

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 365 Members have answered to their names; a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CORRECTION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I asked the House for leave of absence for 20 days on account of official duties. I meant that to read for 2 days and I would like to have the RECORD corrected accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

WITHDRAWAL OF A BILL

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the bill H. R. 3680, which I introduced a few days ago.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Let the Chair make a statement. When the House meets and Members are recognized to extend their remarks or to proceed for 1 minute and all who are on the floor and so desire have been recognized, and then a point of no quorum is made in order to start the business of legislation for the day, the Chair thinks it is hardly proper to begin all over again in recognizing Members to extend their own remarks or to proceed for 1 minute, but the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an editorial in the Boston Herald highly complimentary to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1941

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. 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. 3836) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; and pending that I ask unanimous consent that general debate be confined to the bill and continue for two hours and a half, the time to be equally divided between myself and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

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

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself

into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3836, the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1941, with Mr. McLAUGHLIN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

[Mr. DIES addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first deficiency appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1941, and it carries \$188,863,693.68 in direct appropriations and \$5,794,000 in contract authorizations. Three major classes of items comprise the total: Judgments and certified claims, \$4,454,601.43; deficiencies for the fiscal year 1941 and prior years, \$28,241,592.25; and supplemental items for 1941, \$156,167,500. The report of the committee—House Report No. 185—which is available to the Members, sets out very clearly and with considerable detail the items which compose this bill. Approximately 80 percent, or \$152,638,500, is directly connected with the defense program. I know of no particular controversy over any item in this bill. I hope members of the committee will avail themselves of the report and look at it as this general debate progresses and make any inquiries which they might desire to propound.

There is one item I think I should comment on, however, because there will likely be some discussion of it. I refer to the item of \$22,500,000 for the National Youth Administration. In the last Congress we gave the National Youth Administration \$32,500,000, over and above the regular appropriation, to augment their out-of-school program to accelerate and expand the work experience of youth. The hearings at that time will show that the N. Y. A. stated that with this appropriation they could increase their total enrollment of youth about 125,000.

On page 7 of the report you will find a break-down of the average employment by months under this project, showing that in January the average was 407,000, and February they estimated an average for the month of 475,000 needy unemployed youths working on these out-of-school projects, the shop-training projects and construction projects, which have for their purpose giving preliminary and primary work training from which these youths may go into private industry. In the first 7 months of this fiscal year over 118,000 have gone off this program into jobs. The committee has included in this bill \$22,500,000 to enable the National Youth Administration to continue that program through the remainder of this fiscal year.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DITTER. Was it the gentleman's understanding when we made the additional appropriation in October that this

was intended to carry through for the balance of the fiscal year?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may say to the gentleman that when this matter first came to our attention, this particular item, it was my understanding that that would happen; but when I referred back to the hearings I found it was there specifically stated that that amount of money which we were then appropriating might not carry it through the entire fiscal year, and if Congress wanted the program continued, they would likely come back for more money. That has been done.

Mr. DITTER. Was it the impression it was only to function for 4 months under the appropriation that we made in October?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct; they could only function for 4 months; so, if it is desired now to continue this program, the additional appropriation will be necessary.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman referred to \$32,500,000 being appropriated for the National Youth Administration.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. For this particular program.

Mr. BENDER. For this particular program. Is it not a fact that only \$11,000,000 of that actually found its way into the pockets of the boys and girls who were supposed to benefit, and is it not a further fact that about \$9,000,000 was used for equipment and about \$5,000,000 for administrative expenses?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Well, very probably \$9,000,000 was used for equipment. You cannot give shop training without tools and machinery. Of course, on the question of how much finds its way into the pockets of the youth, the primary purpose of this is to give work training, not money. They get the training and are paid a small monthly salary while they are in training. In some instances part of that salary is used to pay their board. But the primary object of the program is to give them this primary work experience and training.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to say that the persons administering this program in Montana are doing a splendid job. Many hundreds of youths are receiving education and training that otherwise would be denied education. I want to see it carried on as now—so no needy boy or girl will not get a square deal. I note that there were 485,000 employed as of February 5, 1941.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; as of that date, but the average for February is estimated between 450,000 and 475,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The point I am trying to get at is that the amount contained in the bill, if appropriated, would cause a decrease in that number of in the neighborhood of 100,000 of these youths.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I deeply regret the

fact the number receiving training will be cut, as I think the number should be maintained. I understand that if the amount of \$22,500,000 were increased to \$30,000,000 we could retain upon the roll the number that were there on February 5, 1941.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. You could maintain the employment average at between 450,000 and 475,000, but let me say in explanation of that that the committee has given the National Youth Administration in this bill just what the President requested in the Budget estimate, and while the average will drop from between 450,000 to 475,000 for February to 374,000 for each of the last 4 months of the fiscal year, the natural turn-over of those going off N. Y. A. to private industry should about take care of that. In other words, it should not require them to separate anyone from the program who is now receiving benefit from it. They should be able to meet the decrease of between 75,000 and 100,000 in average employment by not taking on additional people.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it true that those who are administering the act asked for in the neighborhood of \$30,000,000 to carry on the 475,000?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They may have asked the Budget for that, but we gave them what the President asked for the program for the rest of the year. I am under the impression they were satisfied with that. This is only part of the N. Y. A. program—the added part that we are extending for 4 months for this defense training.

