call, he voted for the repeal of the law which gave possibility of so-called pensions for Congressmen and Senators. He voted for pensions or retirement bills for railroad employees, and has a most liberal and progressive record in this respect.

ENGINEERING EXPERIMENT STATIONS

He is the author of H. R. 4454, upon which hearings have been held by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House. This bill would provide Federal assistance for the establishment of engineering experiment stations in each State in the Union. It is a constructive measure and in all probability, will receive the attention of the Congress after the war.

WAR CRISIS

Mr. Chairman, our Nation now faces its most grave crisis. The emergency of the situation challenges America's best leadership. Men who are tried and true should now guide the destiny of our Nation. This is no time to experiment with high public office. Experience is essential to best results in our war effort. Mr. GREEN is experienced; he has been weighed in the balance and not found wanting. He is a man of high character and is dependable. He possesses the required leadership.

Appreciation of his character, service, and ability is expressed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable PATRICK J. BOLAND, Democratic whip, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY WHIP,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Washington, D C. March 18, 1942.

Hon. R. A. (LEX) GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D C.

DEAR LEX: I wish to extend to you my sincere thanks, as my assistant whip, for the splendid and effective cooperation you gave me during the past 10 years.

At such times when it was impossible for me to be on the floor of the House, I knew that you would perform the duty of assistant whip with such diplomacy and efficiency that desired results would be forthcoming. I feel that our administration here in Washington owes you a debt of gratitude for your splendid work, and I wish at this time personally to express my thanks for your cooperation.

Your long experience here has given you strength and power in the councils of our great Democratic Party. Your aggressiveness, high character, and fair dealings have enabled you to accomplish things of importance for your district and for the country as a whole. Men of the courage and character of your type are needed in the Congress during the critical period now facing our country. I hope that the voters of your district will continue your services as a Member of Congress.

With very kind personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
PATRICK J. BOLAND.

The Congressional Directory reveals the following: LEX GREEN was born in Bradford County, Fla.; graduated from Lake Butler High School and University of Florida; taught school; studied law, Yale University; admitted to the bar, Florida, and United States Supreme Court. Married Miss Lucile Harris of Gainesville; has two children, Lex, Jr., and Lucile. Member Florida Legislature; speaker pro tempore; county judge, Bradford County. Representative in Congress from Second Congressional District, Florida, for past 17 years. This long service in the Congress has given him seniority and experience. There is no substitute for experience.

It is a generally known fact that those districts which have retained their Representatives in Congress for the longest continuous terms have received the best services and the greatest recognition. The chairman of the powerful Rules Committee, Judge A. J. SABATH, of Illinois, has been in Congress for 34 years and is dean of the House of Representa-

tives. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. R. L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, has been in Congress for 32 years. The present Speaker of the House, Mr. SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, has been in Congress for 30 years. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. HATTON W SUMNERS, has been in office for 30 years, and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, has been in Congress for 20 years. The majority floor leader, Mr. JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, has been in Congress for 15 years. The longer the successive tenure of office, the greater the service and usefulness of the Representatives. Why should a constituency exchange experience and efficiency for inexperience?

In reviewing the record of my colleague [Mr. GREEN], I am reminded of an address made on March 16, 1916, by former Speaker Champ Clark at the Washington Press Club reception, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 17, 1916, as follows:

It is a high honor to be a Representative in Congress, if for only one term, and with the number of terms the honor increases in geometrical rather than in arithmetical proportion. A Member's usefulness to his country should increase in the same proportion. A man has to learn to be a Representative just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor.

"Poeta nascitur non fit"—a poet is born, not made—says Horace; but Congressmen—that is, useful and influential Congressmen—are made largely by experience and practice.

The old Charlotte district in Virginia knew this and kept John Randolph, of Roanoke, in the House till he became a great national figure. Then the Old Dominion sent him to the Senate and General Jackson sent him to St. Petersburg. There are sporadic cases of similar action in other districts.

It is an unwise performance for any district to change Representatives at short intervals. A new Congressman must begin at the foot of the class and spell up. Of course, the more brains, tact, energy, courage, and industry he has the quicker he will get up. If he possesses these qualities, and if his constituents will keep him in the House, he is as certain to rise as the sparks are to fly upward. No human power can keep him down. It is only fair and rational to assume that every Representative's constituents desire to see him among the top-notchers.

Let us take the present House and see how long the men who hold the high places have served. I cannot name all, but will cite a few as samples.

Mr. Speaker Cannon is serving his fortieth year. He holds the record, or, in pugilistic parlance, "he holds the belt," for length of service in the House in our entire history. In several Congresses he was chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations and then was Speaker 8 years, only one man, Henry Clay, having been Speaker longer.

I am serving my twenty-second year; Minority Leader Mann is serving his twentieth year; Mr. Kitchin, chairman of Ways and Means, his sixteenth; Mr. Fitzgerald, chairman of Appropriations, his eighteenth; Mr. Moon, chairman of the Post Office and Post Roads, his twentieth; Mr. Jones, chairman of Insular Affairs and "father of the House," his twenty-sixth; Mr. Flood, chairman of Foreign Affairs, his sixteenth; Mr. Hay, chairman of Military Affairs, his twentieth; Mr. Glass, chairman of Banking and Currency, his sixteenth; Mr. Adamson, chairman of Interstate and Foreign Commerce, his twentieth; Mr. Stephens, chairman of Indian Affairs, his twentieth; Mr. Slayden, chairman of the Library, his twentieth; Mr. Henry, chairman of Rules; his twentieth; Mr. Lever, chairman of Agriculture, his sixteenth; Mr. Padgett, chairman of the Navy, his sixteenth; Mr. Lloyd, chairman of Accounts, his twentieth; and Mr. Sparkman, chairman of Rivers and Harbors, his twenty-second. There are other big chairmanships, but these will suffice to show that, as a rule, the big places go to old and experienced Members, for most of the men who rank close to the chairmen are oldtimers. The same thing holds good with reference to members of the minority. As an illustration, Messrs. Gillette and Cooper, who are serving their twenty-fourth year, are the ranking Republicans on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs, almost certain to be chairman thereof should the Republicans ever again have a majority in the House, as in that event, in all probability, Mr. Mann will be Speaker, unless he is nominated for President next June.

Go through the whole list and you will find, with few exceptions, that the men of long service have the high places.

New England and the cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh have understood the value of long service all along, and, having elected a fairly good man to Congress, they keep him in the harness.

The Member of longest consecutive service is called "the father of the House." Five Philadelphians in immediate succession bore that honorable title—Randall, Kelley, O'Neill, Harmer, and Bingham. Then it went to Mr. Dalzell, of Pittsburgh. When General Bingham announced the death of General Harmer, his immediate predecessor as "father of the House," he stated that the five Philadelphia "fathers of the House" had served a total of 147 years, and he served 8 or 10 years after making that interesting statement.

In the second and third Congresses in which I served, Maine, with only four Members, had the Speakership and the chairmanship of the great Committees on Ways and Means, Navy, and Public Buildings and Grounds—a most remarkable circumstance, giving the Pine Tree State an influence in the House and the country out of all proportion to her population and wealth. These four men—Reed, Dingley, Boutelle, and Millikin—each served in the House 20 years or more. Other States might profit by her example.

No man should be elected to the House simply to gratify his ambition. All Members should be elected for the good of the country.

The best rule, it seems to me, is for a district to select a man with at least fair capacity, industrious, honest, energetic, sober, and courageous, and keep him here so long as he discharges his duties faithfully and well. Such a man will gradually rise to high position and influence in the House. His wide acquaintance with Members helps him amazingly in doing things.

I can speak freely on this subject without violating the proprieties, for my constituents have kept me here 22 years, and for 20 years have given me nominations without opposition, for all of which favors I thank them from the bottom of my heart. Their generous action and unwavering friendship have enabled me to devote all my time to the public service. I have not been compelled to spend any portion of my time in "mending my fences." My constituents have attended to that. God bless them.

The speech of Speaker Champ Clark is deserving of the thoughtful study of every voter of the country.

EXTRACTS FROM MR. GREEN'S ANNOUNCEMENT FOR CONGRESS

My record is an open book; upon it I stand. There is nothing hidden, and your examination of it is invited. During the past 17 years as your Congressman I have done all within my power to bring to you every possible protection and assistance from our Federal Government. Possibly mistakes have been made, because we all make mistakes, and probably none is without fault. I shall be satisfied, however, if, upon examination of my record, you will give careful consideration to each vote cast and official acts which I have performed, place the good on one side of the scales and the errors on the other side of the scales, and vote for the side that weighs heavier. I have no fear of the outcome of such a ballot, because I feel certain that you will find in my record more merit and perfection than demerit and imperfection.

