

an organization of 70 women, opposing the President's proposal to pack and control the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1227. Also, petition of 29 citizens and residents of the city of Newburgh, Orange County, N. Y., opposing the President's proposal to enlarge the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1228. Also, petition of 275 citizens and residents of the city of Brooklyn, protesting against the President's proposal, or any substitutes, permitting the executive branch of the Government to control or subordinate the judicial or the legislative powers established under the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1229. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition signed by Rudolph Schott and 20 other residents of Bronx County, N. Y., urging the passage of House bills 276, 279, and 298 increasing the salaries of custodial employees in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1230. Also, petition adopted by the First Ward Democratic Club of Yonkers, N. Y., endorsing such legislation as proposed by President Roosevelt for the reorganization of the Federal judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1231. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of residents of Kingston, N. Y., under the auspices of the American Labor Party, expressing approval and support of President Roosevelt's proposed reform of the Federal judiciary and of the Supreme Court of the United States as contained in his message to Congress of February 6, 1937; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1232. Also, petition of the citizens of Rhinebeck, Clermont, and Red Hook, N. Y., under the auspices of the American Coalition of New York, opposing the proposal of the President to affect the decisions of the Supreme Court by increasing its membership; also any compromise upon this fundamental issue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1233. By Mr. CRAWFORD: Petition of the Saginaw Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, opposing any program tampering with the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1234. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of the Clarion County Pomona Grange, No. 27, Rimersburg, Pa., protesting against the President's proposed plan to enlarge the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1235. Also, petition of 1,200 members of the Federation of Women's Clubs and allied organizations of Oil City, Pa., protesting against the President's proposal to enlarge the United States Supreme Court or destroy the constitutional checks and balances in our Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1236. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of the Texas State Legislature, favoring House bill 1546, to extend for 2 additional years the 3½-percent interest rate on certain Federal land-bank loans, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1237. Also, petition of Mrs. J. F. Ward, route 1, Ennis, Tex., favoring House bill 87; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1238. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of Richey, Browne & Donald, of Maspeth, N. Y., concerning the Beiter bill (H. R. 4594) to amend the Revenue Act of 1936; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1239. By Mr. MOTT: House Joint Memorial No. 17, of the Thirty-ninth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, urging that the bill now pending before the Congress of the United States providing for the extension of the contracts of star-route carriers for the period of 4 years be considered, and to so amend such bill as to increase the compensation now paid to such carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1240. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 18, of the Thirty-ninth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, urging the Congress to enact House bill 4009, authorizing an appropriation of \$50,000,000 to be apportioned among the various States of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1241. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Petition of Bergen County residents, entering their protest against any change

in the Supreme Court plan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1242. By Mr. SWOPE: Petition of Mary Baker and 25 other citizens of Dauphin and Cumberland Counties, Pa., favoring the enactment of House bill 2257, providing for a national and uniform system of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1243. Also, petition of Katie Hollinger and 16 other citizens of Dauphin County, Pa., favoring the enactment of House bill 2257, providing for a national and uniform system of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1244. Also, petition of John Kotzmoyer and six other citizens of Cumberland County, Pa., favoring the enactment of House bill 2257, providing for a national and uniform system of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1245. Also, petition of Mary Wilson and 16 other citizens of Dauphin County, Pa., favoring the enactment of House bill 2257, providing for a national and uniform system of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1246. Also, petition of Harold Worthington and 18 other citizens of Cumberland County, Pa., favoring the enactment of House bill 2257, providing for a national and uniform system of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1247. Also, petition of Edward Miller and 18 other citizens of Dauphin County, Pa., favoring the enactment of House bill no. 2257, providing for a national and uniform system of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1248. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Charles E. Maley, Jr., and 16 other persons of Dauphin County, Pa., favoring the enactment of House bill no. 2257, providing for a national and uniform system of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1249. Also, petition of Della Wise and 17 other persons, of Dauphin County, Pa., favoring the enactment of House bill no. 2257, providing for a national and uniform system of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1250. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Resolution of the Regular Republican Club of Montvale, Inc., Montvale, N. J., opposing the President's Supreme Court recommendation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1251. Also, resolution from the Women's Republican Club of Palisades Park, N. J., recording the opposition of the members of the club to the enactment of the President's Supreme Court plan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 22, 1937

(Legislative day of Friday, Mar. 19, 1937)

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, March 19, 1937, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Bulow	George	King
Andrews	Burke	Gerry	La Follette
Ashurst	Byrd	Gibson	Lee
Austin	Byrnes	Gillette	Lodge
Bachman	Capper	Green	Logan
Bailey	Caraway	Guffey	Loneragan
Bankhead	Chavez	Hale	Lundeen
Barkley	Clark	Harrison	McAdoo
Bilbo	Connally	Hatch	McGill
Black	Copeland	Hayden	McKellar
Bone	Davis	Herring	McNary
Borah	Dieterich	Holt	Minton
Bridges	Duffy	Hughes	Moore
Brown, Mich.	Ellender	Johnson, Calif.	Murray
Brown, N. H.	Frazier	Johnson, Colo.	Neely

Nye
O'Mahoney
Overton
Pittman
Pope
Radcliffe

Reynolds
Robinson
Russell
Schwartz
Schwellenbach
Sheppard

Steiwer
Thomas, Okla.
Thomas, Utah
Townsend
Tydings
Vandenberg

Van Nuys
Wagner
Walsh
Wheeler
White

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are detained on important public business.

Mr. BULOW. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. HITCHCOCK] is detained because of illness in his family.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is absent because of illness.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting sundry nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

THE DISASTER AT NEW LONDON, TEX.—CONDOLENCES OF SENATE OF FRANCE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a cablegram from His Excellency Jules Jeanneney, president of the Senate of the French Republic, expressing, in the name of the Senate of France, assurance of its great sympathy upon the occasion of the recent disaster to school children and teachers at New London, Tex., which was ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas the noxious weed is one of the major menaces which in time will destroy a large part of the farming lands of the United States, which noxious weed is a perennial plant, propagated for the most part by an underground root system which, if left unchecked, literally takes possession of the soil in which it grows and chokes out the farmers' crops; and

Whereas an exhaustive investigation was made of this problem in 1930, and it was concluded that noxious weeds were costing the United States \$3,000,000,000 every year, and that this amount has been increasing ever since the foregoing figure was arrived at, and will double within the next few years; and

Whereas Iowa, being a great agricultural State, has realized the growing menace of the noxious weed and is in sympathy with any organized effort to control it; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress of the United States certain legislation to aid the various States in their fight on the noxious weed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture have this important subject brought to their attention to the end that adequate Federal legislation be provided to assist in eradicating the noxious weed in the several States so as to save the farms for the farmers of America, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, to each United States Senator and Representative from the State of Iowa, to the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, and to the President of the United States Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia—

SECTION 1. That the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America be, and he is hereby, requested to recommend to the Congress of the United States that laborers employed in the manufacture of turpentine and rosin and naval stores products be classified as farm laborers.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of Agriculture, if within his authority and power to do so, make such classification by Executive order for the purpose of classifying turpentine laborers as farm laborers from inclusion under the unemployment compensation laws of the United States and the several States.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of Agriculture commit himself to the purposes outlined in this resolution and take appropriate action for the determination of this classification, as outlined herein.

SEC. 4. That a copy of this resolution, when adopted by both Houses of the General Assembly of Georgia, be certified and transmitted to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States; and that a copy thereof be also transmitted to the presiding officers of the respective Houses of the Congress of the United States.

Whereas screwworms were not known to exist in the State of Georgia or in Florida, South Carolina, Alabama, Tennessee, or North Carolina prior to 1933, and the first case of screwworm was reported near Boston, Ga., during the first of July 1933. By the end of 1933 it had spread to approximately 64 counties in the southern part of Georgia. A reliable estimate fixed the number of cases in Georgia in this short time at 75,000. This insect continued to spread rapidly, so that by the end of the year 1934 it had established itself in approximately 110 counties in the State of Georgia, and it was estimated that there were 1,222,000 cases, with 75,000 deaths, in Georgia alone; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States came to the assistance of the farmers in the States of Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas, in an attempt to solve this great problem in these States by approximately \$480,000 for a screwworm educational and control program, which was to be conducted by the United States Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, United States Department of Agriculture. And as a result of this screwworm control program by the end of 1935 the screwworm cases in the State of Georgia had been reduced from 1,222,000 in 1934 to 75,680, with only 316 deaths. The number of cases had been reduced in Florida from 1,222,000 cases in 1934 to 153,002 at the end of 1935. There were similar reductions accomplished in the other States in which screwworms had established themselves. The Congress of the United States continued the screwworm educational and control program during the fiscal year 1937, and as a result only 2,174 cases were reported in the State of Georgia from January 1, 1936, to December 31, 1936. Only 43,754 cases were reported in Florida for the same period. Screwworms were practically nonexistent in the States of Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina, with a great reduction in the States of Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, California, and Oklahoma; and

Whereas the livestock industry in the State of Georgia is increasing rapidly and is proving one of the most profitable enterprises for our farmers it is believed that if screwworms are not controlled it will have a disastrous effect upon the future livestock industry of this State. The screwworm experts of the United States Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine who have been carrying on research work on screwworms for a long number of years have indicated that screwworms only overwinter in the State of Florida and in the southern counties in Texas, which is only a small portion of the State of Texas. If they are correct in their statements regarding the areas in which screwworms can overwinter, then the State of Georgia could only be reinfested by flight or by the movement of infested animals from the States of Florida and Texas; and

Whereas Hon. Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, has made the statement that the screwworm educational and control campaign will be discontinued after the fiscal year 1937 and if this program is discontinued we can reasonably expect that the screwworm population will build up in Florida and spread to the other Southeastern States, the same to hold true in Texas with a spread to the Western and North Central States. If this program is discontinued, the livestock owners in Georgia and the Southeastern States and the Western and North Central States will continue to have to fight this destructive insect for all the years to come. If this program is continued, there is a possibility of eradicating the screwworm in Georgia and the Southeastern States, and to perfect a better control in that area of Texas where the pest overwinters: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia (the Senate of Georgia concurring), That we urge the Members of the Georgia congressional delegation to do everything in their power to get the United States Department of Agriculture to continue this screwworm control program and to support adequate appropriations for same and to urge that the United States Department of Agriculture attempt eradication in the State of Florida and continue the control program in the State of Texas and any other section where outbreaks occur; be it further

Resolved, That if eradication is not feasible, to continue the screwworm control program in the State of Georgia as well as other States; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to forward a copy of this resolution immediately to each Member of the Georgia congressional delegation, to the chairman of the Agricultural Appropriation Committee in both the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate, and a copy to the Honorable Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, and to Mr. Lee A. Strong, Chief, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to apply available Federal aid to the salvation of the American farmer and the restoration and stabilization of American agriculture as of more vital national concern than the eradication of noxious weeds

Whereas among the pending bills in Congress, whose sponsors seek popular support because of proposed Federal aid to States with alleged resulting benefit to agriculture, is H. R. 4009 appropriating \$50,000,000 for the next fiscal year to be made available to States on a matching basis for the eradication of noxious weeds; and

Whereas while the American farmer realizes that weed eradication is essential to successful farming and knows that weeds spring from the soil and, if not checked, will choke out his crops, he also realizes that the problem of eradicating or checking weeds is negligible and of no serious concern compared to the great problems arising from certain complex economic forces over which he has no control and which have so severely handicapped him and so seriously threaten the future of agriculture; and

Whereas the steady decline of farm-land values to a level which renders them almost valueless as security for loans, with the mounting indebtedness farmers have been compelled to incur and the deplorable situation of the great number of farmer debtors not being able to pay even interest obligations, create problems far more serious and deserving of Federal attention than the eradication of weeds; and