Mr. KEAN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KEAN. Did the committee receive any testimony from potential employers as to the feasibility of this program?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The committee had the testimony of representatives of the Advisory Committee of the Council on Defense that this program was very much needed in creating an interest among young men to start them on an apprentice training program; and that industry—airplane factories, machine factories, tank factories, and so forth—were glad to get these young men just as quickly as they could get them after they had this preliminary training. I feel that they made a very good case for this item.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to make just one or two general observations on the question of these large sums that we are appropriating for defense. This bill carries \$188,000,000. We had a large defense bill a few days ago, we will be in soon with another, and undoubtedly there will be others to follow when the lend-lease bill passes.

Just a few days ago I received an inquiry from a constituent, a very intelligent taxpayer. He asked me this question, "Don't you feel that we are doing a lot of things now that are really not necessary? Don't you feel that we are building up an Army stronger than we are going to need, and that we are putting more money into this defense program than is

really honestly needed for the defense of America?"

How are you going to answer that question? For my part, being somewhat of an optimist, I believe we are not going to need in the field an army of 1,418,000 men, because I believe America is not going to be invaded. I doubt that we are going to need as much for the Navy as we are putting in it. But who is willing to take the chance?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

I have a liability-insurance policy on my automobile to protect me financially if I should accidentally run over somebody and injure him. I have not the slightest idea that I am ever going to need it, but I dare not be without it. I have carried, as you have, all down through the years, fire insurance on everything I have. I doubt if many of you have ever collected anything on that fire insurance, and you hope and pray that you will not. At any rate, we would rather pay the premiums on those policies than to collect on them.

If there is one lesson America should have learned by now it is that this is one thing no American citizen in this body, charged with responsibility, has a right to take a chance about. [Applause.]

What are you going to do? One of my friends said, "Where has your economy program gone? Where is your economy block?" I said, "It has had the block knocked off of it temporarily."

We could take these estimates and make big cuts in them. Our committee has had before it repeatedly Gen. George Marshall, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, and Admiral Stark, the Chief of Naval Operations of the Navy. I consider America doubly fortunate that we have two great, distinguished, outstanding citizens of the caliber of these two men at the head of these two important branches of our defense set-up. They are experts. They are conservative. They are not swept off their feet by emotion. They are realists. They are looking at this problem in a practical, sane, realistic manner.

If there should come the bugle blast at our frontier telling us that we were attacked by a foreign foe, we would expect General Marshall and Admiral Stark to protect us. When those experienced men stood before the committee and said, "Gentlemen of the committee, it is our deliberate judgment, in view of this emergency, that we need this equipment, that we need this personnel, that we need to build up these defense forces in this manner," who is the man in this body who is better qualified or better equipped to say that they need a lesser amount or a different type of material?

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

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

Mr. RICH. I was glad to hear the gentleman from Virginia make the statement that America is not going to be invaded. I share that opinion. But what does the gentleman think when he says

he does not believe we need an Army of 1,400,000 men, and all these other things? Does he believe we are preparing for a war of aggression?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course I do not. I believe we are not preparing for a war of aggression; but every other nation that has been invaded and has been run over felt just as I say I feel, that I believe we are not going to have to use it, but I am afraid not to have it in case we do need it. Therefore I am going to vote for a defense of this country that will leave no shadow of a doubt but that it will be protected from aggression. [Applause.]

Mr. RICH. I quite agree with the gentleman. We all want that. We do not want anybody to come here and invade us. We will protect ourselves. However, from the requests the gentleman has had as subchairman of the Appropriations Committee, and from the reports that he has heard about the expenditure of these funds, has not the gentleman heard that we have been wasting money, and does he not believe that we ought to be a little careful in parceling it out, so that we may be sure we stop waste?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I believe that we ought to be very careful in our expenditures and see that there is no waste or graft, but I am absolutely confident that we have paid 20 or 25 percent more, perhaps, for these things that we have bought in this year for the defense program than we would have paid if we had sat down deliberately, conservatively, without the element of time entering into it, and placed orders and had them filled in normal course.

Let me use an illustration. The gentleman from Pennsylvania wants to go to New York. He is in a hurry to get there. What does he do? He can go down and take the regular train, pay \$4.55 for a ticket, and he will get there in 4 hours. He can walk over and take a faster-scheduled train and pay perhaps a dollar more, and he will get there in 3½ hours, or he can go over to the airport, if he wishes to do so, and pay twice that amount, and he can get there in an hour. We are paying 20 or 25 percent more for our defense build-up because the element of time has entered into it. These things have to be built and procured quickly, and industries have to be set up, which brings an added cost that cannot possibly be prevented.

This does not mean in any sense of the word that there has been corruption or waste or wanton extravagance. Those things do not follow at all. I have heard nobody testify in the hearings that I have listened to in the subcommittee, which has handled a large part of these funds, about any wanton waste or extravagance. The bureau heads have come in frankly and said, "Yes, sir; we paid for this cantonment and we paid for it more than we would like to have paid, more than we estimated, and these are the reasons. We were acting in a hurry, under pressure of time. We worked labor overtime and on Sundays. That made the labor cost go up. We went into the market quickly to buy goods. We did not have time to adver-

might assist a belligerent. They would prefer that these people be goaded by hunger to revolt. But I say that we cannot ignore the cry of humanity. The deliberate starvation of captive peoples is too utterly inhuman for America to adopt as a means of forcing totalitarian capitulation.