I have printed at my own expense and I am mailing to you this record in order that you may have the correct information concerning my record and my efforts as a Member of Congress. I trust also that you may see fit to request some of the Government publications as indicated on the enclosed list. These publications give the best obtainable information on the various subjects indicated. They are printed by the Government in an effort to be helpful to the citizens of our country. They are your bulletins because you are a part of the Government and the Government belongs also to you. I am sending the list to you in an effort to be helpful in this connection.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and these Government publications are mailed without postage. When the Congress was created, it established the right for the Government to transact its official business postage free. This was a wise provision because if Congressmen, Senators, and Government officials had to pay postage on the Government's publications, then this service would be open to millionaires only because the average man would not be financially able to pay postage on the large volume of Government business required of such official. These publications, in most instances, were printed and ready for distribution before the war; therefore, you should order promptly if you desire any of them because we are endeavoring to cut out every possible Government expense which is not of direct necessity for the prosecution of the war. Many of these publications may not be reprinted until after the war, even if then.

I favor the elimination of every possible Federal expenditure which is not directly needed for the success of the war effort. Newspapers and publications are given special privileges of mailing, the first zone being mailed postage free and the other zones with relatively small charge. If the publications in the country were to pay the same rate of postage you or I pay on private or business mail, the Government would receive, it has been estimated, as much as $150,000,000 annually in postage fees. I am reliably advised that it actually costs the Government each year $83,000,000 to handle this mail of newspapers and other publications. I am satisfied that it costs the Government more to deliver your big daily newspaper in the home county of this daily newspaper than it does to carry the mail of the average Congressman for a whole year. The mailing privileges were given newspapers by the Congress to encourage the free press and it is especially helpful to the small county newspaper which is not financially able to pay the regular business postal rates.

TO THE CITIZENS OF THE SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

I bring back to you the high office of Congressman of your district without stain and without tarnish. I have endeavored since you first elected me in 1924 to be of all possible helpfulness to you. You have responded most nobly and have cooperated fully with me over this long period of time. You have helped me in all efforts for the benefit and advancement of our district and our State and our Nation. You have trusted me and have been kind and good to me in every way.

You have refused to heed the whisperings of the common enemy and you have stood with me on every occasion. For this confidence, trust and goodness on your part, I am profoundly grateful. I hope that my services and conduct have merited your faith and I assure you that if I am now elected as Congressman at Large, I shall continue to do everything in my power for you and for the entire State of Florida, extending from the Perdido River on the west to the Florida straits on the south. I shall depend upon you as my strength to carry our cause to all parts of Florida.

During my long period of service, thousands of you have sent me letters and other communications of inspiration and encouragement. The following one is of particular interest:

CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT,
ALACHUA COUNTY,
Gainesville, Fla., March 9, 1942.

Hon. R. A. (LEX) GREEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GREEN: The county commissioners wish to thank you for the splendid attention you have given to the need for additional facilties at the Alachua County Hospital.

Hospital services have been and are badly needed by the wives and children of the military personnel at Camp Blanding, the defense workers and their families, and the civilian population and all of us are very grateful to secure this grant in the amount of $159,000 to augment the $100,000 furnished by Alachua County.

Your record in Washington conclusively proves that your actions have back of them one thought, to give service for the best interests of our country, the military personnel and their families, and all others. We heartily commend you for this.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,
W. J. WHITEHURST,
Chairman,
CLAUDE BRANDON,
J. P. AMBROSE,
O. M. TILLMAN,
THOMAS D. ROLAND,
Board of County Commissioners,
Alachua County Fla.,
GEORGE E. EVANS,
Clerk of Court.

My decision to ask the people of our State to elect me as Member of Congress from the State of Florida at large was prompted by the sincere hope that, owing to my experience here as a Member of Congress, I may, during this grave war crisis, be of greater service to our entire State and to the Nation. A true servant of the people should at all times do his best, but during a war period the best is imperative.

About a year ago, we were able to pass in the Congress a bill to reapportion the representation in the Congress of the various States. Florida's increase in population gave us one additional Congressman. At the last session of the Florida Legislature, our State was not redistricted into new congressional districts. On this account, the sixth Member of Congress from Florida is to be elected from the State at large. I am asking for this office because it is, in fact, a promotion. I feel that it is appropriate for me to ask for this advancement and broader scope of service. I have served longer in the House than any other of the present Congressmen and Senators from Florida. If reelected to the Congress as from the State at large, I will retain my seniority, also my committee assignments, and my strength and usefulness will be increased. The duties of Congressmen have over the past several years increased and during the grave war crisis they have been multiplied. In the effort to perform these duties, congressional experience is indeed helpful.

TO THE PEOPLE OF ALL FLORIDA

I have during the past 17 years at all times endeavored to represent here the best interests of my district and of our State and Nation. Uppermost in my mind has been the greatest good for the greatest number of people represented. The vote cast by me in the various committees and on the floor of the House has by me been considered as the vote of my people, and not as the vote of any individual.

Many things of helpfulness, I hope, have transpired as a result of these efforts. I served here during a portion of the Coolidge administration; all of President Hoover's administration; and for the past 10 years, under President Roosevelt's administrations. I served through trying times of financial chaos from 1929 to 1934.

Along in 1932 business and industry was at its lowest ebb since the beginning of the depression. Agriculture was in the depths of despair; ten or twelve million idle men and women were walking the highways and streets in increasing numbers looking for jobs. By the 1st of March 1933 a banking holiday had been declared in many States of the Union. The people had almost lost confidence in the ability of their Government to bring about a recovery. Economic chaos threatened the country to a more alarming extent than in the darkest days of the preceding years. Wheat had sold as low as 18 and 25 cents per bushel; cotton 5 to 6 cents per pound; and corn as low as 10 or 12 cents per bushel; in fact, some of the corn growers of the Middle West were burning their corn for fuel, while the coal miners were without food and in need of this very corn for food for themselves and families. There was an abundance of wheat, corn, cotton, wool, and meats, yet millions of people hungry for the want of these foodstuffs and cold from lack of cotton and woolen garments. Granaries and warehouses were filled to capacity, yet railroad cars stood idle and rusting out in the railroad yards, and idle freight boats rode at anchor throughout the harbors of our country. Industry was paralyzed; credit was destroyed. In fact, local credit was almost nonexistent. The old custom of 150 years ago of trade and barter and exchange was in common use. One individual would trade and barter products or commodities for some other needed product or commodity in order to obtain cloth, food, fuel, and necessities of the body. Agriculture was on the very brink of bankruptcy. Money had either gone into hiding or was locked up in bank vaults.

The then remaining banks in the country were closing in alarming numbers, carrying with them the life savings of honest American citizens Church and charity funds and the trust funds of orphans were not even spared. But what was even worse than all of this, there were forces of doubt, suspicion, and destruction at work in our midst which threatened our social and civic institutions and the very foundation of our Government itself.

The Congress endeavored through legislative act to meet this situation and to enact helpful laws. Out of this chaos came legislation for the guaranteeing of bank deposits; an act to supervise through the Federal Trade Commission interstate traffic in investment securities; large appropriations for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; a gigantic public-buildings program; and many other measures of helpfulness. I supported these measures as an attempt to meet the then economic emergencies. Some of these measures were of lasting benefit, while perhaps some were experiments which were in error. I believe, however, that if you had been in the Congress at that time you would have voted for these measures with the hope that help to the American people would come. It is my hope that probably 75 percent of these measures were good, and if such is the case, it was a good batting average.

Along in this depression period we saw the total income of the American people drop to about $38,000,000,000. We have seen since then and prior to Pearl Harbor the total American income amount to almost $100,000,000,000. Along with this increase in income, of course, came increased bank deposits, and almost every avenue of business grew brighter. Florida during this building program obtained post-office and other Federal buildings; contributions of millions toward road, bridge, and overpass construction; contributions for school, courthouse, hospital, and countless other permanent and needed public facilities. This economic battle has in part been won but not before a battle more grim and grave appeared on the horizon. We are now in war, and it is therefore essential that all possible funds be further mobilized for war production and that every nonessential Federal expenditure be stopped. In both of this, I expect to do my full part.