Whereas the estimated waste due to noxious weeds, put at \$3,000,000,000 per year, is small indeed compared to the incalculable loss that would result to this country if the great agricultural industry is not stabilized and if farmer debtors are compelled to submit to continued foreclosure and eviction; and

Whereas the farmer has never sought a short workday but has always been and is now willing to toil 12 or more hours each day, 7 days each week, and even additional hours, if necessary to eradicate weeds; and has never asked for security except the privilege of earning a fair and decent living without impending fear of enforced indebtedness and relentless foreclosure and eviction; and

Whereas the State of Wisconsin, as one of the foremost dairy and agricultural States in the Union, has always favored any program to promote agriculture, has always favored and urged Federal aid therefor, and is proud of its leadership in agricultural advancement, but believes that any available Federal aid should be directed to the solution of the more vital and serious problems confronting agriculture, rather than the comparatively minor problem of eradicating weeds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That this legislature memorializes the Congress of the United States to appropriate the \$50,000,000 proposed in H. R. 4009, but urges the Congress to make such appropriation available for the lowering of interest rates on the farm indebtedness of America so that the farmers and their families may continue to live in the homes they have made, so that their fields may be tilled and their crops raised and the Nation fed, so that a fallen morale may be restored, so that a sturdy and loyal citizenship may be produced who will be the Nation's defenders in time of need as their forebearers were its founders in the days "that tried men's souls"; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to each House of the Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Joint resolution relating to memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide relief for farmers in drought-stricken areas in this State

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a measure known as H. R. 4945 which proposes, among other things, to appropriate \$30,000,000 to the Works Progress Administration to be used to loan to drought-stricken farmers of the Nation to enable them to purchase foodstuffs for their cattle and other necessities; and

Whereas the farmers of this State are in a sad plight due to the drought and forest fires of 1936 and prior droughts and frosts and the depression; and

Whereas thousands of farmers in this State have been forced to reduce and are now reducing their dairy herds below the foundation or basic number of animals and to a point where it has seriously curtailed milk production in this State so as to enable them to purchase foodstuffs to maintain the remainder of such herds until spring; and

Whereas farmers of this State will be in need of millions of bushels of corn, small grain, and grass seed for this spring's planting and sowing; and

Whereas farming is the greatest industry of this State and its dairying industry is one of the greatest in the Nation, and the neglect to grant immediate aid to such industries can have but disastrous effects upon both the State and Nation; and

Whereas the farmers of this State have not received any appreciable Federal aid except under the corn-hog contracts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of Wisconsin hereby respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact into law the aforesaid

H. R. 4945 and thereby provide for loans and relief to the stricken farmers of this and other States; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to both Houses of the Congress, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to relieve financial difficulties developing in northern Wisconsin due to Federal purchases of land

Whereas lands owned by the United States are exempt from taxation; and

Whereas the Federal Government has acquired title to large portions of land in northern Wisconsin; and

Whereas Federal-owned land in Forest County constitutes 57 percent of all land within its borders and the percentages of such lands in various other northern Wisconsin counties have reached similarly large proportions; and

Whereas in counties and local units so affected revenues from real estate have fallen off to the point where they are no longer able to meet fixed charges and current operating expenses; and

Whereas the Federal Government has given no financial aid whatsoever to relieve the distress of these local governmental units caused by such Federal purchases; and

Whereas these suffering counties can be presently saved and placed on a firm financial basis for the future only by an equitable allotment of Federal funds to these counties based on the acreage withdrawn from the tax roll by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact necessary legislation to permit return of Government funds to counties suffering financial distress by reason of deprivation of adequate revenues resulting from governmental acquisition of lands within their borders; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to both Houses of the Congress of the United States and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to investigate certain recent charges relative to the distribution of relief in Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented today by Mr. DUFFY.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to enact the bill (S. 419) to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented today by Mr. DUFFY.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Ransom County (N. Dak.) Farmers Union, favoring the enactment of the so-called (redrafted) Frazier-Lemke farm and home refinancing bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Ransom County (N. Dak.) Farmers Union, favoring the enactment of the so-called Thomas-Massingale farm bill embodying a clause known as the cost-of-production clause, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Ransom County (N. Dak.) Farmers Union, favoring the enactment of legislation to enlarge the membership of the Supreme Court, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the City Council of Moline, Ill., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 1685) to provide financial assistance to the States and political subdivisions thereof for the elimination of unsafe and insanitary housing conditions, for the provision of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low income, and for the reduction of unemployment and the stimulation of business activity, to create a United States Housing Authority, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of members of the Fraternity of Needleworkers, of Mayaguez, P. R., praying for the enactment of legislation to reorganize the judicial branch of the Government, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Mansfield, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to change or enlarge the membership of the Supreme Court, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Texas, praying that no law be enacted closing the mails to the New Testament and other evangelical Christian publications or periodicals, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GIBSON presented two memorials of sundry citizens of Grafton, Vt., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to enlarge the membership of the Supreme Court, or any other legislation of a similar character, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution adopted by American Legion Post, No. 10, of Barre, Vt., favoring the passage of the so-called Sheppard-Hill bill, being the bill (S. 25) to prevent profiteering in time of war and to equalize the burdens of war and thus provide for the national defense and promote peace, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TYDINGS presented a resolution adopted by the Montgomery County (Md.) Civic Federation, favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 419) to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public education, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2257) to provide old-age compensation for the citizens of the United States, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of members of the Women's Bible Class, Church of the Brethren, of Broadfording, Md., remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Sheppard-Hill bill, being the bill (S. 25) to prevent profiteering in time of war and to equalize the burdens of war and thus provide for the national defense and promote peace, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. NYE presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Senate concurrent resolution providing for a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and the congressional delegation from the State of North Dakota, and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to pass a bill in Congress known as H. R. 4009, authorizing the appropriation of \$50,000,000 to aid the various States in their fight of noxious weeds

Be it resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring). Whereas the noxious-weed problem in the State of North Dakota has become such a grave menace to the farmers of the State of North Dakota that it is absolutely imperative that immediate steps be taken to prevent the further spread of noxious weeds in this State, that amongst said noxious weeds which are rapidly destroying the fertility of North Dakota farms, are wild morning glory, also known as the creeping jenny or field bindweed, the Russian Knapp weed, leafy spurge, Canadian thistle, perennial sow thistle, quackgrass, Johnson grass, Bermuda grass, nutgrass, and many others; and

Whereas the State of Idaho has experimented in the destruction of various kinds of noxious weeds with very satisfactory results and the funds of the exterminating of said noxious weeds was furnished by the United States Government; and

Whereas the State of North Dakota is not financially able to provide such funds to carry on an aggressive and successful campaign for the eradication and extermination of noxious weeds prevalent in North Dakota; and

Whereas there is now before Congress a bill known as H. R. 4009, providing for an appropriation by the Federal Government of the sum of \$50,000,000 to be expended in the various States before June 30, 1938, for the control and eradication of noxious weeds; and

Whereas said bill is of the greatest importance to the farmers of the State of North Dakota in assisting them in controlling and eradicating the various noxious weeds growing in this State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring), That the Twenty-fifth Leg-

islative Assembly of the State of North Dakota go on record as endorsing H. R. 4009, now before the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to all Congressmen and United States Senators representing the State of North Dakota in the Congress of the United States, urging that they exert every effort to bring about the passage of said H. R. 4009; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, with the request that the Department use every effort to bring about the passage of aforementioned H. R. 4009; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, with the request that the matter be placed before Congress to show the whole-hearted support of the farmers of the State of North Dakota behind H. R. 4009.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Whereas a large percentage of the lands and water rights located in Duchesne and Uintah Counties, State of Utah, is owned by Indians; and

Whereas the said lands and water rights thus owned are untaxable and the said counties receive no revenue therefrom; and

Whereas between 300 and 400 white families reside upon the said Indian lands, as lessees, and thereby escape taxation; and

Whereas the said counties furnish school for the children of said lessees upon Indian lands and furnish police and other protection for the said Indians and the said lessees living upon Indian lands; and

Whereas because of the conditions above mentioned the said counties have become seriously handicapped for lack of revenue with which to administer county functions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein), That we urge upon the Congress of the United States to appropriate the sum of \$100,000 for the purpose of erecting and equipping a junior college at a site now selected in the city of Roosevelt, Duchesne County, State of Utah, to be jointly used by both white and Indian children; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Utah forward certified copies of this memorandum to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to Utah's Senators and Congressmen.

Mr. DUFFY presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to investigate certain recent charges by a Wisconsin Congressman and a member of the staff of the Wisconsin Relief Administration as to the distribution of relief in Wisconsin

Whereas on January 26, 1937, Congressman THOMAS R. AMLIE is recorded on page 556 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as saying: "I may say I do know of my own knowledge of people who have starved in my own district and died as a result of starving"; and

Whereas charges were recently made in the press by a member of the staff of the Wisconsin Relief Administration that there are in 27 counties of Wisconsin children going to bed hungry at night, and that the counties in Wisconsin are comparable to those in Arkansas and other Southern States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That this legislature urges the Congress of the United States to investigate the charges herein referred to and to publish its findings to the end that the truth shall be known; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to both Houses of Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

Mr. DUFFY also presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass the Harrison-Black-Fletcher bill, providing Federal aid for public education

Whereas the Harrison-Fletcher bill providing for Federal aid for public education was introduced into the Seventy-fourth session of Congress and has been reintroduced at the present session of Congress (Senate 419 and H. R. 2288) as the Harrison-Black-Fletcher bill; and

Whereas this meritorious measure has been supported from its inception by many Members of Congress and men and women throughout the Nation who have recognized the important place of education in our social and economic progress; and

Whereas the bill proposes allotments of Federal funds to the several States for public education on the basis of student population and the relative tax-paying ability of the States; and

Whereas under the proposed plan Wisconsin would receive for its quota of such funds \$2,292,202 for the first year with an annual increase for 4 years until the allotments for the fifth and succeeding years reach \$6,876,606; and

Whereas adequate support of our public schools has long been a problem of paramount concern to State government and local communities and an ever-increasing tax burden to the property owner which such Federal aid will greatly relieve without neglecting education for posterity; and

Whereas centralized funding of the cost of public education is entirely in accord with economic changes of the past two decades: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact into law the Harrison-Black-Fletcher bill providing Federal aid for public education, and that such aid be allotted to the several States without condition or restriction, to be disbursed and administered by the State agency charged with the duty of administering public education in such manner as the State agency may determine to be for the best interests of public education in the State; be it further

Resolved, That duly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, both Houses of the Congress of the United States, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

Mr. PITTMAN presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Assembly joint resolution memorializing the United States Senate to oppose the ratification of the proposed Argentine treaty

Whereas we feel that the ratification of the said Argentine treaty will be detrimental to the livestock industry of the United States, by reason of the fact that regulations under such treaty will furnish a means of entry of foot-and-mouth disease among cattle in the United States and the impairment of the present standard breeds of cattle in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of Nevada, That the United States Senate be memorialized to oppose the said proposed ratification of the Argentine treaty; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of these resolutions be forwarded to our Senators at Washington, D. C., and that copies of this resolution, certified by the proper officers of the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, be transmitted to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and to the Honorable H. A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States.