Therefore I have introduced a bill today to establish a European Food Distribution Commission to acquire and distribute food among needy individuals and needy families in Europe.

We have an abundance of certain food-stuffs in this country. And, thank God, we have had peace which has given us the opportunity to increase this abundance. We should not, we must not, be deaf to the appeal of the destitute. It is true that our own people must be fed, but I propose to use only the surplus food over and above our own needs. Our assistance to Britain has been along material lines for their defense. Surely we shall not deny consolation and succor to the innocent, women and children particularly, in the war-torn countries of the Old World.

This is not an explanation of my plan, but it is a plea for its consideration. The details can be discussed later.

We should be guided by Christian principles in such matters and remember to have "malice toward none and charity for all." A victory for democracy that is purchased at the price of the lives of millions of innocent people is a defeat. [Applause.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to go into this debate, but having listened to the amazing statement of my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and believing that he has been greatly misinformed as to the subject he was discussing this morning, I would like to take just a few minutes to tell the gentleman how wrong he is, and I thank the chairman of the committee for giving me this time to straighten the record.

I did not read the papers referred to at the time the gentleman from Illinois was talking, so I do not know exactly what story he may have read, but I did read in last night's Star the following, and I quote:

Mr. Early also reported the President as saying this morning that a story about plans for defense mobilization of millions of women is a lie.

For several weeks past a so-called home-defense program, by which women and men ineligible for military service could volunteer for special defense work, has been under consideration. At his press conference on Tuesday, Mr. Roosevelt said the problem is proving to be a very complicated and difficult one and that it is still all in the study stage.

Reference was made this morning to a meeting held at the White House some weeks ago. That is true. Several weeks ago Mrs. Roosevelt invited a group of women to call at the White House to discuss the part that women would take in organizing our efforts for defense, if and when it was necessary to call on us for service. No question of mobilizing women was involved. It was to be purely

voluntary service, but as so many plans had been suggested it was thought well to have some pattern to follow, some plan of campaign which would fit women for necessary service and to use whatever natural talents we had where they would be most valuable. There never was any thought expressed at this meeting to mobilize or demand service. It was purely a voluntary contribution and one which Mrs. Roosevelt and the rest of us women were most anxious to offer.

There are many functions women can perform much better than men, with all due respect to the men, and we want to be prepared to do our part in the same spirit the men of America are preparing to do theirs. Surely there is nothing strange about this. Every man who knows the valuable contribution women are making now and did make in the World War must realize that that contribution could have been much more valuable had we been trained for it. May I say, too, that this meeting that was referred to this morning was arranged by Mrs. Roosevelt purely and simply to find out the best means by which we could utilize our talents. The meeting was not a partisan meeting. Women Members of Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, were invited to the meeting and the Members here who were present will bear me out in what I have said, that there was nothing demanded. Suggestions were asked. We were given a plan, asked to read it over and submit our ideas on coordinating and organizing our strength. It was purely to get some plan of action by which the women of America could do their best work if and when we were called upon for service. Each and every one of us was asked at that time to think the matter through and be prepared to submit plans for use if and when it became necessary to organize our forces. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Reconstruction Finance Corporation and The RFC Mortgage Company: For an additional amount for administrative expenses of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and The RFC Mortgage Company, fiscal year 1941, including the same objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1941, \$600,000, payable from the funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 14, after the word "Corporation", strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and add the following: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be paid to any person affiliated with the Communist Party, the German-American Bund, or any other organization seeking to undermine the national defense of the United States and to overthrow our republican form of government."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, this morning at the outset of the session the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] gave to the House a brief accounting of the conduct of his committee. I believe most of the Members of the House are in sym-

pathy with his committee and its fearless and courageous conduct of the investigation of un-American activities. During his remarks the gentleman from Texas stated there were a large number of Communist sympathizers on the Government pay rolls drawing pay from the Federal Government. I assume the gentleman from Texas knows what he is talking about. Whether the number is 500 or half that amount is of little significance; if there are any, then it is the duty of the Congress to strike them off the pay roll. The Congress should not tolerate or compromise with the disloyal and seditious elements in our midst. We have more to fear from our enemies from within than our enemies from without. I submit to the House that the very fact there are Communists and Communist sympathizers holding high or key positions in the Government service, according to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], and drawing pay from the Federal Government, undermines the very existence of his committee. Fundamentally, what right has that committee to go out and investigate Communist activities elsewhere in the Nation, or bundist activities, if in the sanctity of the Federal Government itself there are Communists or bundists on the pay rolls, some he says holding high key positions and receiving funds appropriated by us? It is the utter negation and denial of everything the Dies committee stands for in the investigation of un-American activities and propaganda.

I think therefore an amendment to this appropriation bill stating that no money we appropriate shall be paid to members of the Communist Party, to members of the German-American Bund, or to members of any organization which seeks to undermine our national defense or overthrow the Government should be acceptable and be adopted by the Congress.