AGAINST PENSIONS FOR CONGRESSMEN AND SENATORS

I have voted for every liberalization law and every new bill for increase of benefits to war veterans; also for the Railroad Retirement Act and many constructive economic reform measures. I voted for the Social Security Act, but, before it was passed, joined with other southern colleagues in voting for amendments to give straight Federal pensions to the aged without State matching. I voted then to give $4 from the Federal Treasury and $1 from the State, then $3 and $1, then $2 and $1. All of these amendments were voted down, and the best we could get was a 50-50 matching proposition. In States where Federal funds are fully matched by State funds, the aged of our land are now drawing $40 per month because $20 per month is available from the Federal Treasury for every needy person in our country above 65 years of age, provided the State matches same with 20 additional dollars. I shall continue my efforts for straight Federal pension for the aged, without State matching.

I voted for the postal employees' longevity bill and for other bills helpful to the Federal employees.

I did not vote for the act which gave civil-service retirement possibilities (pensions) to Congressmen and Senators. I did not participate under this law during the few days which it existed, and I voted for the repeal of this law on a roll call in the House of Representatives on February 24, 1942. I am definitely opposed to pensions for elected Federal officials and believe that if they are dissatisfied with the salaries paid them, they should quit. There is no one related to me by blood or marriage on my pay roll.

SUGAR PRODUCTION IN FLORIDA

I have labored vigorously for unrestricted cane sugar production in Florida and shall keep up this effort because it is in the best interest of the prosecution of this war and it is just. Also, in this connection, the damages sustained by the Florida fruit and vegetable growers through eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly should be paid by the Congress and I shall continue my sincere and vigorous efforts for this.

CRITICISMS AND WHISPERINGS

During tragic and critical times, the enemy never sleeps. Whisperings and misrepresentations go on in the darkness of the night. Although I am here at my post of duty, 800 miles from Florida, these statements are brought to me by friendly lips. I hope you will not be misled by these whisperings into voting against me. I have stood by the masses and in the interest of the rank and file. This I shall do as long as I live. I cannot forget my own handicaps and struggles in trying to obtain an honest education. I picked cotton at the age of 4; plowed at the age of 8; hoed, dug ditches, chipped pine trees, dipped pine gum, and cut cross ties. I could do it again, if necessary. I believe in

the dignity of labor and in the majesty of toil. There is no aristocracy except that of honor and no rabble save that of crime I honor the man who earns his living by the sweat of his honest brow I do not light my candle and place it under a bushel.

Of all times in the history of our great Republic, Americans only should be placed on guard. The maximum work capacity of all Americans is the chief hope to win this tragic war. It is time for the full mobilization of the maximum work capacity of all Americans In work there is honor and through work there is victory Every victory I have won and every worth-while accomplishment has been made possible only through the work of my loyal friends. The bright hope now for a prompt American victory is work and cooperation.

WAR EFFORT COMES FIRST

There are many legislative matters of signal interest to Florida in which I, with you, am deeply interested, but which I fully realize may not be hoped for until after this war is won. You can best judge the future by a review of the past and you may depend upon me to exercise my best judgment in response to your needs and representations made to me.

JACKSONVILLE NAVAL AIR STATION—CAMP BLANDING

My efforts have been unabating for national defense measures for many years. I have worked sincerely and voted for all national defense measures prior to and since Pearl Harbor The American Legion has for several years sponsored a defense program which has had my full support. It happens that in my present congressional district, we have been able to locate two of the largest new war establishments in the United States The naval air station for the Southeast, stationed at Jacksonville, and the Army training establishment at Camp Blanding, I believe warrant the good pride of every American. It is true that the Second Congressional District has shared most liberally in the expenditures of Federal moneys during the past several years and it is true, I believe, that it has received more new national defense money than any other district in the country It is true, however that all Florida has been and is now being converted into a comprehensive fortress of defense.

I have given my full support to all of these war efforts and establishments, among the larger of which are Pensacola, Eglin Field, Marianna, Apalachicola, Tallahassee, Jacksonville, Camp Blanding, McDill Field, Orlando, Banana River, Miami, Key West, Sebring, and many others. I have encouraged the utilization of Florida's shipbuilding facilities. The Government is now embarking upon a huge shipbuilding activity at Jacksonville and Tampa and will in the near future go into other of Florida's splendid harbors. All of this program has had my active support I have voted for the huge billions for the prosecution of the war

If elected as Congressman from the entire State, as I have endeavored to do unto the people of the Second District and for the Second District, I shall endeavor to do unto the entire State of Florida I deplore sectionalism, especially State sectionalism; I was born and reared and have lived all of my life in Bradford County It is practically the center of the State. That which is helpful to Starke is likewise helpful to Key West An injury to Fort Myers is an injury to Marianna Money spent in Miami and Tampa reflects economic benefit to Pensacola and Tallahassee. The State is one and its cause is one, and I shall look with equal responsibility and duty of service to every portion of our great State and its interest and security.

NO TIME FOR POLITICS

Ever since Pearl Harbor I have worked at my desk and in the committees and on the House floor an average of 98 hours a week. This has been done in an effort to do what I could as my part in the prosecution of this war I have not had time to visit with you and will not be able to spend much time in Florida in the near future. However, I do not believe that you are thinking in political terms during this war crisis. I feel that you prefer that I be at my post of duty when needed This seems to be the general feeling in our great State. I was greatly impressed by news release on the occasion of the meeting of the Florida State Democratic Executive Committee in Jacksonville last February There was made, according to news reports, by the State's chief executive, Governor Holland, a statement, the substance of which was the hope that there would be no bitterness in Florida political campaigns and that unity and harmony may prevail

It is also most significant that a recent news release indicates that in Osceola County all incumbents were nominated without opposition. It is indeed significant that President Roosevelt was quoted, under date of February 6, 1942, in the press, as follows: "President Roosevelt told a press conference today that when the country is at war we want Congressmen who, regardless of party, will back up the United States Government and have a record of backing it up."

I would like to continue my services here in the Congress during this crisis I ask that you exercise the same judgment in this matter as you do in your own private affairs. If you had a house almost completed, I do not believe you would change carpenters without good cause. If you were seriously ill, I do not believe you would change doctors if your doctor was faithful and honest and sincere. If you had a faithful and experienced employee in your own business, I do not believe you would replace him with one without trial and experience There is no substitute for experience Do not swap horses in the middle of the stream. The war crisis grows more grave daily Civilization is at the very cross roads Freedom faces its supreme test. The occasion demands a united America and the best efforts of all

My platform is: I shall vote, regardless of personal and political consequences, for every measure I believe in the interest of winning this war

Individual ambitions and interests must be submerged The cause of our country comes first. I pledge you that I will keep faith and do all within my power for victory in this war and victory in peace.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 104. This title may be cited as "Title VI, Military Appropriation Act, 1942."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have asked for this time just now to call the attention of the committee to some matters that have been eliminated from the appropriations for the Army and also to try to point out some of the inconsistencies that the Committee on Appropriations have argued here this afternoon, with particular reference to the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] I think it should be made clear that those of us who voted for that amendment were not necessarily voting against that particular improvement, but we were voting against its inclusion in this bill at this time, until it had been adequately heard by the committee which had been set up under the rules of this House for the purpose of hearing testimony with reference to policies.

There were two items asked for by the War Department, and I remember hearing they were urgent. I think the exigency—some one used that word as justifying the inclusion of Steward Field in the bill before us, stating that the matter was a great exigency—I think the exigencies of the matter were nothing as great in the matter of the improvement of Steward Field as they were in some other cases. At the best all that they can get from Steward Field is 200 pilots in 1 year out of 60,000. That is one-third of 1 percent. Yet they argue that the matter is so urgent that they could not go before the legislative committee.

I call attention to pages 7 and 8 of the report of the committee: The War Department did not ask for the establishment of an Army specialist corps, because the President under the powers he had set up that corps and asked the committee to make funds available. The committee refused to do so, and gave this as the reason:

> The committee went into the matter rather exhaustively (hearings, pp. 182-204, pt. 2) and has not given its approval to the matter, primarily because the submission itself suggests the need of specific legislative sanction for disbursing funds for such activity, which, if true, removes the matter from the committee's jurisdiction.