Mr. PITTMAN also presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Assembly joint resolution petitioning Congress for the establishment of a patrol, under direction of the Federal Government, over all the lands coming under the control of the Taylor Grazing Act in the Western States

Whereas under the provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act those lands embraced therein are subject to the supervision of the Federal Government, through the Department of Interior; and

Whereas conditions of depredation of alarming extent by cattle rustlers are being developed on public ranges; and

Whereas local authorities are handicapped by the great areas over which these depredations are taking place, in the enforcement of State laws; and

Whereas a system of patrol and supervision by the Federal Government of said lands would reduce such depredations to a minimum and ultimately eliminate the same: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to establish a system of patrol over the public domain in the Western States coming under the provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of these resolutions be forwarded to our Senators and Congressmen at Washington, D. C., and that copies of this resolution, certified by the proper officers of the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, be transmitted to our sister States wherein Taylor grazing districts exist.

INTEREST RATE ON CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND-BANK LOANS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas, in behalf of a bill introduced by Representative MARVIN JONES, of Texas, extending for 2 additional years the 3½-percent interest rate on certain Federal land-bank loans.

The concurrent resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, is as follows:

Whereas agriculture is one of the basic industries of Texas; and
Whereas during the period of depression no legislation passed by the National Congress has been more beneficial or more conducive to recovery than the reduction of interest on loans by the Federal land bank; and

Whereas there is now pending before the National Congress H. R. 1546, by Representative MARVIN JONES, of Texas, which is as follows:

"A bill to extend for 2 additional years the 3½-percent-interest rate on certain Federal land-bank loans, and for other purposes

"Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the first sentence of paragraph 'Twelfth' of section 12 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 'second' of this section, the rate of interest on any loans on mortgage made through national farm-loan associations or through agents as provided in section 15, or purchased from joint-stock land banks by any Federal land bank, outstanding on May 12, 1933, or made

through national farm-loan associations after such date, shall not exceed 3½ percent per annum for all interest payable on installment dates occurring within a period of 4 years, commencing July 1, 1935; and no payment of the principal portion of any installment of any such loan outstanding on June 3, 1935, shall be required prior to July 11, 1938, if the borrower shall not be in default with respect to any other condition or covenant of his mortgage.

"(b) The fourth sentence of such paragraph 'Twelfth' (relating to the time limit on payments made by the United States to land banks on account of such interest reduction) is amended to read as follows: 'No payments shall be made to the bank with respect to any period after June 30, 1939.'"

Whereas a continuation of said reduced interest rate at 3½-percent interest per annum is necessary in order to further assist ranchmen and home owners in recovery; and

Whereas said reduction and interest rate will save to the people of Texas millions of dollars seriously necessary to such recovery; and

Whereas the House of Representatives of Texas (the Senate concurring) believe said H. R. 1546 should pass, or some measure substantially accomplishing the result sought by said resolution; and

Whereas the passage of said act will permit the farmers and ranchmen who have during the period of depression accumulated tax deficits and other obligations that are fast being removed, and the reduction in interest charge provided in H. R. 1546 will materially aid said debtor class, in again being able to hold their property and at the same time discharge their obligations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of Texas (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of Texas go on record as approving the matters set forth in H. R. 1546, and memorializing Congress to actively support said resolution; and that the chief clerk of the house of representatives be authorized and directed to send a copy, under the seal of the said clerk, to the Members of Congress of Texas; to Senator MORRIS T. SHEPPARD and Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas; and a copy of said resolution be forwarded, under the seal of the clerk, to Hon. Jesse H. Jones, Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as expressive of the desires and wishes of the Legislature of Texas.

PROGRAMS OF PUBLIC EDUCATION—PETITIONS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I also present petitions, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Dallas, Tex., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 419) to promote the general welfare, through the appropriation of funds, to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public education. I ask that the petitions may be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and that the body of one of the petitions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and the body of one of the petitions was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. MORRIS SHEPPARD,

United States Senator, Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Realizing that the time has come for the Federal Government to assume its fair share of the cost of all education in all the States, and that it is right that the Federal Government should "promote the general welfare" through bearing a fair share of the cost of schools, we the following teachers, parents, and voters of Dallas urge you to support the Harrison-Black-Fletcher bill, which will help the schools in all of the States of the Union

Name _____ Address _____ Phone number _____

COMPACT FOR FLOOD CONTROL IN CONNECTICUT RIVER VALLEY

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce a letter from the attorney general of the State of Connecticut relating to the proposed flood-control compact.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Hartford, March 19, 1937.

HON. AUGUSTINE LONERGAN,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR GUS: As you know, for several months we have been working upon the flood-control question. We have now tentatively agreed upon a compact. Its contents have not been made public, and we have all agreed that no part of the contents will be made public until commonly released in all four States at one time.

As you know, the so-called Omnibus Flood Control Act of 1936 provided for the building of reservoirs in Vermont and New Hampshire. In our tentatively agreed upon compact we have provided (subject, of course, to the Omnibus Flood Control Act being amended to permit it) for two of the reservoirs being located in Massachusetts. It was felt that inasmuch as this change refers

to reservoirs in Massachusetts, that the initiation of an amendment to the 1936 act should come from representatives in Massachusetts. I am advised that Senator WALSH has been furnished with a copy of this adjusted amendment and has been asked to originate it.

You can readily see that inasmuch as the Vermont Legislature is likely to adjourn in another month, if we are going to have our present form of compact approved of by all of the States and Congress, we must be very quick in getting action in Congress in amending the Omnibus Flood Control Act.

We are all of the opinion that there is no basis for objection to the proposed amendment. Really all that it amounts to is deleting the words "Vermont" and "New Hampshire" and permitting the construction of reservoirs for the control of floods in the Connecticut River Valley on tributaries of the Connecticut River.

I do not feel that I can adequately state in this letter the requirement for urgency in this matter. I have been working for almost a year upon it. I have spent hours and weeks of time both in drawing outlines of compacts and discussing the many questions involved with representatives of the other States. We have been required at all times to have in mind the thought that any plan tentatively agreed upon must have successful passage in the legislatures of all four States.

It is now necessary to have two of the reservoirs at the start of the program located in Massachusetts, and in order to accomplish this, as stated above, it will be necessary to amend the 1936 Flood Control Act to permit the building of reservoirs in Massachusetts.

Al Philips was up here from Washington the other day, and I talked with him briefly about it. I told him it was quite possible that representatives from the other States (Vermont, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire) and I might attempt to meet with the entire congressional representation from the four States in an endeavor to advance another plan we have discussed in our joint meetings. This suggested meeting may or may not prove worth while.

May I ask that you take up this suggested amendment with Senator DAVID I. WALSH, of Massachusetts, at your early convenience with a view toward expediting the passage of it at the earliest possible date.

If I have not made myself and our wishes clear in this matter, I shall be very glad to amplify my thoughts in any manner you suggest, either by letter, telegram, telephone, or, if necessary, a trip to Washington.

We have gotten so close to the accomplishment of our purpose after these long months of real hard work that we trust most sincerely that nothing will prevent the approval of the compact.

We are meeting again in Boston tomorrow, Saturday, March 20, at which time I trust the final draft of the compact will be agreed upon. I hope then that the matter can be reported here in Connecticut to Governor Cross next week and that he can take the matter up with our legislature at a very early date. Just as soon as the final draft of compact is completed I shall be very pleased to forward you a copy of it.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. DALY, Attorney General.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2291) to amend the act of May 25, 1933 (48 Stat. 73), reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 223) thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on the 19th instant that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 361. An act to further extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.;

S. 996. An act to further extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between the towns of Decatur, Nebr., and Onawa, Iowa; and

S. 997. An act to further extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the cities of South Sioux City, Nebr., and Sioux City, Iowa.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McADOO:

A bill (S. 1946) to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating upon lands within the exterior boundaries of the Angeles National Forest in the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. POPE:

A bill (S. 1947) for the relief of Mary Louise Oxley; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

A bill (S. 1948) to amend the act of June 7, 1935 (49 Stat. 332), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 1949) to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS (by request):

A bill (S. 1950) authorizing the appointment and retirement of Godfrey Neil Wyke as a captain, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GUFFEY:

A bill (S. 1951) to authorize the cancelation of deportation proceedings in the case of Harry Worsley; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 1952) for the relief of Irwin J. Russell; and

A bill (S. 1953) for the relief of Eugenia Scherban; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 1954) to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Grand (Neosho) River and its tributaries in Oklahoma, Kansas, Missouri, and Arkansas, with a view to the control of its floods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1955) to restore without premiums the benefits of United States Government life insurance to certain officers of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1956) to promote on the retired list Army officers retired for wounds received in battle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD:

A bill (S. 1957) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the introduction of American-grown tobacco in England by Sir Walter Raleigh and the three hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the culture of tobacco by Anglo-Saxons—John Rolfe, husband of the Indian princess, Pocahontas, having planted the first acres in the Virginia Colony in 1612; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. COPELAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 96), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved, That the United States Maritime Commission is requested to prepare, and the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Commerce are requested to cooperate with the Commission in preparing, tentative plans for the establishment of an academy for the training of persons to become licensed officers in the merchant marine of the United States, including plans for a course of instruction and estimates of the cost of establishing, equipping, and maintaining such an academy; and the Commission is requested to transmit such plans to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

AID FOR SCHOOLS IN HAZARDOUS CONDITION

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, last week the people of the Nation were shocked at the tragedy which occurred in Texas as a result of an explosion in a public school. There is nothing we can do in reference to that condition and nothing we can do in reference to the tragedy that occurred; but it happens that in the Public Works Administration there are several hundred applications for grants and loans or grants or loans made by school authorities throughout the country, and that in those applications the basis of need as set forth is that the present physical condition of the schools, which are being occupied, and which would be removed from use if the applications were granted and new buildings constructed, constitutes a danger to the lives of boys and girls who are going to the schools. I found in my experience in my State that the applications

based on such need were the ones on which it was most difficult to secure favorable action by the Public Works Administration for the reason that school districts which have schools in such condition are the districts which are least able to meet the requirements of the Public Works Administration. In view of the tragedy which has occurred, I think that the Congress of the United States should interest itself in the subject and attempt to work out a policy whereby it will be possible to meet the problems of school districts which are compelling their children to go to school under conditions of hazard.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask unanimous consent to have read, and then that it be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 97) was read, as follows:

Whereas the Nation has been shocked by the disaster at New London, Tex., in which several hundred school children were killed as a result of an explosion, which explosion, according to preliminary investigation, resulted from defective construction of equipment; and

Whereas there are now pending before the Public Works Administration several hundred applications for loans and grants or loans or grants from the Public Works Administration for the construction of school buildings and facilities which have as their basis for necessity the fact that under the present construction and facilities the lives of the children attending such schools are endangered from fire and other causes: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Administrator of Public Works is hereby directed to file with the Senate a statement setting forth, by States, the number of school projects having for their basis hazard to the lives of the school children, classifying the hazards, and setting forth the amounts of loans and grants or loans or grants requested in the applications.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the request of the Senator from Washington, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REORGANIZATION OF FEDERAL JUDICIARY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLT

[Mr. HOLT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the proposed reorganization of the Federal judiciary, delivered by him on Mar. 16, 1937, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

[Mr. HARRISON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of Federal Assistance to Public Schools, delivered by Senator BLACK on the evening of Mar. 17, 1937, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY DR. HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK ON PEACE

[Mr. POPE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Five Sectors of the Peace Movement, delivered by Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick in New York City on Jan. 10, 1937, which appears in the Appendix.]

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5232) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, this is an important measure involving the appropriation of a little over a half billion dollars, and it seems to me that we should have some explanation of at least some phases of the bill before it is finally passed by the Senate. The bill is drawn in such a way that it is difficult to understand many items in it unless one happened to be a member of the committee or attended the committee hearings. I note that there is an item in regard to petroleum reserves. In the hearings one item of the appropriations was discussed, but another item involving \$10,000,000, so far as I could see, was not discussed at all at the hearing. I should like to inquire what is meant by the item at the top of page 6. It provides:

That out of any sums appropriated for naval purposes by this act any portion thereof, not to exceed \$10,000,000, shall be available to enable the Secretary of the Navy to protect naval petroleum reserve no. 1.