The language of my amendment is clear. It means exactly what it says. If we have difficulty proving they are members of the Communist Party, or these other seditious or disloyal organizations, we are the ones who suffer, but at least we are trying to do what we want to do in this House—to prevent one single dollar going into the hands of Communists or bundists who seek to destroy our free institutions and republican form of government.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman states he wants to prevent any money we appropriate going to Communists or members of subversive groups.

Mr. FISH. That is correct.

Mr. EBERHARTER. If that is the gentleman's intention, why does he not offer a similar amendment to every paragraph of every appropriation bill?

Mr. FISH. That is exactly what I propose to do if this amendment is accepted. I propose, if it is accepted in this instance, to offer it in the case of every appropriation, let us say, of half a million dollars or more, so that we shall at least have a chance to find out whether Members of Congress are sincere or no

in their condemnations of Communists' and bundists' activities and propaganda.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Would not the gentleman accomplish the same purpose by adding his amendment at the end of the bill making it applicable to the entire bill instead of cluttering up the bill by adding the same amendment to each paragraph?

Mr. FISH. That is exactly what I propose to do. I am offering this amendment in the nature of a test of the sentiment of the membership of the House. If it is agreed to, then at the end of the bill I intend to offer a general proposal in similar words to apply to all money appropriated in the bill. I should like to have this amendment voted on now, however, to get the reaction of the membership. If it is the will of the House, I certainly shall offer a general amendment at the end of the bill to cover the use of all appropriations.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am entirely in sympathy with the gentleman's objectives.

Mr. FISH. I am sure the gentleman is.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. But has the gentleman considered the administrative difficulties? How is the Comptroller General going to determine in the case of each voucher he approves for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that no Communist or member of a subversive group received any of the funds?

Mr. FISH. I called attention to that myself. I admit it will be difficult to prove it if they deny it. There are some who will not, and there are others whom it will be easy to prove are either Communists, bundists, or affiliated with subversive groups.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a vote on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FISH) there were—ayes 54, noes 52.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

For additional amounts for the National Youth Administration, fiscal year 1941, to be expended in accordance with the provisions of the National Youth Administration Appropriation Act, 1941, except that all training or educational programs for youth employed by the National Youth Administration on work projects shall be under the control and supervision of the State boards for vocational education of the several States and shall be paid for out of appropriations made to the Office of Education and expended by the States pursuant to plans submitted by State boards for vocational education and approved by the Commissioner of Education as provided for in First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941, under the heading "Office of Education," paragraph (5), and except as hereinafter provided, for the following purposes:

For the purposes and objects specified in paragraph 1 (b) of such act, \$21,980,000, of which \$25,000 shall be available to the United

States Employees' Compensation Commission for the purposes of paragraph 18 of such act.

For salaries and other administrative expenses specified in paragraph 2 of such act, \$500,000, of which sum so much as may be necessary may be transferred to appropriations of the Treasury Department in accordance with and for the purposes of such paragraph.

For printing and binding, \$20,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Beginning with line 18, on page 5, strike out all down to and including line 18, on page 6.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is the appropriation I spoke about when I had the floor a short while ago saying I intended to move to strike the item out.

That you may have in mind the actual status of the National Youth Administration appropriation, I call attention to page 396 of the hearings where the balance upon March 1 is shown to be \$43,523,129.

If this money were being used for training students out of school, and then adding 10 percent overhead expense and administrative expense, this could take care, on the average, for those 4 months, of 980,000, but it is not being so spent. It is being spent for private boarding schools, about half for boys and half for girls. This gives them a great amount of money and very few of the schools have any relationship to national defense. Let me give you a little illustration by citing what is happening in western Massachusetts. I read the following newspaper item:

Young men interested in obtaining N. Y. A. employment, where workers are getting experience in the care of livestock, cafeteria work, construction and maintenance, small-scale direct farming, and other work incidental to agriculture, can apply to John F. Hobin of 1 Assonet Street, State Administrator John L. Donovan, Jr., announced yesterday.

Mr. Donovan said the turnover of youth from N. Y. A. rolls to private employment has been so large in the past few months that a number of vacancies at Methuen have been created.

In other words, they are advertising for trade. There is so little interest in it, and so little demand, and they have so much more money than they have any business having, that they are advertising for trade.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. The gentleman has mentioned the State of Massachusetts. I would like to point out that in the State of Massachusetts—

Mr. TABER. The gentleman will ask a question. He is not asking a question. He is trying to make a speech and he is trying to tell something. If he wants to tell it, he may do so in his own time. I am not going to yield for that.

The trouble with this whole picture is that when you hit somebody on the head here they come up with an alibi. The story is that this is not for national defense. It is a waste of \$22,500,000.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Let us save this for national defense and quit playing into the hands of Stalin and Hitler.

I hope the Members of this House will show an appreciation of their responsibility. If this were for out of school boys at \$10 apiece, it would take care of all they have on the roll, but they waste this money on private-boarding schools. Are you going to let them make a fool of you?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER.]

(Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, we are not surprised at the latest blast against the N. Y. A. from the distinguished gentleman from New York. Those of you who were here a year ago will remember that the same gentleman made the same or similar blast against the N. Y. A. when the regular appropriation was being considered for that organization. It will be recalled that upon the heels of a very great oratorical effort on his part, this House increased the amount just \$15,000,000 above the Budget estimate. [Applause.]