They refused to appropriate money there, where the President and the War Department had asked for it. The War Department had been before our committee in regard to that particular activity and said it was urgent and that they needed it. The committee refused to appropriate the money for the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, and I think they properly did so, but I call your attention to this statement by the witness for the War Department:

> We wanted to start it immediately and not have to delay until estimates were processed and appropriations obtained. We hope that we shall require no more supplemental estimates this fiscal year

Now the committee boasts of the fact that it omitted those items from this appropriation and the reason for it was because legislative sanction had not been given to those particular matters.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAY It was said by the chairman of the subcommittee for civil functions of the War Department that it would take 8 months to build Stewart Field. Does the gentleman have any idea that the delay in getting legislative authority would have held up that program?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We could have gotten a bill out of committee and passed it and sent it to the Senate before the Senate could possibly act on this particular appropriation. The only point I want to make is this: That Congress intended, when it set up the various legislative committees that those committees should be respected in their rights and prerogatives. It is not fair, it is not right for the Appropriations Committee of the House to take unto itself those rights and those prerogatives. I do want to plead in all earnestness that at least the Appropriations Committee be consistent in the arguments that it advances.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance, Bureau of Ships: The appropriations under this head for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 shall be available for repairs, conversions, and restorations on nonnaval vessels operated for naval requirements; and for the accomplishment of the purposes authorized by Public Law 280, approved October 24, 1941, amended by Public Law 446, approved February 10, 1942.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, after consultation with gentlemen on the minority side, I desire to submit a unanimous consent request. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill and all amendments thereto close at 5:30 o'clock.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I suggest also, if it is proper to do it and within the parliamentary power of the gentleman, that we eliminate further reading of the bill, with the right to amend it, and save time that way.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is impossible to dispense with the reading of the bill, but we can close debate on it at 5:30 o'clock.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment on page 29. I want to make a point of order or offer an amendment. I take it that I will be given the privilege of doing that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman will have that right under the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Reserving the right to object, I have an amendment to propose on page 18, and I would like at least 3 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I merely ask that debate close at 5:30. There will be no limitation on amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HOBBS. Reserving the right to object, I do not believe we should be cut off this way. There are some amendments that are to be offered that are absolutely worthless and useless unless we have a chance to explain them. I think probably they will be, anyway, in the light of the fate of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I assure the gentleman the committee will take no time at all.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, I want to know that when we place these amendments on there, we are going to have at least 2 minutes to discuss them.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I couple with my request, Mr. Chairman, the further provision that Members have 2 minutes on bona fide amendments.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Reserving the right to object, suppose there are more amendments than could be considered with 2 minutes to each amendment? What are you going to do with the surplus?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, I understood the chairman to add to his original request that each person offering a bona fide amendment would have at least 2 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Reserving the right to object, I know that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] desires to make some comments about the travel allowance. It would be necessary for him to move to strike out the last word. That is an important amendment. I would also like 2 minutes. I would like to know if that would be included?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I ask further that the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] be granted 2 minutes each.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I expect to make a point of order and I expect to argue it not too long, but I want the membership to understand that if we close debate, probably the gentleman would prefer to confine the debate to 20 minutes instead of to a given time.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, I will say that his point of order will be conceded by the committee. It has already been talked over by the chairman of the committee and myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I feel I would be derelict in the duty I owe to the people I represent did I not call to your attention another fact that I have recently observed in connection with the expenditure of public funds out of the appropriations that we have heretofore made and are now making.

We all know the problem that small business in this country has to secure defense orders. We know the problems that are confronting those businesses that have not had a call to engage in the direct production of arms and munitions.

Let me illustrate the case of a large chair manufacturing company in my district. This is one of the largest manufacturers of chairs in the United States and has been in business for a great many years. This company is tooled and equipped, and its factory designed for the production of chairs. Now an invitation for bids comes out from a department for prices on furniture. The bid specifications call for not only chairs, but for tables, for dining room furniture, for bedroom furniture, and so forth. These items are all included within one specification. This company is unable to bid under those specifications because their production is limited to chairs. A furniture manufacturing company in my district making tables and bedroom furniture is not able to bid because their production is limited to those specific items. What happens? The thing that inevitably happens is that some intermediary slips into the picture. He is given the specifications, and he goes to these parties, collects their bids. He then submits a bid to the Government and although he has perhaps nothing more by way of investment than a desk here in Washington or in the city of New York, he gets the business. Why cannot these departments, in the name of common sense, split these specifications up so that the chair factories in my district and in yours will have an opportunity to bid, to furnish chairs? Why do they not split them up so that the table manufacturers can bid to supply tables and the Government receive a much better product at a great saving to the taxpayers of this Nation? Why is it necessary to have these intermediaries drawing their profit out of the deal? Why does not the Government deal direct?

I have before me right now an invitation to a manufacturer in my district to participate in the manufacture of 18,000,000 tent stakes. Did it come from the Government? Did that invitation come from the War Department, the Department for which we are appropriating funds this afternoon? No; the invitation came from a concern up in Philadelphia that is listed in Dunn & Bradstreet's but that has no financial rating. Did the Government come to the manufacturer in my district and ask him to submit a bid to the Government for a part of these stakes? No, it did not. They were asked to submit a bid to a concern up in Philadelphia with whom the Government is dealing as intermediary. Why does not the Government deal directly with these concerns that have the capacity and the ability to manufacture tent stakes rather than to call in this intermediary and pay him a profit when perhaps he has no manufacturing facilities and is totally unable to bid on the 18,000,000 tent stakes without the supporting bids of real manufacturers?

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that such criticism is constructive, and that if the agencies in charge of the expenditure of this money will pay some attention to what I have said they will relieve some of the distress of the small manufacturers, and give them a chance to participate in the war effort.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 201. Whenever the President deems it to be in the interest of national defense he may authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell, transfer title to, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of, to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, any defense articles procured from funds appropriated in this title, in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 11, 1941 (Public Law 11): *Provided*, That the total value of articles disposed of under this authority shall not exceed $18,000,000: *Provided further*, That the term "defense article" as used herein shall be deemed to include defense information and services, and the expenses in connection with the procurement or supplying of defense articles, information, and services: *Provided further*, That the limitation of $2,500,000,000 established in sec-

tion 301 of the act of February 7, 1942 (Public Law 441), shall apply to all appropriations made to the Navy Department since March 11, 1941.

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

Mr. Chairman, at a later stage of the bill I shall offer an amendment and take but a moment now to read it to you. It is the insertion of a new section to read as follows.

No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay that portion of a contract for construction of any character and/or procurement of material and supplies for either the Military or Naval Establishments, designated as final payment until the contractor shall have filed with the procuring agency a certificate of costs and an agreement for renegotiation and reimbursement satisfactory to the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be.

This suggested limitation grows out of the recent Bethlehem decision by the Supreme Court of the United States in which the Court held that if excessive profits were made in the prosecution of a contract, once having made final settlement and paid the contractor the Government cannot recover.

In other words, the Court has held that we must lock the barn before the horse is taken. We must have an agreement for renegotiation of the contract and reduction of the costs or reimbursement if an audit of costs shows the price to be excessive. And this must be done before final settlement is made.

I have discussed this approach to the problem in hearings on two different bills recently: First, with General Reybold, Chief of Engineers, in the hearings on the civil-functions War Department bill, and with Colonel Kutz, representing the ordnance branch, on the bill now before us. You will find the testimony of Colonel Kutz on page 147 of the hearings.

I read this portion of the testimony:

Mr. CASE. In connection with this problem of costs, at a previous hearing of this committee I suggested to General Reybold, of the Engineers Department, the possibility of a provision that that portion of the payments designated as the "final payment" in any contract should not be made until the contractor has furnished the War Department with a satisfactory certificate of costs and a satisfactory renegotiations agreement, as a matter of protection of the Government. Have you given any consideration to that method of making it possible to recapture excessive payments, or protect the Government?

Colonel KUTZ. Not exactly, sir. However, in a number of our contracts we have provided for the renegotiation of the costs based on a percentage run, say, of 25 percent production under the order, after which time an audit shall be made of the actual costs, and the renegotiated price to be based upon those actual costs.

For example, in the case of machine guns, the initial estimated price, after having been renegotiated on the basis of the actual experience on production of 25 percent of the total order, was reduced by more than 50 percent, and the price as renegotiated was made effective over the entire contract.

Mr. CASE. I do not want to prolong this discussion, but I am just going to make this observation: I fear it will be impossible for Congress to control that by simply passing a law saying that profits shall not exceed a certain percent; that there must be some method, in the light of the Bethlehem decision, for the Government to protect itself by getting a renegotiation agreement that will permit it to take advantage of any discovered excessive costs. And that, of course, will have to be done before final settlement is made.

Colonel KUTZ. That is correct, sir.

This experience of the Ordnance officers would indicate that such a procedure as I have proposed is workable.