May we have a brief explanation of that \$10,000,000 item?

Mr. BYRNES. That item is carried in the bill every year for the purpose of enabling the Secretary of the Navy, in case it should become necessary to protect our oil reserves, to drill wells for that purpose. The appropriation has not been used but has been carried in the bill heretofore, so that the Secretary of the Navy may have authority to use it in case it should become necessary to protect the oil reserves of the Government.

Mr. FRAZIER. Was none of this money used last year?

Mr. BYRNES. It was not used but is carried as an emergency item, giving to the Secretary of the Navy the power to use the money in case it should become necessary.

Mr. FRAZIER. On page 5, in the same paragraph of the bill, there is an item of \$62,000 having to do with the conservation, development, use, and operation of naval petroleum reserves, an amount which is a trifle less than that expended last year, according to the hearings.

Our naval policy, of course, is supposed to be set up by the Congress but is really set up, so far as it is set up, if there is any policy, by the Navy Department; and we have been repeatedly told by no less an authority than President Roosevelt that we were building a navy for adequate defense only. Now, as I understand it, there are no new battleships or war vessels provided for in this bill. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRNES. There is no provision in the bill for the construction of any new battleships; that is correct. There is provision for the construction of some destroyers and submarines—eight destroyers, as I recall, and four submarines.

Mr. FRAZIER. There is also some provision for the completion of several battleships, is there not?

Mr. BYRNES. Of course, the Senator understands that battleships authorized by the Congress are not completed in any one year, and funds are appropriated each year to carry on the work of construction. Some of the money appropriated in this bill is to be used to continue the construction of the ships now under construction. There are under construction 81, including all kinds of vessels.

Mr. FRAZIER. How much of the appropriations provided by this bill are for the continuation or completing the construction of battleships, cruisers, and aircraft carriers?

Mr. BYRNES. The amount appropriated by this bill does not provide for the completion of the construction, because it will take a much longer time than will be covered by the appropriations in this bill to complete the construction of the battleships.

Mr. FRAZIER. How much is it proposed to appropriate for that purpose by the bill?

Mr. BYRNES. Nine million one hundred and seventy-nine thousand dollars for construction and machinery and \$6,000,000 for armor, armament, and ammunition.

Mr. FRAZIER. How many aircraft carriers are under construction?

Mr. BYRNES. In all there are built and building three aircraft carriers, either authorized or in process of construction.

Mr. FRAZIER. Of course, the building of aircraft carriers would seem to me to be in preparation for a foreign war rather than merely for protection of our own coasts. In hearings before the House committee, and I think before the Senate committee too, some very noted officers of the Navy have appeared and stated that in the event of another world war the great battleships, and other naval paraphernalia in the form of vessels, would be practically useless, because most of the fighting would probably be in the air and the protection of the coast would have to be by airplanes and bombing planes. Yet we are continuing to build battleships and aircraft carriers. Battleships at the present time cost \$50,000,000 or more, cruisers \$10,000,000, \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000, and airplane carriers, I believe, cost about \$50,000,000.

I noticed some little time ago a statement given out by some governmental authority to the effect that the construction of battleships, airplane carriers, and so forth, was going to be continued. Only a few days later Great Britain gave out a similar statement to the effect that they were going to spend several hundred million dollars for a larger Navy. It

would seem to me that our naval program and Great Britain's naval program run almost side by side. It seems almost like a race as to whether we shall have a larger navy than Great Britain or whether Great Britain shall continue to be what is termed the "mistress of the seas."

It was only a few short years ago that the Senate approved what is known as the Kellogg Peace Pact, which was in turn adopted, through the influence of Secretary of State Kellogg, by all the great nations of the world. In that pact we pledged ourselves not to be aggressors in any war and practically not to prepare for war. However, each year for military and naval purposes we have been spending increasingly large appropriations, and even since the Kellogg Peace Pact was adopted each year we have been spending more money for such purposes than we spent theretofore. So it is evident that those who have been determining the so-called naval policy of the United States have ignored entirely the Kellogg Peace Pact. In other words, it would seem that we did not mean what we said in the Kellogg Peace Pact in the first place. I do not know whether or not that is the case, but I cannot quite understand why we should have a world peace pact and then continue to appropriate more money each year for naval purposes and war purposes than we have ever before appropriated.

I wonder if the Senator in charge of the bill can tell us what nation is considered our enemy that we need to construct battleships and airplane carriers in order to be in readiness to go to war? Is there any country which is preparing to go to war with the United States?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I am unable to answer the question of the Senator, but let me say to him, and I know he will agree with me, that the policy of the Congress as to the construction of naval vessels is not determined by the Appropriations Committee. The Congress of the United States, after the receipt of recommendations from the Executive, determines upon the policy of the Government as to its Naval Establishment. Congress in what is known as the Trammell-Vinson Act provided for the construction of certain vessels, a certain number of battleships and a certain number of destroyers and submarines, all within the provisions of the treaty with other naval powers.

The Appropriations Committee has no duty other than to comply with the act of Congress and to provide the funds to enable the Navy Department to carry out the policy which has already been determined by the Congress. That is all the Committee on Appropriations has done in reporting the pending bill providing funds for carrying out the policy of construction already determined by Congress.

Mr. FRAZIER. I should like to ask the Senator again if he believes it is necessary, especially after the adoption of the Kellogg Peace Pact, to continue to build great battleships at a cost of \$50,000,000 or more apiece, and to continue to build airplane carriers and cruisers, cruisers with a cruising radius, I understand, of 10,000 or 15,000 miles? They certainly are not being constructed for the defense of our coasts, but apparently for use in foreign wars.

Mr. BYRNES. After the approval of the Kellogg treaty the Congress of the United States determined upon this policy; and the Appropriations Committee, I must again inform the Senator, does not go into the matter of the determination of the policy but considers only the question of providing the needed funds.

Mr. FRAZIER. The Senator is a Member of the Senate just as the rest of us are, and if the Congress determines a peace policy each of us should be included in the determination, it would seem to me.

Mr. BYRNES. Of course, that policy was determined; and why the Congress determined it the Senator from North Dakota, who voted for or against it, knows as well as I do. The Appropriations Committee has never held, and never does hold hearings, on that particular subject. We are simply providing funds for carrying out the provisions of an act of Congress.

Mr. FRAZIER. If the statements made by officials of the Government, members of the Cabinet, the President himself and other officials, are correct that we are preparing for adequate defense and for defense only, it seems to

me we should change the name of our War and Navy Departments and call them the Defense Department. If it is to be our policy to have an Army and Navy for defense only, then let us have a policy of national defense and set up a defense department instead of the War and Navy Departments. Let us work along that line. I know we can save a great deal of money in our appropriations for the Navy, and probably for the Army, too, if we are on a defense basis and not on a war-policy basis. If we are going to plan for defense of our own coasts only, we certainly do not need these great battleships.

I remember the late Gen. William Mitchell made a statement a few years ago that in the event of another world war the safest place for our great battleships would be up the Mississippi River as far as they could get, because, he said, in the event of another such war, the airplanes would play a great part and one well-directed bomb from an airplane would sink the biggest battleship afloat. I think he was absolutely correct. It seems to me the money we are spending in the construction of more naval vessels is rather a waste of public funds and the taxpayers' money.

More than that, we are constructing 80 or more war vessels at the present time. Authorizations have been made and appropriations approved to carry on that work, and further appropriations are included in the bill now before us. Some of these vessels have been laid down and some are to be started under the terms of the bill here today.

Then there is another department of the Government which is dismantling and scrapping many vessels. They are, of course, vessels of a different kind; but it seems to me rather strange that one branch of the Government should deliberately try to scrap 40 vessels, if that is their plan, at the present time, while another branch plans to build a great many more, both at immense expense to the taxpayers.

Secretary Roper, of the Commerce Department, only a few months ago made a statement in a speech in which he condemned the scrapping of some of the ships that were to be scrapped, and, in fact, stated that he had canceled part of the contract. Some resolutions were introduced here by the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] in regard to one of the contracts to scrap a number of ships.

I hold in my hand a book by Mr. Ewing Young Mitchell, formerly Assistant Secretary of Commerce, entitled "Kicked In and Kicked Out of the President's Little Cabinet", in which he gives some very interesting facts in regard to scrapping these ships, and says they were scrapped in defiance of law and facts, and names the amounts that the vessels cost, and what the Government is getting for them for scrap iron. He states that evidence was produced that they could be repaired at small cost and continued in service; and he gives the history of the old *Leviathan*, which has been discussed on the floor of the Senate a number of times, and gives the names of some of the shipping companies which evidently made a lot of money through buying ships from the Shipping Board, running them for a little while, and then scrapping them, or making some other disposition of them.

Mr. Mitchell also discusses the mail contracts. We passed a resolution here giving the President authority to cancel the mail contracts with the various ship companies.

I note that in this book, on page 223, Mr. Mitchell says:

The President has had the authority to cancel any or all of these contracts—

That is, mail contracts with the various shipping interests—

since he received the reports on January 11, 1935, Congress having extended this power from time to time. But notwithstanding this situation, every one of these contracts, except one of small importance held by the United Fruit Co. which was canceled at that company's request, are still going strong. The continuation of the contracts is costing the Government more than \$2,200,000 per month, or \$26,500,000 per annum.

And besides that, we are scrapping vessels at a great financial loss and then appropriating more money to build others.

Mr. President, I notice that this bill contains quite a substantial appropriation for the air forces of the Navy Department. I should like to ask the Senator in charge of

the bill how much of the money appropriated in the bill goes for naval air forces.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, does the Senator mean the construction or the maintenance of airplanes?

Mr. FRAZIER. Construction, especially.

Mr. BYRNES. In the 1938 procurement fund it is shown that there will be 251 replacement airplanes costing \$19,386,000; 104 airplanes as an additional increment, \$7,894,000; 42 airplanes for the Naval Reserve, \$1,580,000; 2 nonrigid airships, \$275,000; increase of inspection force, \$51,000.

Under the act known as the Vinson-Trammell Act the Navy has determined upon a quota of 1,910 airplanes as being commensurate with a treaty navy. Under present prospects we shall not have, we cannot have, a treaty navy until 1942. That is, the United States cannot have until 1942 the ships to which the Government is entitled under the treaty Navy, and there is no chance that we shall have all of the airplanes we need for a year or two to come.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if the Appropriations Committee has given any consideration to the proposal to consolidate all the air forces under one head instead of having part of the air forces in the Navy, part of them in the Army, and part elsewhere.

Mr. BYRNES. No, Mr. President; because if the Appropriations Committee should report a provision of that character it would be legislation, and would be in violation of the rules. There is not one amendment contained in the bill as reported by the Senate committee that is in the nature of legislation. The committee has lived strictly up to the rule of the Senate that no legislation shall be reported in an appropriation bill.

Mr. FRAZIER. Any consideration of that subject, then, would have to be made by the committee which is authorized to handle the subject of the consolidation and reorganization of Government departments?

Mr. BYRNES. It would have to come from the Naval Affairs Committee, which reported the original measure, and which can recommend the repeal of the provision for the construction of these ships, or provide for changing naval policies, and would have to agree upon a combination or a merger of the various departments.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I suppose there is no chance of making any reduction in this bill. The Senate committee has reduced the total amount somewhat from that requested by the Budget Bureau, and the House committee also cut it down somewhat, but still the expenditure of over \$500,000,000 in peacetime for naval purposes seems to me altogether too great. I hope the Committee on the Reorganization and Consolidation of Departments can work out, before another session comes around, some plan to save a great deal of this money. It seems to me that if we are going to have preparations for military and naval defense, we should have a defense department under one head; that the Army and Navy Departments should be done away with, and all the activities brought in under one head; a defense department, if that is what our policy is. I believe we could save probably half of the present amount, which would mean about half a billion dollars each year in that way.