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. The gentleman who just preceded the present speaker alluded to the fact that there had been reported a large turnover of these youths from the National Youth Administration to private industry pay rolls. Is that not the very purpose of the National Youth Administration and should not all of us be very happy that we are getting such fruitful results from the National Youth Administration?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; the gentleman makes a most excellent point, and I thank him sincerely for his contribution. But answering the serious but perennial charges of the gentleman from New York against the N. Y. A., the gentleman states this has no connection with the national defense program. Let us see what the facts are. Since last July 1 the defense industries of this country have taken 118,000 of these trained youths from the N. Y. A. training schools into their industries, and I will insert in the RECORD excerpts from several of many letters which I hold here from representatives of some of the leading industries asking for additional N. Y. A. youths who have had this training. These facts, I submit, in all fairness speak louder than strong assertions and bitter denunciations against this great organization that is doing so much for the needy youth of the land.

What are the further facts? The National Youth Administration is feeding to these defense industries approximately 22,000 youths per month. That many are being taken now into the Nation's defense program, and it is unable to train young men as fast as the industries are asking for them. Yet the gentleman from New York has the unmitigated gall to say this appropriation for the training

equitable distribution. Why should the States who pay the least get the most? It is not fair. It is not just.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to assure you that just as much as any Member of this House I want to cut down the expenses of Government and cut down the appropriations, but I do not want to do this at the expense of the American youth who is in need of education and training.

Under the provisions of this bill, if we allow the \$22,500,000, 100,000 youths who are now being trained and educated will be required to be taken off of the rolls, such a reduction is too severe at this time—I would try to avoid this if it were possible. I want to say this, that in my own State of Montana I do not know what we would have done without this program. It is being carried on and administered in perfect fashion. We have one of the best N. Y. A. administrators in the United States and his supervisory set-up is excellent. They are doing a swell job and we are taking care of many boys and girls who would be required to go without an education and training were it not for this program.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I cannot refuse to yield to my good friend from Arizona, even though I have only 2 minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Thanks. I will say that the gentleman's remarks will apply equally to my State of Arizona, but with regard to this N. Y. A. program as a part of national defense, does it not seem to the gentleman fantastic that we should build machines without making adequate preparation of the human element?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course.

Mr. MURDOCK. And is not this a vital part of the preparation of the human element of our defense?

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is just 100 percent right, and I cannot conceive of any Member of this House seriously getting up here and advocating cutting one penny off of this appropriation when it will come out of the hide and out of the future of the boys and the girls of this country who are in need. The future of our country is dependent upon our youth and it is clearly our duty to prepare them for the arduous task that is ahead of them. [Applause.]

[Mr. HOFFMAN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, you ladies and gentlemen will recall that when this matter was up for a vote before I supported the Youth Administration, and I am here again today supporting it. These young people came into this world without their permission and must go out of it without their consent. We have a situation existing in the country today that requires that these young people be educated, and they are as much entitled to consideration here as is the national defense. I think the greatest problem we have is to take care of the youth. If you will read a little bit of history you will learn that they took care of the youth over there in the old country, and

that the youth is taking care of Germany today. That is what we have to do in this country. When I inquired of the gentleman from New York what he would do with this Youth Administration he said that he would send the youths back to their fathers and mothers, to their homes, and let the communities take care of them. That is no answer at all. We must take care of these youths. I know what this amendment would do to the State of Wisconsin, and I am surprised that the gentleman from New York, who is getting nine and a half million dollars out of this for the State and city of New York, opposed it.

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

Mr. JOHNS. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. With all deference to my colleague from Wisconsin, and also to my other colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], during the last 3 days we have been listening to a whole lot of tears that have been shed about the rural people of America. Possibly it may be pointed out that 40 percent of the farm children do not even go to high school, at least that is in the State of Wisconsin, and that is probably true of other States, and some of them may not have as high a percentage as that.

Mr. JOHNS. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly interested in this bill this afternoon and I am surprised at some of the opposition to the training of youths, because it has been said here this afternoon that industry is training the youth of America. Industry is not training the youth of America and has not trained the youth of America during the last 25 years. The results are now self-evident. Here in America we have not enough trained mechanics at the present time. I stated on the floor of this House in 1938 that the day would come when America was faced with war that there would be a great lack of trained mechanics. I know that today we have several agencies endeavoring to train youths to flow into the defense work of our country. In the State that I represent youths are receiving training both from the State Board of Education and the United States Department of Labor and the National Youth Administration, and over 90 percent of the trainees there find employment in defense industry. In my own town I had the honor to institute a welding school about 6 weeks ago and the records of the trainees from that school, trained by Government funds with the help of State funds, show that 100 percent of the boys have been accepted into industry, into the shipyards, in the defense program. This is one of the things that we need to continue. The machinery is set up. Last Monday I visited one of these schools in my district and saw there 100 boys receiving this training. One of the best shipyards along the North Atlantic coast is situated in my district, and today it is empty, while the world is crying for the construction of cargo ships. The reason that the Navy Department gives for this is that

the shipyard is not open because of lack of trained mechanics. I plead with you this afternoon to reject this amendment and to keep this training program in progress during the next few years. [Applause.]