All of us have been appalled by the recent testimony that has come out as to the excessive profits being made under certain contracts. Profits so big they had to have shovels to handle them; profits of 100 and 200 percent in some extreme cases. Under the court's holding in the Bethlehem case, it would appear that the only way that we can get at these cases is to have a provision in the contract providing that before final settlement is made a certificate of costs shall be filed with an agreement for renegotiation and reimbursement for excessive profits. I hope when the amendment is offered it will have your support.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized to store valued documents of the House of Representatives in The National Archives Building and such documents shall continue under his control and jurisdiction and shall be consulted or removed only on his written order. The Archivist shall assign suitable space and provide adequate protective custody for such documents.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against this last paragraph on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee concedes the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grants to States for old-age assistance: For an additional amount for grants to States for old-age assistance, subject to the conditions specified under this heading in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1942, $30,000,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'CONNOR: Page 18, line 4, strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000."

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to increase the appropriation of $30,000,000 for social security to $100,000,000. This bill carries a total appropriation of $18,000,000,000 for all purposes. I am for the bill, and will vote for it.

My amendment will provide an additional $70,000,000 with which to take care of the aged in need and crippled people of this country, those who may be in such a condition that they are unable to secure employment—or work if they could get it. We have taken it upon ourselves to establish freedom from want in every country in the world. I think we had better begin by trying to establish freedom from want in our own country. You may find want in every State in the Union.

Mr. Chairman, I ask in the name of the people who are in need, who are sick, who are old, who are crippled in this country—many of whom are living in abject and dire poverty—that this sum be increased from $30,000,000 to $100,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Access roads: Authority is hereby granted, in addition to the authority granted for the same purpose under this heading in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, to enter into contracts in the amount of $20,000,000 for the construction and improvement of access roads and for replacing existing highways and highway connections as described in and in accordance with section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (Public Law 295), such authority to continue during the existence of the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: On page 22, line 17, strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$25,400,000."

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would simply restore the amount of the contract authorization to the Budget estimate. This bill authorizes contracts up to $20,000,000. The Budget calls for $25,400,000. There were $150,000,000 authorized by the appropriate legislative committee of this House and $25,400,000 is the unallocated balance of that authorization.

I want to read you the reason given by the Appropriations Committee for this reduction, and I read from the report, page 18:

In making the decrease of $5,400,000 in the requested contract authorization, the committee has been advised—

It does not say by whom—

that some projects—

It does not say how many what, or where—

constructed under this program are more elaborate than the circumstances of the access needs warrant and that lesser appropriations will suffice if the projects are planned on a strict utility basis of war need.

I submit, in all frankness, candor, and sweetness, though fully appreciating the outstanding ability of the great Appropriations Committee, I would rather have the opinion of the Bureau of Public Roads and of the Army engineers than that of the Appropriations Committee.

Our Appropriations Committee says that it has been advised that some projects are too elaborate. Two separate groups of experts, as well qualified and patriotic as any living men, have approved every one of the access road projects in this program as being necessary to our Nation's war effort, and have prepared the plans and specifications for each with that care and skill for which they are justly famous. The Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy has certified each as important to national

defense. The Budget has asked Congress to authorize contracts for $25,400,000 worth of them. Instead of doing so, our committee says "No." We are advised that some projects are too elaborate, so we will cut $5,000,000 off the amount certified as being needed for war purposes after your best, studied estimate. This seems to many of us both arbitrary and capricious. There is no showing of facts to justify the committee's guess based upon the advice of the unknown man.

We had better be safe than sorry. Let us have no more of the "too little, too late" preparedness.

This item is not an appropriation of money. It is merely a contract authorization. If it be true that some projects have been too elaborate, it does not follow that these, for which contract authorization is now sought, are.

I beseech you to follow the advice of the experts of the Bureau of Public Roads, the Army engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and take no chance of blocking projects certified as being necessary to help win the war.

I am satisfied that quite a few members of the Appropriations Committee themselves agree with me on this proposition. Let us adopt my amendment and restore the Budget estimate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Forest-fire control, Department of Agriculture (emergency): For all necessary expenses to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, independently or in cooperation with the various States or other appropriate agencies or individuals, to intensify and augment forest-fire prevention and suppression measures in critical areas on Federal, State county, municipal, or private lands, including the purchase (not to exceed $5,000), operation and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles, and not to exceed $15,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1942, $2,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1943: *Provided*, That there shall not be expended from this appropriation on non-Federal lands in any State any amount in excess of the amount made available by the State, or private agencies, or individuals for the purposes of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That sections 2 and 3 of the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, or similar provisions in this Act or in the act making appropriations for said Department for the fiscal year 1943 shall not apply to persons employed hereunder for less than 60 days on sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Chairman, as the House has agreed to close debate on amendments at as nearly 5:30 p. m. as possible, there will be no opportunity to obtain an adequate hearing on the question of emergency forest-fire-control appropriations. The Forestry Service asked $18,100,000 of the Bureau of the Budget for this important purpose but in its wisdom the Bureau cut that to $5,000,000 in making its recommendation to the Appropriations Committee. Then that great committee cut the $5,000,000 to $2,000,000, which is the amount recommended in this bill. That amount is entirely inadequate for the purpose of protecting the national forests from sabotage fires in southern California alone.

I have talked with other Members of the House from the three Pacific States who know what this means for us and we have decided that owing to the lateness of the hour, the restlessness of the Members present, and the attitude of the Committee on Appropriations that it would now be an inopportune time to offer an amendment restoring this item even to the amount recommended by the Bureau. We have decided to let the matter rest in the House and to take it up in the other body where we may be able to accomplish our need.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act of March 5, 1942 (Public Law 473), and in accordance with the provisions thereof, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere (including alien labor); printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); purchase of books of reference and periodicals; the purchase (not to exceed $13,000), operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles; the exchange of passenger-carrying and other motor vehicles, tractors, and other equipment and parts or accessories thereof, in whole or in part payment for similar equipment; the erection of necessary buildings; the procurement of medical supplies and services for emergency use in the field; and the acceptance of donations of land and rubber-bearing plants, $4,200,000, to remain available until June 30, 1943: *Provided*, That any proceeds from the sales of guayule, rubber processed from guayule, or other rubber-bearing plants, or from other sales resulting from operations under such act of March 5, 1942, shall be covered into the Treasury as "Miscellaneous receipts": *Provided further*, That the allocations of $884,000 and $750,000 for these purposes from the emergency fund for the President in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942, made by letter No. 42-75, dated February 6, 1942, and letter No. 42-89, dated March 10, 1942, respectively, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, and immediately thereafter an amount equal to such allocation shall be repaid to said emergency fund for the President (Pub. Law 473, 77th Cong.).

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

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very unfortunate that a bill of this importance, carrying military appropriations, has to be a catch-all.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman offered a bona fide amendment?

Mr. MONRONEY. No.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under the agreement, the gentleman cannot be recognized unless he offers a bona fide amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. It was my understanding that specific provision was made for me to be recognized for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The agreement was that the gentleman from Oklahoma would be recognized for 2 minutes and the gentleman from Texas for 2 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is indeed unfortunate that an important military measure has to be a catch-all in some degree for appropriations that do not go through the regular channel. In regard to the travel in respect to guayule, I call your attention to an article appearing in the El Paso Herald of March 16, 1942. It reads as follows:

HOW TRAVEL MONEY GOES—THREE UNITED STATES AGENTS RIDE TO EL PASO ON GUAYULE

A phase of the United States Department of Agriculture's contemplated Pullman farming program has come to El Paso County.

Four agricultural agents, three of them on the United States Agricultural Department's pay roll, came to El Paso last Friday to arrange for planting of guayule in two 1-acre plots.

County Agricultural Agent Foster, whose $3,443.20 annual salary is paid by the Federal Government, the State, and the county, could have handled most of the arrangements, saving Uncle Sam the traveling expenses of the three agents.

J. T. Presley of the Arizona experiment station, came by train all the way from California at Government expense. S. E. Wolf, of the Soil Conservation Service, and C. H. Muller, of the Bureau of Plant Industry, Department of Agriculture subsidiaries, came by automobile with A. R. Templin, of the Texas experiment station, from San Antonio. Mr. Templin is a State employee.

Arrangements for planting of an acre of guayule on the Ord Gary farm in the Upper Valley and an acre on the Lower Valley experiment farm to determine its growth for future rubber production could have been arranged through his office, Mr. Foster said.

"We arranged things so the agents could find out about planting guayule here, and I suppose we could have handled the actual signing of agreements," Mr. Foster said. "These men, however, are setting up a special office in San Antonio to get the guayule program started. Mr. Presley has had experience in growing it."

