

I am confident that the report which I am herewith transmitting will help in devising effective means for enlarging the scope and extending the area of this type of civil service.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 24, 1941.
COMMUNITY FACILITIES UNDER
NATIONAL DEFENSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following further message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The national-defense program has required a large expansion of existing military and naval establishments. The Government has constructed new cantonments, air depots, and naval bases. We have financed and stimulated the construction of hundreds of new industrial plants to produce airplanes, guns, powder, ships, and tanks. This program has been spread throughout the country and has resulted in new concentrations of military forces and civilian workers.

Military and naval strategy has been the controlling factor in determining the location of many of these new defense establishments. As a result posts and plants have been necessarily located near communities without adequate public facilities and services for the large numbers of workers who arrived to construct them and who will be needed to operate the new establishments. There have been shortages of housing, insufficient sanitary and health facilities, overcrowding of transportation services, and inadequate recreational facilities. In fact, this shortage of essential public facilities has handicapped our rearmament effort in some areas.

The Government has already embarked on a defense housing program, but that is not enough. We must do more to obtain the most effect from new plants, new houses, and, most important, from new workers. There is need, in some areas, for improved streets and roads to carry the increased traffic, additional water supply and sewerage systems to service the new structures, and better health, safety, and welfare facilities to benefit the new workers and their families.

The provision of such community facilities has always been a local responsibility. It still is today; cities generally have been straining to meet the problem. Yet we must face the fact we cannot expect local governments to assume all the risk of financing the entire cost of providing new public facilities for the defense program.

After the defense program comes to an end, these new facilities may not be needed. This increase in operating and service costs may also be much greater than a coexistent rise in local public revenues from an increased business activity. Under these circumstances, equity requires that that element of risk attributable to the national-defense effort should be shared by the Federal Government.

I am therefore transmitting for the consideration of the Congress a supple-

mental estimate of appropriation to be available for allocation to appropriate Government agencies, and to remain available until expended, in the amount of \$150,000,000 for the purpose of providing community facilities in those communities where there exists or impends such an acute shortage of such facilities as to impede essential national-defense activities, and where such facilities cannot otherwise be provided. This estimate is based upon studies and recommendations submitted by the Chairman of the National Resources Planning Board, the Coordinator of Defense Housing, the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, the Coordinator of Health, Medical, Welfare, and Related Activities Affecting the National Defense, and the Director of the Division of State and Local Cooperation of the Defense Commission.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 24, 1941.
EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include copy of an address made by Dr. Fred Taylor Wilson before the Rotary Club, of Charleston, W. Va., on February 14, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two particulars and to include certain extracts, and to include in one a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

[The matters referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

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

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address I delivered over the National Broadcasting Co. on Saturday evening, February 15, 1941.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

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

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when everything is disposed of on the Speaker's desk, and at the conclusion of any other special orders, I may be permitted to address this body for 30 minutes on next Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House at this time for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

IS A NEW CONGRESSMAN A
CONGRESSMAN?

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I have been given permission to address this House for 30 minutes on next Thursday, at which time I shall talk on the subject Is a New Congressman a Congressman? Though it is really not necessary, I do not particularly encourage attendance of anybody who has been here over 2 years. There is no way to force the new Congressmen to attend. They may or may not come. But they are welcome to be here when I spend 30 minutes talking on that subject.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN NATIONAL LAWYERS' GUILD AND A LOUSY HEN—LAWYERS' GUILD PROTESTS DEPORTATION OF HARRY BRIDGES—CONDEMNS LEGISLATION WHICH WOULD AID IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in its Monday, February 24, press release National Lawyers' Guild, of Washington, gives notice of its opposition to the deportation of Harry Bridges. Bridges has probably done more to wreck the shipping interests of the west coast, to injure the cause of labor than any other Communist in the United States, yet National Lawyers' Guild takes him under its wing.

A lousy hen is not to blame for the parasite she carries. My farmer, if not my city, friends know that a lousy hen will get into the dust box and try to get rid of the lice which infest her. She does not ask for lice. She does what she can to get rid of them.

The National Lawyers' Guild on the contrary, takes the louse, the parasite, Bridges, under its wing and protects him, would prevent his removal from the country his activities would destroy.

The difference between the lousy hen and the Lawyers' Guild is that the hen has no choice about the matter, is ashamed of her condition, endeavors to remedy it.

The guild chooses to be lousy, selects Bridges as its protégé, and glories in the unpatriotic activities of its adopted child.

Apparently, the guild is wholeheartedly in sympathy with those communistic unions and Communist leaders like Bridges, who are endeavoring to render our national-defense program ineffective.

The resolution on Harry Bridges reads as follows:

Whereas it is historically demonstrable that opponents of the labor movement attempt from time to time to thwart the development thereof by persecuting its leaders; and

Whereas such persecutions frequently take the form of oppressive legislation and discriminatory actions on the part of law-enforcement officials directed against specified labor leaders; and

Whereas such persecutions are likely to be particularly flagrant in times of national emergency; and

Whereas the pending prosecution of Harry Bridges, president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union and director of the California region of the Congress of Industrial Organizations is an instance of this tendency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Lawyers Guild condemns any of the pending legislation and the proceeding just instituted against Harry Bridges and condemns any of the legislation or proceeding which is aimed at a specific labor leader for the real purpose of undermining the effectiveness of labor unions.