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 12, noes 84.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 6, line 10, after the word "act", strike out "\$21,980,000"; and in line 14, strike out after the word "act", "\$500,000" and insert in line 10, "\$15,990,000" and in line 14, "\$300,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Salaries: For an additional amount for salaries, fiscal year 1941, including the same objects specified under this head in the Railroad Retirement Board Appropriation Act 1941, \$234,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Page 7, line 9, strike out "\$234,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$244,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Miscellaneous expenses: For an additional amount for miscellaneous expenses, fiscal year 1941, including the same objects specified under this head in the Railroad Retirement Board Appropriation Act, 1941, \$220,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Page 7, line 13, strike out "\$220,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$210,000."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, in explanation of these two amendments, I will say that the effect of them is merely to shift \$10,000 from "Miscellaneous expenses" up to "Salaries."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE PANAMA CANAL

Maintenance and operation: For an additional amount for maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, fiscal year 1941, including the objects and conditions specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1941, \$11,283,300, to be available until expended, of which \$10,510,000 shall be available for continuing the construction of special protective work.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BONNER: Page 27, lines 20 and 21, strike out the following: "and set forth in House Document No. 87, Seventy-seventh Congress"; and in line 23, strike out "\$23,882,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$23,987,000."

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will include in the bill two small items that were authorized in public numbered 868, a small harbor just north of Cape Hatteras and a small harbor just south of Cape Hatteras.

The Atlantic coast off the shores of North Carolina has a peculiar geographical formation. The shores come down and go off the mainland around Cape Hatteras and south of Cape Hatteras, leaving inland sounds from 15 to 40 miles in width. During the period of the World War there were several ships sunk off the North Carolina coast by German submarines. Notably among them was the British oil tanker *Murlow*. From this tanker the Coast Guard under Capt. John Allen Medgett with a small boat launched from the beach saved 40 lives, 20 miles offshore. There was also sunk at Cape Hatteras the Diamond Shoal lightship by a German submarine. The improvement of these two small harbors will facilitate the harboring of small craft now being built by the Navy Department. It will mean the only harbor 100 miles south of Cape Henry and the only harbor 60 miles north of Morehead Inlet, N. C.

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

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Have those two projects been approved by the engineers of the War Department? Have there been hearings held on them before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors?

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman. These two projects were approved for commercial value in the rivers and harbors bill that was vetoed in the last Congress. I may say that in addition to national defense they furnish great commercial value, for off Cape Hatteras every year there gather from 75 to 100 trawlers that come down from the New England coast and from Chesapeake Bay, fishing off the banks of Cape Hatteras. There is no harbor at present where they can come in. Silver Lake will furnish a harbor 10 feet deep, which those trawlers can enter.

Mr. DONDERO. I may say that the Rivers and Harbors Committee is holding hearings now on an omnibus rivers and harbors bill, and I think only yesterday projects along the Atlantic coast, particularly in North and South Carolina, were before that committee. I am wondering whether or not this is the proper time and place to present this matter?

Mr. BONNER. These two projects were mentioned in Public, Numbered 868, authorizing the improvement of certain rivers and harbors in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] has spoken to me several times about his projects, and I am very familiar

with them. On the merits, I think the gentleman has a very meritorious project and it ought to be taken care of. I think it ought to be in this bill on account of the national defense, especially in view of the fact that there is being developed a marine base in that area. But since talking with the gentleman the other day I find there are several other projects in exactly the same situation, and, under the circumstances, I would appreciate it if the gentleman would not press his amendment at this time, but let it come up a little later in the regular way.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, in view of that statement, I will withdraw the amendment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Page 28, after line 18, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or other fund contained in this title shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of any 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 or fund in such title 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. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to title I, not in any sense of the word for the purpose of taking any credit away from the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] who offered an amendment of the same general purpose to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation paragraph earlier in the afternoon. The gentleman from New York is entitled to full credit for calling the attention of the committee to this and for initiating the action which was taken by the committee.

The language which I have offered, however, is the provision which was offered in the House to House Joint Resolution 77 providing an appropriation for cargo ships and finally perfected and agreed to in conference. The paragraph I have offered provides not only that no appropriation or fund in this bill shall be paid to anyone who is a member of the Communist Party or who advocates the overthrow of the Government but provides administratively a manner in which it is thought the matter may be handled. I believe it accomplishes everything the gentleman from New York had in mind; and it is similar to the provision which is now in Public Law No. 5 of

the Seventy-seventh Congress which was approved February 6, 1941.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I am wondering if we are adding legislation to an appropriation bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is a limitation, although the penalty part might be considered legislation.

Mr. DONDERO. I do not intend to raise the point of order against it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I thank the gentleman. All we are trying to do is to work out a provision by which we can accomplish the purpose which the Committee of the Whole has just approved. I say again this is a provision that finally was worked out in another bill which has become law recently and which I think will be administratively workable.

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia is a proper amendment. It has been well considered and I believe it probably fulfills the purpose Members on both sides have in mind. I would ask the gentleman whether his amendment applies to the whole bill. I only heard it for the first time as it was read.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It applies to all of title I. I did not make it applicable to the next title, which consists of judgments, audited judgments. It would be very difficult to undertake to go through all those judgments.