I respectfully urge upon the Committee on Reorganization and Consolidation, and the committee which is studying the proposal to cut down the expenses of the Government, the reading of this book by former Assistant Secretary Mitchell, which, to say the least, gives some very interesting information. He names officials and dates and places, and makes a very frank statement as to many things which he believes have been "put across" contrary to law and contrary to the interests of the people. Because of some of the instances that I happen to know something about, I feel that Mr. Mitchell is practically correct in the statements in his book, so far as I have examined them, and a thorough study of the book should be made, I think, by a Senate committee.

Mr. President, in these times, when so many persons are out of employment, and so much money is being spent for relief and work relief, it seems to me it is a waste of the

taxpayers' money to appropriate and spend a billion dollars a year for what we term "adequate defense" in peacetimes, more money than we have ever before spent in peacetimes, and more money than any other nation has spent in peacetimes up until the last year or two at least. Great Britain and other nations, too, have used as an excuse for increasing their appropriations for their navies especially, and their air forces, the fact that the United States is making these vast appropriations and spending these vast amounts of money.

Of course, I cannot agree that the policy adopted by the Congress would meet the approval of the majority of the people of the country. I believe the majority of the people of our Nation, if the proposition were put up to them in a fair, plain, straightforward manner for their expression of opinion by vote, would vote, I was going to say, to abolish both the Army and the Navy; if not, at least to cut down their expenses very materially, because they cannot understand why it is necessary to build \$50,000,000 battleships and then spend one million or two million dollars a year each for their upkeep in these peacetimes, when we are not supposed to be figuring on war with any nation, when it is the avowed policy of the President of the United States himself to have us make preparations only for adequate defense here at home.

Of course, the term "adequate defense" does not mean much to anyone who thinks about the subject. It has been demonstrated time after time that with modern methods of warfare there is no such thing as adequate defense. A \$50,000,000 battleship can be sunk, according to experts, by one well-directed bomb; and the same thing is true of the smaller cruisers and other fighting vessels of the Navy. So "adequate defense" does not mean much, after all. I am sure, too, that the great majority of the people throughout our Nation are not in favor of going into another world war, and, in my opinion, they are not in favor of these immense expenditures for preparation for war; and I can see no other reason for a billion-dollar appropriation for war and Navy purposes than the expectation of going into another world war.

I have called the attention of the Senate several times to the words of the late William Jennings Bryan, just after the World War was declared but before we got into it, when he said that the nations which were best prepared were the ones that went into the war first; and he also stated that if the United States had been as well prepared for war as some of the big-army and big-navy crowd had advocated, undoubtedly we should have been in the war right from the start. I think Mr. Bryan was absolutely correct in that statement.

It has always been true, so far as I know, when a war came on, that the countries best prepared were the ones which went into it first. That was, indeed, the case in the World War. And the nations which went into the war got nothing out of it, and we are still paying the expenses of our participation in the World War. The debts which have been repudiated by foreign countries, of course, are being paid by our own taxpayers, and the building of great battleships and the preparations for war, which are now under way, are being paid for by our taxpayers. The vessels in the merchant marine which are being scrapped have been paid for by our taxpayers. Those vessels are either being scrapped or sold for prices away below cost to private companies at the expense of our taxpayers.

Mr. President, I admit that I am ashamed, as a Member of the United States Senate, that the policy has been adopted here of spending a billion dollars a year for war purposes in times of peace, of giving private shipping lines over \$26,000,000 a year as a subsidy for carrying the mails, selling them at low prices vessels which have been built by the taxpayers' money, almost giving them away. I am ashamed, as a Member of the United States Senate, that that kind of a policy has been adopted. I will say in defense of the Senate, at least in defense of myself, that, in my opinion, it has not been the Congress which has adopted that policy. The Congress should have adopted a policy, but it has been

derelect in its duty, in my opinion, in letting the big Army men and the big Navy men direct the policy and say what it should be.

I see on the other side of the Chamber the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the chairman of the Coordination Committee to Investigate Ways and Means of Cutting Down the Expenses of the Various Departments, and I call his attention to a book written only last year by a former Under Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Ewing Young Mitchell. He made what seemed to me some very startling charges as to expenditures of Government money. He mentions some of the committees of the Senate and some of the Members of the Senate. I respectfully refer the junior Senator from Virginia, in his study of how to cut down expenses, to this book of Mr. Mitchell's, entitled "Kicked In and Kicked Out of the President's Little Cabinet."

I shall not take more time now, as I know it is useless to do so. I have had previous experience along this line. I think, however, that it is important to get a little of this information to the public, at least so that they will know what is being done and how a part of our money is being spent in peace times for war purposes, notwithstanding the fact that we have joined in a pact known as a peace pact, a pact to outlaw war, in which we have obligated ourselves not to be the aggressors in any war and not to settle our disputes by means of war. Yet we are spending a billion dollars per year in preparation for war.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, is the bill now open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH in the chair). The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. BONE. I have sent an amendment to the desk, and I ask that it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 54, line 3, after the word "plants", it is proposed to insert the words:

Provided further, That no part of the moneys appropriated or made available in this act shall be used for the construction of any naval vessel not heretofore let to contract, by a private contractor or contractors; nor shall any of the moneys herein appropriated or made available be used for the manufacture, by a private contractor or contractors, of the main engines, ordnance, and armament for such vessels, the term "manufacture" to mean the making of castings and forgings (both roughing and finishing) the parts, assembling, and installing.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it changes existing law, although it is drafted in the form of a limitation. The act of March 27, 1934, provides that each alternate ship may be constructed in the Government navy yards, and there is the further proviso that—

If inconsistent with the public interests in any year to have a vessel or vessels constructed as required above, the President may have such vessel or vessels built in a Government or private yard, as he may direct.

That language gives to the President the power to exercise his discretion whenever it is consistent with the public interest. The language of the proposed amendment would repeal that provision and specifically provide that a vessel should be constructed only in a Government yard and not as a result of a contract.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I assume that under our rules and under the parliamentary procedure of this body any provision which in itself is a limitation of this character does not violate the rule to which the Senator from South Carolina has adverted. I do not wish to prolong the discussion, and I will speak later on the bill itself and discuss the subject I have in mind, which involves our navy yards and the drastic curtailment of work in the Government yards. I do not want to make the argument, however, if the present occupant of the chair desires to rule on the point of order raised by the Senator from South Carolina. I do not believe the point is tenable. I think the amendment has to do with a limitation. It is not legislation, but has to do merely with a limitation on the expenditure of the funds. I remember

many instances where limitations of this kind have been inserted in appropriation bills in the Senate, and it has frequently been stated on the floor that they do not impinge upon the rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair overrules the point of order and holds that the amendment of the Senator from Washington is merely a limitation.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I desire to discuss the amendment very briefly. I am happy to observe that in the bill the provision which would in practical effect have destroyed the operation of the Philadelphia Aircraft Factory, into which we breathed the breath of life by an amendment to the naval appropriation bill in 1934, has been stricken from the bill. The Senator from South Carolina has pointed out today that that provision, to which I had intended to make objection today, has been removed from the bill, and I express my great gratification that we are at least preserving that small part of the Federal operation in the aircraft field.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he starts his discussion?

Mr. BONE. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. DUFFY. Can the Senator give us some idea as to whether it might be expected that Government navy yards could construct or would construct these vessels as cheaply as they could be constructed in private navy yards? What I have in mind is that I understood, from an article I read some months ago—and I may not be correct in my recollection—that there were bids on the construction of a sister ship to the *Washington* and the *Manhattan* which ran about at least a third higher in the Government yards than in private yards. I was wondering whether the Senator intended to cover that matter in his discussion.

Mr. BONE. I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I have no intention at the moment of going into the question of comparative costs, because that would involve a very lengthy discussion, and that field was covered in considerable measure when the Munitions Committee appointed by this body went into the matter of building costs. I have upon one or two occasions called attention on this floor to the cost of the cruiser *Louisville*, erected in the Bremerton Navy Yard, a ship which was built at a much lower cost than the cost of similar cruisers in private yards.

I may say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I would not tender the pending amendment were I not firmly convinced in my own mind that the Government can build its own warships and navy auxiliaries at lower cost than they can be built in private plants. Over and beyond that, however, there is a moral reason why the Government should become self-sufficient in time of war and get rid of practices which it seems to me have been a challenge to the moral integrity of this country.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, does he recall the instance where competitive bids were submitted by Government yards and by private yards on the building of a large class of vessels, and there was a very great discrepancy, much higher bids being submitted by the Government yards than by the private yards? I do not know the facts; I am merely asking for information.

Mr. BONE. I do not recall the incident to which the Senator refers. I have very fresh in my mind the figures as to the *Louisville* and a sister ship built at that time. Further, I have in mind a very tiny part of the record that was made by the Munitions Committee of the Senate, where it was shown that private shipbuilders were invited to come to Washington and get together on their bids.

Beyond that, there is another aspect of this matter which I desire to make the burden of my very brief remarks today, and which has to do with the drastic curtailment of work now contemplated with respect to our Government navy yards.

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

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. POPE. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that in the hearings before the Munitions Committee very careful data were submitted on the comparative cost

in Government navy yards and private plants, and as I recall the facts, there was a rather surprising difference in favor of Government construction.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I have not the time nor the inclination at the moment to go into that subject. I am merely asserting that that is the fact, and I assert it because I became so convinced as the result of the inquiry which the Members of this body made into that business.

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

Mr. BONE. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Did we not have a pretty fair demonstration upon that question during the past year, when the question of building a floating drydock was under consideration by the Navy Department?

The Senator will remember that the only bid received from private companies was the bid of the Bethlehem Co., which was something in excess of \$21,000,000. While the Navy Department has not seen fit to give us the exact figures on the estimates of the Mare Island and the Bremerton Yards, the indications are that they were something around \$16,000,000, or about \$5,000,000 less than the Bethlehem bid. It seems to me those figures indicate that where a Government yard can compete upon the same basis as a private yard—that is, where they are both starting out from scratch—it is possible for the Government yard greatly to underbid the private yard. The reason why it has been possible for private yards to underbid Government yards in some instances was that the private yard was completely equipped for the building of the particular kind of a ship. Therefore it could underbid the public yard; but where they both started from scratch, with no equipment for building a floating drydock, the estimates by the Government yards were about \$5,000,000 less than the private bid.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, what my colleague has suggested is my understanding of that situation.

Preliminary to my statement about the situation which now confronts us, I desire to refer for just a moment to the demand for preparedness which underlies the present program of the Government in the matter of both its military and its naval program.

I think it was demonstrated to the satisfaction of those who read the RECORD that for something less than \$24,000,000 the Government could so expand its naval building facilities that it could not only handle the program contemplated under existing acts, but could even handle a naval-race program. That sum—something less than \$24,000,000—would provide dies, jigs, tools, cutting and welding equipment, docks, building facilities, and ways by which the Government could become master of this situation so far as it affects national defense. I have been unable to understand why the Congress of the United States does not want its Government, the Federal Government for which we speak, to become self-sufficient, at least to the degree where it would not have to rely on private agencies which might, and probably would, do to us what was done to us during the war by a great powder-manufacturing concern, which told us it would not build necessary facilities until the Government made a contract which reflected such a profit as the company was willing to accept.

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

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. NYE. If the Senator will refresh his memory, I think he will recall that practically the same situation was encountered by the Government in its effort to win cooperation from one of the private shipbuilding companies. The New York Shipbuilding Co. refused to enlarge its facilities to the degree the Government required until it could be assured of a larger return for its trouble.