The county agent explained that his office had no control over the functions of other Department of Agriculture agents.

Mr. Foster will have nothing to do with the guayule experiments unless he is called upon to aid the San Antonio office, he said.

One of these agents came from California to El Paso and three came from San Antonio to El Paso to plant these 2 acres.

I am taking the time of the House today to tell the men who will spend this $4,200,000 on this most useful war program that the House will not tolerate this as a boondoggle. We mean business and we are going to watch every one of their expenses. We do not want this money spent on offices; we do not want it spent on regional inspectors; we want it spent on the planting of guayule rubber. This is not just an ordinary peacetime expenditure. The House Appropriations Committee, I know, intends to watch it.

Going back once more to dumping these items into these vital War Department bills, may I say that in the item just before this there is an appropriation for controlling the white-winged moth, and in that there is a travel account amounting to $117,860. I think these departments should come down and put their total appropriations in the agricultural bill, and not come in under a big bill that is of such vital importance to defense

and expect the House to miss those items in its consideration of the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I agree with all the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has said. I think he has rendered a very distinct service to the House and to the country in calling attention to the waste of money in traveling expenses. I have supported every amendment he has offered along that line and shall continue to do so. I am for cutting all items to the bone that are not absolutely necessary in the prosecution of the war.

May I say in connection with the statement the gentleman has just made and the article he read that I am tremendously interested in the guayule program. I see the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] is present. When he had his bill before the House some 2 months ago to purchase the seed of the Intercontinental Rubber Co. at Salinas, Calif., I was very happy to support it.

The guayule plant is a proven thing in my part of the country, especially in the Big Bend. There was once a splendid factory in the town of Marathon, Tex. There are literally thousands of young unmatured plants there now. Only last week I had a conference with Doctor Walton, the president of Texas A. & M. College, who is much interested in the development of guayule in Texas. The able representative from the district in which the college is located is Mr. LUTHER JOHNSON, who has been cooperating with me in the matter. Mr. JOHNSON and I talked to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, and Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Mr. Grover Hill, of Texas, and urged that the Texas A. & M. College, through its county agents, have a part in this program. There is no greater college of its kind in America than Texas A. & M. and we were promised cooperation.

In my judgment, it is unnecessary to be spending a lot of money in these experimental 1-acre tracts to develop guayule. It is certainly not necessary to spend any excessive amount in the way of traveling expenses. There are literally thousands, perhaps millions, of plants in old Mexico now and many of them fully matured. Under the new bill that has been passed by Congress, there is authority to build factories in the United States to process the guayule that is brought out of Mexico. These guayule plants take 3 or 4 years to mature, but there is a great lot of guayule now in Mexico that could be processed in this country now if we had the factories and I want to see one in Texas.

What I want to see done is to have the great agricultural schools along the Mexican border like Texas A. & M. cooperate in this program through the county agents, and thus you will not need all this travel expense. I want to see everything possible done to develop the guayule industry in west Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and southern California. It has a great future and do not forget the rubber supply is getting short and the situation more serious every day.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Fire protection of forests, forest industries, and strategic facilities (national defense): For all necessary expenses to enable the Department of the Interior independently or in cooperation with other appropriate agencies to initiate and intensify and augment forest-fire prevention and suppression measures on critical forest, brush, and grass areas under the administration of the Department of the Interior, including not to exceed $8,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed $6,000), maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles; hire, with or without personal services, of work animals and animal-drawn and motor-propelled vehicles and equipment; and purchase in the District of Columbia or elsewhere of other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior," fiscal year 1942, $324,800, to remain available until June 30, 1943: *Provided*, That for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property, persons may be employed for periods of less than 60 days and be paid salaries or wages from this appropriation without regard to citizenship and without regard to membership in an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, if I offer an amendment to this section and the amendment is not adopted, can I then make a point of order against the section?

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order has to be made against the section before the amendment is offered.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I wonder if the gentleman will confine his point of order to lines 10 and 11 on page 29?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a point of order against this, but I would like just to change the wording of the section because I have talked to a number of the members of the Committee.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may submit the amendment for the consideration of the Committee.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Without prejudice to any point of order, I shall not object.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr RICH: On page 29, line 9, after "without", strike out "regard to citizenship and without regard to membership in an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government," and insert "the necessity of inquiring into their citizenship or membership in any organization."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment speaks for itself. I am against anyone now and immediately who advocates the overthrow of this Government, and I want to put him behind the bars and I do not want him to have any chance to do any damage, and that is the reason I offer the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 402 No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk, and which I have previously explained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Page 36, after line 11, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 402-A. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay that portion of a contract for construction of any character and/or procurement of material and supplies for either the Military or Naval Establishments, designated as 'final payment' until the contractor shall have filed with the procuring agency a certificate of costs and an agreement for renegotiation and reimbursement satisfactory to the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy as the case may be."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that under the guise of a limitation the amendment would require executive action.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order and offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 36, after line 11, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 402-A No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay that portion of a contract for construction of any character and/or procurement of material and supplies for either the Military or Naval Establishments designated as 'final payment' to any contractor who fails to file with the procuring agency a certificate of cost and an agreement for renegotiation of contract and reimbursement of profits in excess of 6 percent."

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 70, noes 8.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 404. Section 302 (c) of the Treasury and Post Office Departments Appropriation Act, 1942, and section 302 (c) of the Treasury and Post Office Departments Appropriation Act, 1943, are hereby repealed; and the limitation of $750 specified in section 302 (a) of each of such acts and any similar limitation of the same or a lesser sum specified in any other appropriation act for such fiscal years may be exceeded by such amount as the Secretary of War, in the case of the War Department, the Secretary of the Navy, in the case of the Navy Department, and the Director of Procurement, in the case of other essential governmental needs, may determine necessary to obtain satisfactory motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles of the lightweight, low-priced class, but in no event shall the price so paid for any such vehicle exceed $900 free on board factory.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 37, line 13, after the word "exceed", strike out "$900" and insert "$360.50."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, that accounts for the 15 percent that they allow dealers. There is no reason why they should permit the Army to pay more than the price that Mr. Henderson fixed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 405. This act may be cited as the "Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 7, strike out "$45,650" and insert "$59,847."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. COOPER having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. BLAND, 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. 6868), making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] have permission to revise and extend his remarks made today and include therein excerpts, letters, and editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on this bill may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HON. ROWLAND K. ADAMS

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Baltimore Sun.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to learn of the appointment of Judge Rowland K. Adams, of the supreme bench of Baltimore, as regional director of the Office of Civilian Defense for the area comprising Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, and I am sure that under his guidance the Office of Civilian Defense will be conducted in a very efficient and intelligent manner.

Judge Adams' performance in the State attorney's office and on the supreme bench of Baltimore will guarantee to the people of the Third Corps Area the leadership which is needed at this time.

[From the Baltimore Sun of March 28, 1942]

OUR OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE AREA OBTAINS A GOOD REGIONAL DIRECTOR

The appointment of Judge Rowland K. Adams, of the supreme bench of Baltimore, as regional director of the Office of Civilian Defense for the Third Corps Area will be welcomed by the people of Maryland and by those outside the State who know him. Judge Adams' modesty has not hidden the fact that he is a sound and intelligent man capable in his quiet way of thinking complicated problems through and acting on them decisively.

The Third Corps Area includes Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. The touchy civilian defense problems here will arise in part from the fact that the defense area overlaps the respective jurisdictions of a series of local governments, each of which could mistakenly seek to think first of its own pride despite the far more important general need.

The man selected to approach these touchy matters must be tactful and at the same time forceful if he is to be successful. Judge Adams has both these qualities. The Office of Civilian Defense is fortunate in obtaining his services and so are the civilians of the area affected.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include two tables and an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Federated Press.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks for every day that the House is in session during the next 2 weeks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Judge Michael A. Musmanno, on the subject of Saint Patrick.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon and include therein a brief excerpt from the hearings on the War Department appropriation item.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon and to include therein excerpts from letters received from constituents.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] be allowed to extend his own remarks and include an article from the Milwaukee Journal.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to extend my own remarks and include therein an editorial and a news item.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include therein a certain letter from a constituent and an article from the Washington Post of today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wish to bring to your attention an article that appeared in the Washington Post on Saturday, March 28 1942:

MARYLAND BRICKLAYERS REFUSE PAY BOOST

BALTIMORE, March 27.—The business representative of the Bricklayers and Masons Union No. 1, American Federation of Labor, announced today the members had rejected a dollar a day pay increase due to start April 10.