Mr. FISH. I thank the gentleman, but I repeat what I stated before that I did propose to offer a general amendment to cover the entire bill at the end by adding a new section; but the gentleman's amendment, as I understand it, applies to the entire first part of the bill which carries all the appropriations touching salary payments.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. To all of title I. I wish the gentleman would consent to vacating the proceedings by which his amendment was agreed to. Then we should have the bill in good shape.

Mr. FISH. What is the objection to leaving both amendments in?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There would be conflicting provisions in the bill, that is the only thing.

Mr. FISH. They both accomplish the same thing. It makes assurance doubly sure. This is a little bit more than lip service. It is not the best possible amendment, but it is the only way we have of reaching it. We have had too much lip service as to what Members of Congress wanted to do to the Communists, to the bundists, and the other disloyal elements, how much they hate them, how much they loathe them, how they want to drive them out of the Government service and off the Government pay roll. Evidently we are limited in our power to deal with these seditious elements except through appropriations. This is not a perfect method, it is far from perfect, but it is the only method we have that we can vote on in order to show the administration what we mean. We do not want any Communists or any bund-

ists on the Federal Government pay roll. The continuation of these seditious and un-American elements on the Federal Government pay roll makes a travesty and mockery of the Dies committee and its very reason for existence. The administration should clean its own house and Augean stables of all Communists, bundists, and other revolutionary agitators and termites and give their jobs to loyal American citizens who believe in our free institutions and American system of government. Whether this amendment will work or not I do not know, but at least it is all we can do, and I hope that it will prevail.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WHITE. Does not the gentleman think his amendment provides a way for framing innocent people who are in the service of the Government? Is it not conceivable a man might be framed by a little clique who would say he was a Communist when he was not?

Mr. FISH. Oh, I do not believe that, any more than the charge that is being made that everybody who urges America to keep out of foreign wars is either a bundist, a Communist, or a Fascist. We have gotten accustomed to that type of propaganda. I have been called all three, so I am not worrying about that. If I know a man is a Communist or if I know a man is a bundist or if any Member of the House knows of Federal employees who are Communists or bundists, he may go to the Comptroller General and say, "This man is a Communist and I have the proof," and under the law he is not entitled to have a dollar appropriated by the Congress of the United States. That is what this amendment does. That is the purpose of it, and I am not quite as thin-skinned as the gentleman from Idaho, because I have been called all three for trying to keep this country out of foreign wars and will continue to do so.

Mr. JONKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JONKMAN. May I ask whether this amendment is as far reaching as the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York? This seems to refer only to those who propose to overthrow the Government by force.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It goes as far, and even further than the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman from Virginia have anything in his amendment about undermining the national defense?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TABER. The only thing about the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is that there is no method provided for administration in it, which is provided for in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia. I am wondering if the gentleman from New York would not consent to return to the point where his amendment was adopted and add the admin-

istrative provision that the gentleman from Virginia provided by his amendment?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may say to the gentleman if anything is done at all we ought to vacate the proceedings by which the previous amendment was agreed to. If not, I would prefer to leave it as it is.

Mr. FISH. The House has already voted on my amendment. It is somewhat different, but it does not do any harm to leave them both in the bill. I think we might as well let them both stay in.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Let them both stay in for the present.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], as usual, made a very interesting speech today. In part he called attention to the appropriation of \$975,000 carried in this bill for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I am in the same position as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] as I favor the additional appropriation for this agency.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] referred to the appropriations that have been allowed his special committee. It so happens that I have handled every resolution appropriating money for the Dies committee since it was originally created. The Accounts Committee has given to the Dies committee every dollar that it has asked and I might say, on one occasion \$10,000 more than was requested. When the Congress extended the life of the committee recently a resolution was introduced providing for an appropriation of \$150,000. At my suggestion language was also placed in that resolution allowing the committee an unexpended balance of around \$4,000.

Of course, the amount appropriated by the Congress for the Dies committee is insignificant in comparison with the amount we have appropriated for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. As I understand, the Dies committee is created for the purpose of investigating conditions with a view to securing information that would enable the committee to recommend legislation that would stop subversive activities. It is not an enforcement committee but an investigating committee. On the other hand the Bureau of Investigation is an enforcement agency.

The normal budget for the Bureau of Investigation for the fiscal year 1941 is \$7,422,000. With the \$975,000 carried in this bill the Congress has appropriated for the present fiscal year, ending July 1, aside from the normal appropriation, \$7,321,800 or a total for this agency for the present fiscal year of \$14,743,800. Of course, conditions warranted this appropriation. If it had not been justified before the Committee on Appropriations it would not have been recommended.

In my opinion there is absolutely no reason why there should not be complete cooperation between not only the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Dies committee but all Government agencies.

Section 3 of the resolution passed by

this House on February 10, appropriating money for expenses of the Dies committee, reads as follows:

The head of each executive department is hereby requested to detail to said committee such number of legal and expert assistants and investigators as said committee may from time to time deem necessary.

I admit this is not a mandatory provision, but it is an expression by the House of Representatives that the executive branch of the Government should cooperate with this select committee of the House of Representatives.