Mr. BONE. That is correct. If we should become involved in another war we would simply run into the same situation we met before. There would be more Hog Island scandal, more profligate and prodigal outpouring of money. Repetition of such conditions could in no small measure be removed—probably to the extent of 75 percent—by the Federal Government expending just a little more money, yes,

less than half what one major capital ship is going to cost us, if newspaper reports of costs are correct.

There has been a suggestion that the new battleships will cost \$60,000,000 apiece. Yet \$24,000,000, Mr. President, will expand our building facilities so that we can build our own warships. What legitimate criticism can there be of that program? I may say, in justice to my brethren who do me the honor to listen to me, that I am not proposing in this amendment that that be done; but the amendment, of course, would lead to the expansion of the Government yards.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator suffer an interruption?

Mr. BONE. Indeed, yes.

Mr. KING. I am very much interested in the last observation the Senator made. Some years ago I attempted to make a study of the comparative costs of the production of battleships, submarines, and all other naval craft in privately owned yards under contract with the Government and in the yards owned by the Government itself. The conclusion I reached from the comparative statement was that by construction under contract the Government saved a great deal of money. Has the Senator made observations and calculations and examinations that enable him to speak with any degree of authority as to the difference in cost between privately produced and manufactured naval craft and those which are manufactured by the Government?

Mr. BONE. I have had the benefit of the inquiry, research, and findings of the experts who were retained by the Munitions Committee of the Senate, who went into this question and secured as nearly as possible a break-down of costs incident to the expansion of Government yards. We went further, however, and interrogated naval officials and the owners of private yards that built ships for the Government. I asked those men to produce for me a break-down and a study of the figures involving wages and cost items. They have not been forthcoming. I asked a member of the naval staff whether they had ever had a break-down of costs, a study of costs in private shipyards, and the answer was "no." Up to that time the Navy of the United States—our naval department—had never had an intelligent or understandable study or break-down of figures of costs in private shipyards, and to this day they have not had that sort of a study.

Mr. President, this tremendous program of building takes us in clear up to the eyebrows. We are pouring out a flood of money that must almost be staggering to the imagination, and the whole world is going berserk. We are going right along pouring out a vast sum of money in naval preparation; and this bill, as I understand, calls for around half a billion dollars. In the face of this tremendous building program, let me say that I have and I now desire to present to the Senate a memorandum from the Navy Department, emitted about the end of the year, which points out that a vast number of discharges of Federal employees in Government navy yards impends. It is upon us. I suspect that other Senators are receiving the sort of mail I am receiving—mail from employees of Government navy yards protesting against drastic lay-offs. I know Senators must have received letters of that kind from employees and representatives of employees of the Washington Navy Yard. Senators have told me they have received that sort of mail.

In the circular from the Navy Department—and it is not a confidential circular—it is said:

In view of the prospective discharges from many of the continental navy yards, and the fact that the reduction in force unfortunately will probably reach high figures, commandants should especially satisfy themselves that the efficiency lists as of 31 December, 1936, show correctly the real relative merit of all employees, and that neither prejudice nor partiality have a part in making up these lists. As the efficiency lists, especially in the face of prospective discharges, vitally affect the well-being of employees and their families, it is essential that they be prepared with absolute justice.

Whether it be right or wrong, this means that in these perilous times of economic stress, to those on a proscription list the ax is going to fall. It is going to fall on the necks of—let me quote the language—

Large numbers of men in the form of drastic reductions of the personnel.

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

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. Will not the same condition apply to the shipbuilding companies in case of enlargement of facilities by the Government? Will not the private shipbuilding companies have to lay off their men?

Mr. BONE. Undoubtedly that is true. I have in mind that if we must make the selection, then for the sake of national defense, for the sake of making our Government the possessor of adequate instrumentalities of national defense which it can wield without asking any private individual whether he will do certain things or not do them, I prefer, in the situation which has arisen, to see my Government protect itself, protect its own agencies, rather than those that are privately owned. I am sure that, if the Senator does not agree with my viewpoint, he will, at least, understand why I would make this sort of an election.

Mr. MOORE. I do understand, and, if the Senator will allow me further, I should like to say that I am very much interested in what he is saying; but in one navy yard there are, for instance, 200 men, while in one shipyard in New Jersey there are 10,000 employees, and I suggest the query to the Senator whether it is better to use the 200 men in the navy yards in repairing ships or to do the work of building all the ships there and throw out of employment 10,000 men in yards in New Jersey? Of course, the Senator might well say that they could move out of New Jersey, but that would certainly not be desirable.

I throw out the suggestion to the Senator that if the building of ships was confined to navy yards, then when the ships were built and the program completed, thousands of men would be thrown out of employment at one and the same time.

At private yards, the work being diversified between war vessels, commercial ships, and so forth, the men are kept more continuously employed.

Mr. BONE. There is a very large navy yard at Philadelphia, and it does not follow at all that the 10,000 men in New Jersey would be thrown out of employment. It simply means that Uncle Sam would do enough work in his own navy yards at least to keep those men employed, even if the Navy Department is not willing to see adopted an amendment such as I have suggested. I cannot view with other than alarm and without a protest the conscious, purposeful crippling of our own arms of defense, upon which fundamentally we certainly would have to rely in time of stress and storm, and I think that logic calls upon us to protect these Government agencies of national defense.

Due to the completion of work on naval vessels now in course of construction at the several navy yards, heavy discharges of civilian employees will take place in the navy yards during the next 6 months. The process of laying off men is now in progress and will increase in momentum during the month of May. According to recent estimates of the Navy Department, there will be about 5,200 employees discharged during this period.

Let me say parenthetically that this opinion is given to me by officials of labor organizations who are in very close touch with this work; I am assuming that they are accurate; but I give the Senate the information concerning the source whence the figures come, so that if further question be raised as to their accuracy any Senator or the Navy Department itself may give the Senate further information.

These discharges will be distributed as follows:

New York Navy Yard.....	1,000
Philadelphia Navy Yard.....	1,000
Norfolk Navy Yard.....	750
Washington Navy Yard.....	670
Puget Sound Navy Yard.....	500
Charleston (S. C.) Navy Yard.....	400

All these men will probably be discharged during the period from March to July of this year.

Beginning in July the Mare Island Navy Yard will be affected to the extent of 200 men and the Portsmouth, N. H., Navy Yard to the extent of 80 men. There is also involved

the probability that unless steel shall be delivered promptly additional discharges will follow.

The slowing up of the navy-yard work resulting in these heavy discharges has been in contemplation for many months, and yet during this time work of various kinds has been let to private contractors which could have been assigned to navy yards, thus reducing the number of men to be discharged. Last fall, for instance, all six sets of main engines for the submarines appropriated for last year were let to private contractors; that is, three sets were let to the Hooven Owen Rantschler Co., of Hamilton, Ohio, and three sets were let to the Winton Engine Corporation, of Cleveland, Ohio; whereas, three sets of the engines should have been allocated to navy yards under the provisions of the Vinson-Trammell Naval Construction Act of March 27, 1934, which requires, in effect, that one-half of the naval vessels, including their main engines, and so forth, shall be constructed and manufactured in navy yards and arsenals.

To be sure, the act contains the exception which reads:

Except such material or parts as were not customarily manufactured in such Government plants prior to February 13, 1929.

But prior to February 13, 1929, whenever submarines were constructed in navy yards, the engines were customarily built at the New York Navy Yard. The six sets of engines above referred to were let to private contractors on the pretext that the design of the engines had been changed. However, the Vinson-Trammell Act does not state that the Navy Department may disregard the provisions of the act in case there are changes in design. Everyone knows that the design of naval vessels and of the machinery that goes into them is continually changing, as the result of progress in science and invention.

Similarly, in the fall of 1935, six submarines were authorized by the Naval Appropriation Act to be constructed, three of which were allocated to navy yards; but, instead of assigning three sets of engines to navy yards, only a part of one set was allocated to the New York Navy Yard for manufacture; and the other five and a half sets were awarded to private contractors. In view of the fact that the plans were furnished the navy yard by the private concerns manufacturing the bulk of the work, and the private concerns had the advantage of making economies by the larger quantities of work they turned out, the result was that the navy yard was placed at a disadvantage as to cost in this initial order. Everyone knows that the first batch of any line of work undertaken by a shop always costs more than succeeding orders. In the arsenals the experience has been that the first order usually costs twice as much as succeeding orders. This is due to the extra overhead involved in turning out a small order, organizing the work, and the inability of a shop to always apply the most economical method of production the first time a job is performed. Furthermore, the concerns which received the contract for the construction of these five and a half sets of engines in 1935 had already had a year's experience in the production of six sets of the same engines in 1934 and therefore were a year's experience ahead of the New York Navy Yard in turning out one-half of one set in 1935.

The decision of the Comptroller General of October 29, 1935, touching upon this question, is manifestly in error, due to the fact that he merely states the letting out of the entire engines is within the law, because engines are an intrinsic part of a naval vessel and a vessel is not complete without an engine. He overlooks the fact that the Vinson-Trammell Act specifies not only that one-half of the vessels shall be built at navy yards, but also mentions main engines, and so forth, which means that Congress, in drawing the act, has drawn a distinction between what constitutes a vessel and what constitutes an engine. Manifestly a further tightening up of the law which requires work to be performed in the navy yards and arsenals is necessary even to carry out existing law on the 50-50 proposition.

In 1934 all the Diesel engines for the six submarines appropriated for that year were let to private contractors, notwithstanding the provisions of the Vinson-Trammell Act, which required half of them to be allocated to navy

yards. But the Navy Department unofficially assured labor representatives speaking for the navy yards that in the following year, 1935, the navy yards would get half of the engines to build, as required by the law. Notwithstanding this unofficial assurance in 1935, the navy yards received only one-half of one set; and in 1936, following a Comptroller General's decision to the effect that they did not have to build any of the engines in the navy yards, all of the engines were again let to private contractors.

It is also maintained by the Navy Department that, due to the fact that more than 50 percent of the ordnance for all of these vessels is being manufactured in the navy yards and arsenals, therefore, the 50-50 ratio is maintained in the proportion of work being allocated to navy yards. This extenuating circumstance overlooks the fact that the provisions of the Vinson-Trammell Act merely say that the first and each succeeding naval vessels of each category shall be built in navy yards; but it does not specify that the other 50 percent of the work shall be assigned to private contractors. Furthermore, the naval appropriation bill has annually contained a provision to which the present amendment is sought to be attached, which provides that all naval vessels and war equipment shall be allocated to navy yards in case time and facilities permit, and when, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Navy, the work would not cost appreciably more than by contract. Hence, this language of existing law amply covers the more than 50 percent of the ordnance which is allocated to navy yards and arsenals. There is, therefore, no justification for subtracting from the total amount of construction work to be done at the yards, in view of the additional ordnance work being performed beyond the 50 percent required by the law without qualifications as to time, facilities, and cost.

The pending naval appropriation act calls for commencing the construction of 8 destroyers and 4 submarines, whereas last year's bill called for the construction of 12 destroyers and 6 submarines. Due to the completion of vessels now on building ways in the navy yards, there are ample facilities to accommodate the 12 vessels upon which work is to start this year.

In addition to this, one of the battleships appropriated for last year is due to be let to contract, unless my amendment is adopted, requiring both of the battleships to be allocated to navy yards. In other words, if this proposed amendment should be adopted the Government would build both the proposed battleships in its own yards.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITE in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. As I read the Senator's amendment, it seems to me it would have the effect of preventing from now on the construction of any naval craft in private yards. In other words, it would suspend all future construction in private yards. Does the Senator approve of that construction of his amendment?