The agent, J Raymond Ward, said the union surveyed the situation and decided it was not the proper thing at this time to increase wages, because the United States is at war "We want to do our part as well as any other soldier."

To understand the labor front in America it is necessary to survey the entire picture. It is a fatal mistake to generalize from isolated instances.

But strange as it seems we listen to Members of Congress, day in and day out, walk down in the Well of this House and proclaim to the world that it is necessary to curb labor in order to increase the production of war materials that are essential today to win this war.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and several well-known leaders of the opposition forces of organized labor, nine times out of ten only give to you and to me and to all the world isolated cases of strikes in our defense industry. By citing the above notice in the Washington Post I do not attempt to say that every local in the country is doing the same thing, but being honest and aboveboard I am willing to admit that this is an isolated case, and by the very same token I make the charge that the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Virginia when they make the charges that they do day in and day out are without question making them without foundation and only in isolated cases.

Mr. Speaker, it amuses me to listen to these labor haters day after day hark back to the days of industrial strife such as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] did yesterday when he said:

Who was it who, in 1937, invaded the State of Michigan and with armed goon squads beat into submission the workers of General Motors at Flint, Mich.? Who was it who took possession of some of the cities of Michigan and by force maintained possession for weeks; yes, for months? Who was it who carried on that undeclared war against civil authority? It was the Congress of Industrial Organizations of which Murray is the head.

Well, I say in answer to the gentleman from Michigan that these very same companies that he speaks of are the very same ones that organized a strong-arm squad its leader stated:

To put the fear of God not only in any union outsider who might appear but also in any employee with a sympathetic attitude toward union activities.

They were supplied with blackjacks which were manufactured in the plant; later, as their work progressed they acquired whips, lengths of hose, and similar weapons. They were stationed at different vantage points throughout the city, were given free use of company cars, and were afforded free access to the plant at all hours.

Mr. Speaker, one man was murdered by mistake by this group—they wanted his brother—and I have heard of another who was tarred and feathered, his eye gouged out, and left to die (this was also a mistake: he was a union organizer, but in another type of industry). The conditions here that I have described are not presented in any attempt to show that labor is always right and its employers are always a group of exploiters. But the silence of our press on these matters does reveal its leanings and its biased and partisan treatment of labor relations, and the sniping at the labor laws by those in and out of Congress who delight in condemning those of us who are affiliated with organized labor and in reality they portray the faults of labor and the virtues of capital.

Oh, yes; Mr. Speaker, it makes my blood boil when I sit here in the House and listen to the gentleman from Michigan and others proclaim that unity does not prevail, when in reality they, by their remarks and insinuations, are the ones who are creating disunity in our ranks, coupled with the help of the press, the all-too-wise radio commentators, the chamber of commerce, the dollar-a-year men, the manufacturers, and all others who disagree with our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States; Mr. Nelson, the Navy Department, the Army Department, in fact those who are responsible for carrying out our war effort are all wrong if we were to listen to these prophets of today who are telling us how to win this war and yet by their past votes if they had their way we would now probably be under the thumb of the Axis Powers.

The gentleman from Michigan also brought to the attention of the House the initiation fees that are charged workers at Camp Pickett, Va. All I can say in answer to that is, brother, those fees are cheap at half the price. When I joined the Bricklayers Union of Providence, R. I., I paid $107.15, and was damned glad to get in at that price.

When I think of those days when men labored 12 and 14 hours a day for a dollar a day, and because of labor being organized when I joined the union I received $12 a day for 8 hours' work, brother, I considered that a very good investment.

The initiation fees charged and collected from new members go into the local union treasury and that the new member, through the payment of his initiation fee, acquires an equity in the funds belonging to the local union. Not one single penny of the initiation fees collected goes to the national treasury. All of it is held by the local, belongs to the local, is deposited in the local union's treasury, protected and safeguarded by local union officers who are required to furnish adequate bond. Thus new members who join the union become beneficiaries in that the funds thus accumulated in the local treasury are used for the purpose of paying sick, death, and accident benefits and unemployment benefits.

In other words when a new member joins he rates the same benefits as those that have been paying dues for 30 or 40 years which to my mind is some investment worth while and particularly when they are about to receive a wage that is just about twice the wage if they were to work for some unorganized outfit.

Mr. Speaker, no one can tell me that all this poppycock and propaganda about getting rid of the 40-hour week and time-and-one-half for overtime originated from the people of this country. No; I maintain that the huge corporations are using their fantastic war profits to finance the drive as well as to reduce income taxes.

And I further believe that these same interests are more interested in winning their war against Roosevelt and unions than against Hitler and Hirohito.

Mr. Speaker, I am not in favor of changing any of our labor laws and I will vote against any amendment and any bill that would take away any of the gains that labor has gained, and in closing I would like to include a letter that I received from a constituent of mine, which is as follows:

We know that your sympathies are with the workingman, but that, unfortunately, many of your colleagues do not share your point of view.

We've been reading and hearing all about letters being sent to Congress by the people wanting abolishment of the 40-hour week and overtime pay. It seems inconceivable that working people would write such letters, and a little hard to believe

Here's a letter to the contrary, and I believe it represents not only us but thousands more like us. The avor we ask of you is to read it and if you think it presents our case well enough give its contents to the poor thinkers who are trying to push this bill that will surely sabotage the war production effort.

If a man is making a dollar or more per hour, straight time, maybe he can stand to have his overtime pay taken away; I wouldn't know; but what of the man whose base rate is only 62 cents an hour? Take my husband, for instance:

He works 60 hours a week, one Saturday afternoon off a month. He's up at 5:30 a. m., to work at 7 o'clock; stands on his feet steady all day, eyes glued to his work, to the point of strain at times, breathing iron dust into his lungs all day, finding many tasks more than tedious, bosses temperamental, quitting at 6 p. m., "all in" from the tension, gets home at 7 p. m., muscles aching, feet burning, too tired to eat or go anywhere for recreation from one end of the week to the other, nerves frayed All this, Monday through Saturday, in—about—the largest defense plant in this State Many's the morning he is more tired than when he went to bed, but he feels his country depends on the workingman as well as the soldier, and so he puts his feelings behind him and goes

right on to his work. He needs more nutrition to keep going, extra vitamins, extra tonics.

Is $37.50 a week going to make it all up to him? To his wife and children on whom all this reflects? He is proud of his lapel button with the E for efficiency and the pretty diploma with his name on it, also awarded for efficiency by the Navy. Is this to become a mockery?

There is a lot of shouting about union trouble. It seems to me that labor trouble, in defense industry, is pretty thinly scattered today. The union and nonunion are working side by side, here, in harmony; forgetting their differences in their all-out effort. They're all working far over the 40 hours, without complaint; even though many feel now that they are underpaid they are willing to forget it.

Is the passage of this bill to be their reward? We know many defense workers from various plants, union and nonunion, you can bet they won't take it lying down. Where all is smooth now all will be havoc, if not revolution entirely, and who could blame them? Unpatriotic? They are not!

How would the Congressmen like it if they did the work these men are doing and some one passed a bill whereby they were told they couldn't have what they earned? That's no better than Gestapo agents in Europe going around and taking the people's money away from them.

Who started this anyway; the South? Through their jealousy over northern industry?

Why should we kick when the soldier is only getting $21 a month, they say. God bless the soldiers, we appreciate them and pray for them, our hearts are with them. But the $21-a-month soldier is not, in most cases, the head of a family, coping with living costs at home, supporting a family. The soldier's board is free. We certainly can't all be in the war, and you certainly can't dispute the fact that we, on the home front, are using our pay checks to the best of our ability in aiding the war effort. If they pass this bill who is going to buy Defense or war bonds, how can we pay income taxes? Many of us incurred bills in good faith on the strength of our wages. The creditors will attach the wages and the men will lose their jobs in many cases. I don't mean we've done any excessive buying. One or two things necessary to living, that's all, but we all have our bills to pay. Where will we be? I believe these Congressmen so anxious to pass the bill should be investigated as fifth columnists.

Mr. FOGARTY, we are asking you to visit us in our home, over Easter. We understand the Congressmen are going to do this among the voters. We are typical of the average, honest, upright Americans. We'll show you a home, a budget, and many other things that will prove that we are not going to perdition on any exorbitant defense pay.

Hoping the defense worker isn't going to get this awful wallop below the belt by some very unpatriotic Congressmen, and that you will honor us with a real down-to-earth visit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a letter I have received requesting me to place an editorial in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no obection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Milwaukee Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I received from the Salley Grocery Co., of Bernice, La., dealing with employee participation in the buying of defense bonds.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Helena (Ark.) World.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON] may have an indefinite leave of absence on account of illness.