Yesterday I made a suggestion to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. I told him that I thought it would be advisable if he would take the more important complaints that come to his committee and refer each to the Attorney General with a request that the Federal Bureau of Investigation look into the matter and make a complete report of its findings to the Dies committee. The Bureau of Investigation has branch offices throughout the entire United States with any number of agents assigned to each office. The F. B. I. investigators could and should make such investigations for the Dies committee. If, when the report is received, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] felt that it was of such importance as to detail his special investigators, then that could be done. I think, if such a policy was followed, there is no doubt but that the Dies committee would receive information that would be of value. I cannot conceive that any Government agency would refuse a request of this character from a select committee of the House of Representatives. If it did, then I would say that the time has arrived for the House of Representatives to make it mandatory that Government agencies cooperate with select committees of this body.

I feel confident the Attorney General, Mr. Jackson, would respond to Mr. DIES' requests, and I sincerely hope he will follow out my suggestion.

I can say I have called to the attention of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, of the Bureau of Investigation, information that has come to me, and he has not only willingly made investigations but expressed his appreciation.

To listen to some speeches made on the floor of this House one would feel we are not interested in destroying any groups who would overthrow our form of government, but the answer to any such insinuations is found in the amount of money we have appropriated during the present fiscal year for the Bureau of Investigation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill be amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and

the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. McLAUGHLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3836) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, 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. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include therein certain brief tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN], who is absent at a committee meeting, that he may extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a statement in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

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

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include herein certain excerpts and articles.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Worcester Evening Gazette.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

(Mr. COCHRAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

REVISION OF SUGAR ACT OF 1937

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting H. R. 3582, to revise the Sugar Act of 1937, which was introduced by my colleague from Nebraska, the Honorable HARRY COFFEE. I do this because I feel that this measure is the most practical immediate step that can be taken, not only for the sugar-beet industry, but for the entire country.

Under the Sugar Act of 1937, domestic quotas were established for the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, the mainland cane-sugar areas, and the domestic sugar-beet areas totaling 55.59 percent of our entire consumption. The balance of the sugar consumption, or 44.44 percent, was allotted to the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, Cuba, and other foreign countries. Of this allotment, which is not given to the domestic producers, the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands receives about one-third of that quota.

The Coffee bill is predicated on the theory that the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands may not be able to market their full quota in the United States. This is based upon the belief that difficulty will be encountered in the shipping of that sugar from the islands to the United States. Under existing law, if the Philippine Islands cannot market their full quota, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to increase the quotas for foreign countries other than Cuba to make up the deficiency.

H. R. 3582 provides that if the Philippine Islands cannot market their full quota in the United States that we give that deficit to the domestic producers of sugar, instead of to foreign countries.

I apologize to no one for being American. I apologize to no one for placing the welfare of the American people foremost in my consideration. American farmers, American labor, and American business want this increased sugar quota. I think they should have it. I hope that the day will soon come when we can go a lot further than is now proposed in this present bill.

I am supporting this bill because I believe that it is in the interests of American labor to enact this proposal into law. I am for every just right that American labor has gained. I want to see every American who wants to work given

the right to have work. I would rather see American laborers work at good wages in private industry than on any Government-made work activity. I feel that it is the duty of this Government to see that nothing is placed in the way of those who are anxious to provide jobs, in private enterprise, for the citizens of the United States. The domestic growing and refining of sugar means jobs for Americans. Jobs mean wages and American wages mean not only food and raiment, but homes, education, medical care, and all those other things that add to the spiritual life of our Nation. Let he who professes a love for American labor raise his voice against the extension of the sugar industry in America with much caution.

When the American housewives purchase sugar grown and refined in foreign countries, they are not patronizing American labor. When the housewives purchase sugar grown in foreign countries and refined in the United States, they are paying about one-fourth cent a pound to American labor. When they purchase sugar that is both grown and refined in the United States, about 2 cents per pound of the cost goes to American labor. In other words, the laboring men of America receive eight times as much employment from our own sugar as from sugar grown in foreign countries. This means that a given amount of foreign sugar refined in this country may provide an American laborer with 1 day's work, while the same amount of sugar both produced and processed in this country would provide him with 8 days' work.

Not only is American labor entitled to play its part in placing the sugar on the tables of the American people, but likewise the American farmer is entitled to produce that sugar. Domestic acreage for this year has been drastically cut. This is a severe blow to many areas, especially those areas that have suffered from drought in the last few years.

When we speak of the domestic production of sugar we include not only the domestic beet-sugar area but the mainland cane area, the Territory of Hawaii, and the possessions of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. While it is true that no constitutional statutory or treaty provisions exist which would prevent Congress from denying the importation of sugar into the continental United States from Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, the citizens of these islands are by law citizens of the United States. H. R. 3582 does not interfere with existing quotas that have been given these islands for the production of sugar.

Likewise, the Philippine Islands have been legally granted a quota of sugar continuing up to July 4, 1946, when they are to be granted their complete independence. Cuba is not a possession or a territory of the United States, but, historically, we may have some obligation toward Cuba. However, this pending bill does not disturb the quota now allotted to Cuba. It merely asks this Congress to declare that if the Philippine Islands cannot deliver their quota of sugar, the domestic quotas be increased that amount. It is a clear-cut issue between American farmers, American laborers,