Mr. BONE. The Senator is correct in saying there would be no further contracts let. My amendment would not affect ships under contract—that is, where contracts have been let for ships now being built.

Mr. WALSH. The present law provides for building at least 50 percent of naval vessels in Government navy yards.

Mr. BONE. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. If the Senator's amendment should be adopted, it would result in no more contracts being let for the construction of naval craft in private yards.

Mr. BONE. That is correct. I know the Senate will understand that the amendment is for that very specific purpose. The effect of the amendment would be to require the building of the two proposed battleships in our own Government navy yards. The navy yards are amply equipped to construct both these vessels, in addition to the 12 smaller vessels appropriated for in the bill now before the Senate. I understand that the bill carries an appropriation for 12 vessels; and if I am in error as to that, I ask the

Senator from South Carolina in charge of the bill to so advise me.

During the last session of Congress a comprehensive ship-subsidy bill was passed. The merchant marine board contemplated by that act, known as the Maritime Commission, has now been appointed. If the private shipbuilding interests possess the degree of initiative with which private enterprise is presumed to be endowed they would not be in need of naval work but should be able to fill up their shipyards with merchant-marine construction work. At any rate, the Federal Government is not justified in discharging its own employees and allowing its own plants to stand idle for the sake of shifting the work which can be performed in such plants to robust individualists such as private shipbuilding interests are presumed to be.

Mr. President, by way of conclusion of these remarks, I merely repeat that I see no escape in logic from the conclusion and the assumption that the Government, if it is to continue down this pathway of preparedness—and obviously Congress is thoroughly sold, if I may use that vulgarism, on preparedness, which is made so evident here year by year—then, for one, I want my Government to become self-sufficient in the matter of preparing its instrumentalities of war.

I hope we may have a record vote on my amendment, not that I desire to require any Senator to express himself for the RECORD but I think that the eyes of the country and of the whole world now are being literally glued on this preparedness race, which is so menacing and challenging in its international aspects as to constitute an ominous threat against our civilization. As a result of our experience in the World War, our very unhappy and gloomy and sordid experience, when private munitions makers took a shameless advantage of this Government, we are soon going to have to determine the fundamental question of whether or not this Government is going to be self-sufficient and release itself from the clutches of these gentlemen who in our hour of peril are very prone and very likely to lay aside, as they have done in the past, what would seem to be a spirit of fair play and sportsmanship and take a shameless advantage of their Government.

Mr. President, on my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] has introduced a bill embodying his views on this question and that bill is now pending before the Committee on Naval Affairs. I respectfully submit to the Senate that, should the Senate ever seriously consider the adoption of the views expressed by the Senator from Washington, it should be done only after the Committee on Naval Affairs has held hearings on the subject and given adequate consideration to the proposal.

I am satisfied that the Senator from Washington does not really intend what I conceive to be the effect of the amendment he has offered this morning. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] a few moments ago asked the Senator from Washington if his amendment would not have the result of requiring all naval construction to be done in Government yards. As a matter of fact, the adoption of the amendment would prevent the construction of any vessels until there was another appropriation bill passed, because the law now provides that the first and each succeeding alternate vessel of each category shall be constructed in Government yards. One is constructed in a Government yard and the next in a private yard.

The Senator's amendment, seeking to accomplish indirectly what his bill provides for, simply provides that no funds appropriated in this bill shall be used for the construction of any vessel in a private yard. Therefore, if one of the capital ships now authorized and appropriated for is given to a Government navy yard, then no funds appropriated in this bill can be used for the construction of the next vessel in a private yard. At the same time, under the law, the Navy Department must give the contract for the construction of the next vessel to a private yard. If it gives it to a private yard the funds appropriated in this bill cannot be used to pay for it under the Senator's amendment.

Manifestly the Navy Department would not use the funds for construction in a private yard and could not construct the vessel in a Government yard, so his amendment would stop the construction of any vessel other than one in a Government yard at this time.

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

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I know the Senator realizes that if there is any amendment he might suggest which would cover the thought he has in mind I would be happy to add it to my amendment.

Mr. BYRNES. The reason why no amendment can be offered is that the amendment would be legislation upon an appropriation bill. That is the difficulty the Senator has encountered. It is the only reason why his amendment has been framed as it is. It does not do what he wants to do and what he desires to do. His bill does. His bill provides affirmatively for construction in Government yards. That can be accomplished by legislation. It cannot be accomplished by putting a limitation only upon the funds in this bill.

I submit to the Senator from Washington, knowing the earnestness with which he has presented this cause and his views on the subject, that he ought to present and make his fight before the Committee on Naval Affairs, which committee alone can recommend legislation and which can arrive at a proper solution of the question.

Mr. BONE. I may say to the Senator that upon several occasions in the Committee on Naval Affairs I have raised this very question. Amendments to naval bills have been submitted by me and considered by the Committee on Naval Affairs in times past. Very shortly I hope to introduce a bill which will require, other legislation to the contrary notwithstanding, the building of all naval vessels in Government yards. That would be a piece of straight-out legislation, which would eliminate completely the whole question the Senator has raised with respect to this being merely a limitation and not being capable of being considered here otherwise than as a limitation and only as a limitation.

The bill I have in mind, if it shall be favorably reported by the Naval Affairs Committee, and if it shall be passed, will entirely eliminate the objection raised by the Senator from South Carolina.

It may be that a sufficient number of Members of the Senate do not agree with that idea; the Naval Affairs Committee may not agree with it; but at least the Naval Affairs Committee and the Senate, if the committee shall vote to report the bill, will then have the opportunity to do the very thing I suggested a moment ago, and that is to decide once for all this question of policy on the part of our Government toward the preparation of its own instrumentalities of war.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I made the suggestion to the Senator in the hope that under the circumstances he might urge this proposed legislation before the Naval Affairs Committee. I really thought Senate bill 1490 was his bill, but evidently I was mistaken.

Mr. BONE. Yes; it is my bill.

Mr. BYRNES. That bill is now pending before the Naval Affairs Committee. The Secretary of the Navy has submitted to the Committee, under date of March 17, a letter with reference to the bill. He sets forth the attitude of the Navy Department; and, inasmuch as the amendment is pending, I shall read this letter from the Secretary.

Mr. BONE. I should like to have it in the RECORD.

Mr. BYRNES. The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 17, 1937.

The CHAIRMAN,
Committee on Naval Affairs, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The bill S. 1490, "To provide that all naval vessels and their main engines, ordnance, and armament should be constructed or manufactured in Government establishments", was referred to the Navy Department by your committee with request for report thereon.

The purpose of this bill is to require the construction of all naval vessels, together with their main engines, ordnance equipment, and armor (including the making of castings and forgings,

machining the parts, roughing and finishing operations, and assembling and installing the parts) in navy yards, naval stations, naval gun factories, naval ordnance plants, or arsenals of the United States.

In general, it must be emphasized that constructing, equipping, and supplying ships and aircraft of the present naval program cannot be accomplished with personnel and facilities now existing in establishments under the control of the Navy Department or any other department of the Government.

With more detailed reference to manufacturing facilities, it should be pointed out that Government plants are not now equipped or are equipped only in a limited manner to manufacture Diesel engines, large units of electrical equipment, engines and gears, large valves and forgings, drums and headers for boilers, technical fire-control apparatus and instruments, gyro compasses, gages and instruments in general for ships and aircraft, aircraft and aircraft instruments, and certain structural steel and shapes.

These facilities, therefore, must be either acquired or greatly expanded to accommodate the volume of work which would be added by reason of the requirements of the bill S. 1490.

In addition to plant facilities required for manufacturing the various items that have been enumerated in the preceding paragraph there is for consideration the problem of personnel. If the objects of the bill are to be accomplished, there must be a very large increase in laborers, mechanics, technicians, and so forth, in the many trades which go to make up an industry having the ramifications of ship and aircraft construction.

In order to make any progress at all in the direction of having ships and aircraft which are even reasonably adequate, there must be maintained many departments of research, together with large staffs of design engineers. It need not be demonstrated that the building up of such organizations requires years of time and the expenditure of huge sums of money.

In addition to the time and money that must be consumed in building up plant facilities and training competent personnel, there is for consideration the effect such an organization in the Government would have on the efficiency of the Navy and the adequacy of the national defense facilities.

In the construction of ships and aircraft and their component parts, the field of competition is large. Constructors and manufacturers have their own departments of design and research. There is, therefore, never ending stimulus for one manufacturer to build an airplane, ship, or some part thereof superior to anything in the field. The Navy is in a position, under such circumstances, to take advantage of the best that the market affords.

While the Navy may leave from consideration of the problem any effect which the proposed course of action may have on private industry itself, it cannot overlook the ultimate effect on the whole aspect of national defense.

A major war today means a nation in arms. In such an emergency an immediate and enormous expansion of manufacturing facilities is mandatory if the needs of the fighting forces afloat and ashore are to be adequately met. The World War proved conclusively that this could be accomplished only by the utilization of every industrial plant, the equipment of which could be diverted to the production of war necessities. Complete separation during peacetime of the industrial resources of the Nation from participating in national-defense work will unquestionably handicap seriously the effort of the Nation for defense work in an emergency.

If Government facilities for ship and aircraft construction are provided with the necessary skilled artisans, design engineers, and research technicians there arises in addition to any present consideration of expense and delay to the completion of the national-defense program another serious problem. Personnel and facilities cannot be employed gainfully over a period of years on such technical work as that which is comprised in the scope of ship and aircraft construction. There must be periods after the present program is completed when there will be no naval requirement for these added facilities. Any suggested employment of them outside the Government field would raise the question of Government competition in private business or continued idleness of personnel and plant facilities.

In conclusion this Department is of the opinion that the national defense would suffer immeasurably by the adoption of the proposed plan and the cost of the national defense would be largely increased. The national defense requires the help of private industry to provide facilities and research over a period of time which the Government could not supply. On the other hand, extensive Government competition with private industry, when private industry can do the work properly, is considered basically unsound both as to national economics and as to national defense.

The Navy Department, therefore, recommends against the enactment of the bill S. 1490.

The bill S. 1490 is not in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE A. SWANSON.

That letter is addressed to the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee and signed by the Secretary of the Navy.

I simply wish to say to the Senate that the matter is now before the Naval Affairs Committee. The statement of the Senator from Washington and the letter of the Secretary of the Navy shows that the subject is one to which most serious consideration should be given by the legislative committee after the Senator has had an opportunity to study the views of the Department and present his views to the committee.

It seems to me that upon the floor of the Senate, when the proper committee has been given an opportunity to go into the subject, it is not fair to the Senator's cause to have it acted upon, any more than it would be fair to the Department or to the national defense, in my opinion, to adopt it without serious consideration.

I may say to the Senator that, while I share his views as to the condition of the various navy yards today, where a shortage of work necessitates a reduction in personnel at this time, the existing law gives to the President of the United States the power, where it is inconsistent with the public interests in any year to have a vessel or vessels constructed on the alternate plan, to have a vessel or vessels constructed in a Government yard or in private yards, as he may direct. Therefore it is within the power of the President today, under the proviso to the Trammell-Vinson Act, to direct that one of these ships be built in a Government yard, which would solve the problem which has been presented by the necessary reduction in personnel at this time.

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

Mr. BYRNES. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator from South Carolina construe the proviso he has just read to supplement the proviso requiring a certain percentage of the ships to be built in navy yards and another percentage by private industry?

Mr. BYRNES. That is the way I construe it.

Mr. WALSH. So the President may set aside the percentage required for building and, if he chooses, have all the vessels built in navy yards?