The lack of patriotism of those members of the guild who drew that resolution is matched by their ignorance.

The resolution on strike legislation is this:

Whereas a number of bills have been introduced into the Seventy-seventh Congress, containing prohibitions against strikes or providing for compulsory waiting periods and compulsory mediation of labor disputes before strikes may be declared; and

Whereas such legislation deprives labor of one of its basic rights and thus tends to destroy the workers' faith in democracy; and

Whereas experience has shown that legislation of this type does not prevent strikes, but only illegalizes them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Executive Board of the National Lawyers Guild opposes all legislation seeking to prohibit strikes or compel so-called waiting periods and compulsory mediation before strikes may be declared, and opposes specifically the Hoffman bills, H. R. 1403, H. R. 1407, H. R. 1814; the Vinson bill, H. R. 2850; the Shafer bill, H. R. 1626; the Ball bill, S. 683; and the Dirksen bill, H. R. 2662; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress is urged to defeat these specific bills and all similar legislation.

None of the bills introduced by me and referred to by number in this resolution prohibits strikes. None compels a waiting period. Though members of the guild are supposed to be lawyers, apparently some of them not only lack legal knowledge but common sense and the ability to read.

H. R. 1403 merely extends to defense work the provision of section 276 (b) and 276 (c) of title 40 of the Code of Laws of the United States of America, in force January 3, 1935.

If the law were good—and apparently the guild never made any complaint about it—when enacted in 1935, now in time of an emergency there is much greater reason for its application to work in connection with the defense program.

H. R. 1407 provides in substance that those who wish to engage in defense work for the United States shall be required to enter into a contract which shall contain a statement fixing the hours of work, the wage to be received, the duration of the employment, and a further provision that the terms of such contract shall not

be altered without the consent of the Federal Government or of some person duly authorized by the executive or other department of the Government, or the consent of the individual, association, partnership, corporation, or group entering into such contract; and provides for a penalty for a violation of such contract. That bill was first introduced by me on November 28, 1940, and again on January 6, 1941. It is more than significant that the local papers of the 7th carry a statement that the A. F. of L. metal-trades department in connection with an organizing drive proposing that future collective-bargaining agreements, strikes, and lock-outs be forbidden during the "defense emergency production period." The metal-trades department of the A. F. of L. claims between 850,000 and 900,000 of skilled workers most essential to defense production.

Thirteen international unions pledged adherence to such procedure. Certainly the 13 international unions who believe in the policy so enacted can have no objection to legislation which would require less patriotic organization to follow the same course.

Moreover, not long thereafter two affiliates of the A. F. of L. entered into collective-bargaining agreements which contained terms similar to the provisions of H. R. 1407.

H. R. 1814, introduced first by me on November 25, 1940, and again on January 10, 1941, extends to American citizens who do not belong to unions the same right to work on national-defense projects that is claimed by unions for their own members. It does not forbid strikes; it does not forbid collective bargaining. It extends protection to the man who, without fault of his own, has up to the present time, in all too many instances, been denied the right to work.

The guild, by these two resolutions, stamps itself, if not as a communistic organization, as an organization favoring the retention in this country of Harry Bridges and communistic activities. It also, by the passage of the second resolution, if it knew what it was doing, joins forces with those who would prevent national defense, and should be dealt with accordingly. Undoubtedly, if the emergency continues and the country finds its existence at stake, National Lawyers' Guild will be classified among the Nation's public enemies.

DISTRICT DAY

The SPEAKER. This is District day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

PUBLIC DEFENDER FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 2533) to provide for the office of public defender for the District of Columbia, which has been heretofore referred to the District of Columbia Committee be re-referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

PROHIBIT INTRODUCTION OF CONTRABAND INTO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PENAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up H. R. 2297, to prohibit the introduction of contraband into the District of Columbia penal institutions, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person, not authorized by law, or by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or by the general superintendent of penal institutions of the District of Columbia, who introduces or attempts to introduce into or upon the grounds of any penal institution of the District of Columbia, whether located within the District of Columbia or elsewhere, any narcotic drug, weapon, or any other contraband article or thing, or any contraband letter or message intended to be received by an inmate thereof, shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction thereof in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia or in any court of the United States, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 10 years.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to prohibit the bringing of contraband, such as narcotics, weapons, and so forth, into the penal institutions of the District of Columbia. The bill contains provisions which are substantially the same as those contained in the Federal law. It is believed advisable that the prohibition of the introduction of such contraband into District institutions be in keeping with the Federal law on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF ACT PROVIDING FOR A UNION RAILROAD STATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3066) to amend an act to provide for a union railroad station in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of section 10 of an act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for a Union Railroad Station in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved February 28, 1903 (Public, No. 122, 57th Cong., 32 Stat. 909), which reads "Any and all streets or highways within the District of Columbia now or hereafter planned or projected to cross any line of steam railroad in the District of Columbia, which may be hereafter opened to public use shall be located, constructed, and maintained either beneath such railroad by a suitable subway, or above the same by a suitable viaduct bridge at such altitude as will not interfere with the free and safe operation thereof.", be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Any and all streets or highways within the District of Columbia now or hereafter