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

There was no objection.

CALENDAR BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH DURING NEXT 2 WEEKS

Mr. McCORMACK. I ask unanimous consent that during the next 2 weeks business in order, under the rules of the House on any of the calendar days, may be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, March 30, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 14, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1538. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

1539. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 9 of the act of August 18, 1941 (Public Law 213, 77th Cong.), by striking out the proviso thereto which requires a monthly report by the Secretary of War to the Congress of the number of men in active training and service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 6874. A bill to change the designation of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy to the Bureau of Naval Personnel; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota:

H. R. 6875. A bill to protect owners of businesses from increased rents while such owners are in active service in the land or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 6876. A bill to authorize the incorporated town of Petersburg, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, and for other purposes, and for such purpose to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding a total of $150,000; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 6877. A bill to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered by governments of cobelligerent nations or the other American republics; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 6878. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941, so as to authorize the President to permit unlicensed use of inventions in time of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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 Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to investigate the activities of Col. Harry F. Besosa, acting adjutant general of the State Guard of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. PETERSON of Florida introduced a bill (H. R. 6879) for the relief of Oliver W. Williams, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2623. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island Truck Owners Association of Providence, R. I., memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to defeat proposed legislation to increase the Federal gasoline and lubricating oil taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2624. By Mr KRAMER: Petition of the Los Angeles Industrial Union Council, Chemists and Technicians, Chapter 205, expressing their disapproval of the Smith bills and urging the Representatives in Congress to vote against these and any similar bills; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2625. Also, petition of the Aeronautical Mechanics Lodge, No. 727, Burbank, Calif., bitterly opposing the Smith labor bills; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2626. Also, petition of the California Federation of Women's Clubs, opposing the Ways and Means Committee proposal to enact the joint income tax on Federal taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2627. Also, petition of the Pacific Coast Transportation Advisory Board, in session at Los Angeles, Calif., urging the President of the United States and Members of Congress, through appropriate legislation, to modify the present 40-hour week in order to expedite the various phases of the national defense program; to the Committee on Labor

2628. Also, petition of Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles, Calif., urging the adoption of House bills 6525 and 6638, and fully endorsing the principles of each bill, if they should be contained in another bill of similar nature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2629. Also, petition of the reclamation board of the State of California, thanking the House of Representatives, and in particular the Members of the California delegation for their support in the passage of House bill 6736, which appropriated to the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for expenditure of the Sacramento flood-control project, the sum of $3,210,000, and they ask the support of the House of Representatives in securing the passage of the same measure in the Senate; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2630. By Mr PLUMLEY: Petition of Hon. Flora J Coutts and some 16 other residents of Newport, Vt., for all-out production, stoppage of strikes, elimination of overtime and double Sunday pay, an efficiency program and immediate action; to the Committee on Labor.

2631. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco Round Table, requesting that national expenditures for nondefense purposes be kept at a minimum; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2632. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of the Texas Chiropractic Research Society, Inc., asking the establishment of department of warrant officers in the Medical Corps of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs

2633. By Mr VINCENT of Kentucky: Petition of B. F. Parker and citizens and residents of Russellville, Logan County, Ky., urging the passage of laws at this time to speed up the war effort; to stop strikes; to change the 40-hour workweek to the number of hours necessary to meet the emergency, allowing no extra pay for Sundays or holidays; and to change any needed industry from nonessential to war production, placing those refusing under Government supervision, etc.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2634. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Council of the City of Toledo, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 6750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 30, 1942

The Chaplain, the Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Merciful Father, who hast promised to the meek in heart the blessings of the life that now is and the sure hope of an eternal inheritance: Grant that in this Holy Week we may capture more and more the spirit of true meekness as it is revealed in the person of Thine own dear Son, who floods the simplest acts of life with an unearthly light, making them gracious and beautiful symbols of some pure and holy mystery by means of which each human thought and word is clothed with a radiance divine. Help us each day and hour to take His yoke upon us and to learn of Him, that we may take suffering and pain into our souls not as a tedious interlude but as the very melody and march of life itself, touched perhaps for a moment by a mordant note, only to resolve itself into the perfect harmony of life triumphant.

Inspire in us a deeper consecration to Thy service as we strive to do Thy will; make us ever more responsive to the call of duty, whatever its demands, willing, if need be, to yield up life itself, and do Thou lure us by the sweet compulsion of the Saviour, whose gentle tyranny is always exercised in perfect love. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, March 27, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

EMPLOYEES OF BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE—STATEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Vice President, on the basis of information which he had received the afternoon of Sunday, March 29, from friends as to a letter written him by Representative DIES, put out a statement over the telephone to the press. The Vice President has not yet received from Mr. DIES the courtesy of the letter which Mr. DIES gave to the press on Sunday to be printed Monday morning. I have here a copy of the Vice President's statement which was telephoned to the press last evening and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

I have been informed of an open letter written me by Mr MARTIN DIES regarding certain employees of the Board of Economic Warfare. If Mr DIES were genuinely interested in helping our war effort, he would have discussed this matter with me as soon as it came to his attention He did not. Rather, he is seeking to inflame the public mind by a malicious distortion of facts which he did not want to check with me. If we were at peace, these tactics could be overlooked as the product of a witchcraft mind. We are not at peace, however We are at war, and the doubts and anger which this and similar statements of Mr DIES tend to arouse in the public mind might as well come from Goebbels himself as far as their practical effect is concerned. As a matter of fact, the effect on our morale would be less damaging if Mr. DIES were on the Hitler pay roll.

Obviously, I stand ready at all times to have any and every fact regarding our employees thoroughly investigated. This is being done daily by the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. We are eternally vigilant about it. The current charges will be investigated at once by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. If that investigation proves that these men are unsuited for work with the Board of Economic Warfare, they will be dismissed promptly as others have been in the past. If it does not, I expect a public apology to the men whose reputations Mr. DIES has publicly smeared without giving them a chance to be heard

Over half of Mr. DIES' "letter" is given to charges against Mr. Maurice Parmelee. I never heard of the gentleman until last Saturday morning. Since then I have been informed that he was employed because of responsible work he did in London on blockade control for the United States War Trade Board during the last war. Subsequent to that, in 1920, he was named as special assistant to the Secretary of State. He is not now doing post-war work

Notwithstanding Mr DIES' statement, less than half a dozen people are engaged in post-war planning for the Board of Economic Warfare. The majority of our employees are engaged in work on over 8,000 export-license applications which are analyzed and cleared every day Mr. DIES' reason for distorting the emphasis on post-war work was because of the chance it gave him to draw utterly false inferences from a book Mr. Parmelee wrote 11 years ago on nudism.

This book was first published in 1931 by Alfred Knopf, one of the established publishing houses in this country Some years later a libel suit in connection with an English edition was filed in the Federal district court here. Mr. DIES quotes extracts from that lower court decision. He would keep the American people in ignorance of an appeal in the case. Such an appeal was taken to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and the lower court decision was reversed. In a decision handed down by Justice Miller on May 14, 1940, the court held that the entire text of the book was inoffensive and that only a few of the illustrations were questionable.

The court held further that "it is obvious that the latter do not furnish the dominant note of the publication * * * In the present case, as in the Ulysses case, the book as a whole is not obscene * * * The author has been known for many years as a well-qualified writer in the field of sociology. His textbooks have been long known and used in the colleges and universities of this country."

Mr. Parmelee's case has been passed on by the courts of the land as provided for by our form of government. Not one person in a hundred thousand in this country is interested in nudism. Mr. DIES has twisted a few isolated facts in an effort to create the impression that the Board of Economic Warfare is planning a nudist post-war world for the United States. In calmer times this would make him the laughingstock of the country. In these days of crisis and tension, however, we cannot tolerate deliberate and dishonest efforts to confuse the public.

These are the most critical times in our history. Everything we treasure is at stake. It is the solemn duty of all patriotic citizens to fight the enemy within our gates who hides under many cloaks, the most insidious of which is a false patriotism. Any man who seeks to undermine faith in our Government by a malicious misuse of facts is a greater danger to our national safety than thousands of Axis soldiers within our borders. Hitler and the Japs know that better than anyone else. We Americans must face this ugly truth

I trust that Mr. DIES and others of his kind, with an intense itch for publicity, will use their talents to help the United Nations win this war rather than stir up discord among patriotic Americans.

HENRY A. WALLACE.

MARCH 29, 1942.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.