Mr. BYRNES. I am satisfied that that is the case. I will read to the Senate the language to which I refer:

Provided further, That if inconsistent with the public interests in any year to have a vessel or vessels constructed as required above—

That is, on the alternate plan—

the President may have such vessel or vessels built in a Government or private yard, as he may direct.

It is solely a question as to what the President would consider inconsistent with the public interest; and if it be inconsistent with the public interest to call for the discharge of a large number of men, and it should be so determined by him, he could direct construction in a Government yard rather than in a private yard.

Mr. WALSH. So apparently the President has the last say?

Mr. BYRNES. I am satisfied that he has under this language.

On the other question I am sure the Senator from Washington, if we are affirmatively to provide that hereafter all construction shall be in Government yards, would like to have an estimate as to exactly what expenditure would be necessary; and if we have a large personnel in the Government yards in 1942, when the present naval program is to be completed, I am sure the Senator would like to consider what we would use this increased personnel for; whether we would use them in the construction of private vessels, or whether the repair work would be sufficient to employ them, or, if not sufficient to keep them at work, how we would then reduce the force. I submit to the Senator and to the Senate that these and many other questions that I can conceive of should be considered in connection with the Senator's bill upon which the Department has reported, and upon which, I am sure, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] will have a hearing at any time the Senator from Washington may indicate, when he will have an opportunity to present the subject in detail, and with the thoroughness that the subject demands before definite action is taken upon it.

I hope the Senator from Washington, after consideration, will not insist upon action upon his amendment at this time, but will insist upon action upon his bill, which provides affirmatively for construction in private yards and does not merely impose a limitation which will result in tying up the construction of ships, even in Government yards. I fear that it may be so construed that it will prevent the construction of any ships, because the Department says that if they cannot proceed with construction on the alternate plan as

required by the present law, they will not be able to proceed at all; and if they do not proceed at all there will be no construction of destroyers or submarines, and the Senator does not want that to happen any more than I do.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, the suggestion that the Congress of the United States is so inept, so helpless, so child-like, and naive that it could not correct that condition in 5 minutes is a reflection upon our intelligence.

Do Senators think we cannot construct these ships? I could write a bill and in 10 minutes put it through here, if Senators would vote for it, and then we could go ahead with that sort of building operation.

I desire to say that the letter from the Secretary of the Navy, without employing the reference in an invidious way at all, is what a lawyer would call a plea in confession and avoidance.

He says that during wartime of course we have to thrust a great burden on private concerns. That is what happened during the World War; we thrust this great burden on these astute gentlemen and they made a mess of it, and their ineptitude cost us billions of dollars because we were not prepared to do the work ourselves. We thrust it into the hands of these clever businessmen, who gave us Hog Island and the smelly, messy scandal of the Spruce division. Many grafting fellows should have gone to the penitentiary, but did not.

Another aspect of this matter which we must not overlook is that the very small amount necessary to do this work is so tiny compared with what we are spending that we ought not to blink at it.

Mr. President, my good friend the Senator from South Carolina has said that I should not thrust this sort of thing so obtrusively onto the floor and compel Senators to vote on it when they do not understand it. As a Member of this body—and every other Member has had the same experience—I am compelled time after time to vote for some bill a careful examination into which has not been my lot because I was not a member of the committee which handled the bill. I ask Senators to be witnesses to the accuracy of my statement that as the naval appropriation bill has been reported to the Senate in the last 3 years, each year it has carried half a billion dollars. And how were Senators not on the Naval Affairs Committee able to vote intelligently on those bills? How did they know all the minute details which were locked safely in the breasts and the minds of the able gentlemen in the Navy Department who formulated the bills? Yet all Senators had to vote on them. By saying "aye" they made the Government spend a billion and a half dollars, approximately, in 3 years, and did not have any more information about the matter than about many other things pending in the Congress. That is the way legislation is acted on and passed.

What I have said is not a challenge, because it is a part of the mechanics of legislation. But it is not an answer to say that we cannot pass intelligently on these things. We are compelled to pass on them whether we desire to or not. Every Member of the Senate has to say "aye" or "no" to any bill before us, and thereby possibly be the judge as to whether or not we ought to spend \$500,000,000. Is not that the truth? Wherein am I in error in that assertion? Every Member of the Senate must say "yes" or "no" to this particular half-billion-dollar bill and sit in judgment on the wisdom or lack of wisdom of the Navy Department. He has to say whether he wants 12 submarines built, or 6, or 9, as the case may be. So it is a perfectly futile argument, it seems to me, to say that all these matters have to be taken care of in a committee, because the committee sends the bill onto the floor, and theoretically, and under every parliamentary procedure known to Anglo-Saxon civilization, every Member who votes on it, even though he is not a member of the committee, must constitute himself a committee of one to pass upon the merits of the particular piece of legislation.

The Members of the Senate are just as capable, without having the advantage of committee hearings, to pass on this amendment of mine as they are to spend half a billion dollars by their vote on this bill, when probably there is not

1 man in 10 here who can give you the many details of the bill. If there is that fundamental lack of information about the details of the bill, how can there be a challenge to my suggestion, which is very broad in its scope, that we build these vessels in Government navy yards? The intellect of a child can comprehend that.

If the Navy Department wants retained adherence and unstinted loyalty to the principle of private building and development in the naval defense, that is one thing. They have been very frank in saying that they want rugged private initiative preserved in the naval program, and the War Department takes the same attitude in connection with the War Department bill. But it is that very fundamental principle which I desire to challenge positively, directly, and purposefully, by the amendment, and certainly we do not have to know how much it costs to build a submarine or a torpedo boat to determine whether we want the Government to build its own warships. That is all this amendment provides for.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, it is with regret that I feel that I must vote against the passage of the Navy Department and naval service appropriation bill now pending. This program means, with the amount of regular and supplemental Budget estimates for the Navy for 1938, that we are asked to appropriate in round figures \$564,000,000 for the Navy, an increase of some \$36,000,000 over the peace record appropriations of last year.

Mr. President, there is included in this bill provision for two new battleships, calling for an expenditure of \$126,000,000. That is more than the combined cost of State and local government in Kansas, even when the cost of new social-security legislation is included. It means more than \$10,000,000 spent every week by our Government for naval purposes. I can see no need, no justification, for this enormous and extravagant expenditure of public funds. I might support the measure if the appropriations for these two battleships were eliminated, although I myself cannot see the need for the eight destroyers and four submarines also included in the appropriation measure.

Mr. President, we make loud and continued statements that we are a peace-loving people. But we are now spending more than a billion dollars a year, or will be during the next fiscal year, for preparations for war.

It is not seriously contended that we have to spend that much money to maintain peace at home, nor is it contended that we must spend that much annually to defend the United States against invasion. So it seems to me that the only purpose for spending this billion dollars a year must be to enable us to engage in war across the seas again, and I will never vote to send the boys and young men of America overseas to fight other peoples' battles.

The United States of America does not need 87 more war vessels, including 2 new battleships at a cost of \$126,000,000, for the purpose of adequate national defense. I am in favor of adequate national defense, but I am opposed to extravagant expenditures of hundreds of millions of dollars in the name of adequate national defense, when all the world knows we do not require this much for adequate national defense.

Enactment of the proposed neutrality law, which is a foregone conclusion, presumably will lessen, not increase, the danger of our being drawn into a foreign conflict in which we should not be involved. Therefore I say we should cut down these appropriations for war purposes, not increase them. I am compelled to cast my vote in protest against such a war policy.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am sure we all admire the earnestness and the persevering spirit of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] in his efforts to bring about the building of all naval craft in Government-owned shipyards. I rise to emphasize the importance of the proposal, and to call attention to why, in my opinion, it would be most unfortunate to adopt it at this time.

First of all, the suggestion is vigorously opposed by the Navy Department. The distinguished Senator from Washington calls attention to the fact that we have a \$500,000,000 bill before us, that we are following the lead of the Navy

Department in accepting their suggestions as to their needs, and that very few Senators know the details about it. The fact of the matter is that this appropriation bill has been for weeks before the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and I hold in my hand this large volume of the hearings showing the extent to which the House Committee on Appropriations investigated every item of the bill. It has been for several days before the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the bill as reported has lessened the amounts agreed upon by the Budget as essential for the Navy.

Mr. President, we must accept the proposition that the Navy Department is acting in good faith, that it is concerned with the defense of our country from the naval standpoint, and with that assumption and with the recommendation of the Department against the pending proposal, do we not at least owe them a committee hearing where the whole matter may be threshed out and discussed pro and con? Is it not impressive that a great department obligated to concern itself with naval defense says this plan would be ruinous and injurious, and that it is strongly opposed to it?

There is a second objection. Who dares to say how many more millions, if not billions, of dollars it would cost to put our present navy yards in condition to build all the naval craft which it may be necessary to build now and in the immediate future? I think the number of navy yards, large and small, is nine, and nearly all of them are equipped for special and limited work. For instance, the navy yard at Portsmouth, N. H., builds nothing but submarines, and is not equipped to build anything but submarines. Some of the other yards are equipped merely for repair work or for building destroyers, or some other particular kind of naval craft.

I myself offered an amendment, at the request of the employees of the navy yard at Boston, asking for the extension of the structural shop there. Requests were before the committee from every navy yard in the country asking for increases in their facilities, the theory being that if this structural shop, for instance, were built in Boston, that yard could bid for more naval work, and have more naval work than is now being allotted to it. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] will bear me out in stating that millions of dollars were requested by the various navy yards for the purpose of increasing their present facilities so that they could carry on in a better way than at the present time, and not necessarily for the purpose of expanding them so that they could take on the building that is now being done by private yards. Their requests were denied without any exceptions by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask what proportion of the building is now being done in navy yards?

Mr. WALSH. Not less than 50 percent of new constructions, and all the repair work.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. BONE. An item was inserted in the appropriation bill—I think it was last year—of four and one-half million dollars to build a dock at Bremerton Navy Yard. An amendment I offered carrying that provision went into the bill but was taken out in conference. I think it was done at the request of the Navy Department. Of course, the Bremerton Navy Yard happens to be in my own back yard, so to speak, and I rather approached the subject with some diffidence; but that amendment would have permitted that great navy yard, one of the greatest in the State, to have equipped itself to do intelligently and efficiently and, I hope, cheaply the class of work that was sought in the case of this floating dock, which obviously will have to be built on the Pacific coast. Yet that item went out, and I think it went out at the request of the Navy Department.

What I cannot understand is why they would object to even that small item—four and one-half million dollars—which, I think, would enable the Government to get decent and respectable bids for building this dock. In other words,

I cannot understand why the Navy Department wants to tie its own hands.

Mr. WALSH. I think the Navy Department has made requests for—and I ask the attention of the Senator from South Carolina—appropriations for improving and increasing and developing shore establishments. I use the expression "shore establishments"; that is the naval expression for navy yards and naval bases, in distinction from naval craft. They have made requests for appropriations for improving, increasing, and developing a large number of shore establishments. The proposal that I was interested in, relating to the Boston Navy Yard, was, I think, recommended by the Navy Department but was far down on their list of favored and immediately necessary projects.

Let me say in this connection that this summer I visited the submarine base at New London, and I was grieved to find the conditions that existed at that submarine base. It is the place where young officers and enlisted men in the finest of health, the most perfect specimens in the Navy, are sent for training in submarines.

As is well known, submarine training is the most injurious to health of any in the naval service. Tuberculosis and other diseases are quickly contracted as the result of training and experience in submarines. The buildings where these men were housed, built during wartime, were dilapidated, insecure, unsafe, and all were firetraps. The toilets were adjoining the dining room. You just passed through a door from the messroom into the toilet. The whole appearance of the building was that of a firetrap. Furthermore, in that particular plant there was a Government instrument worth \$90,000 housed in a building that cost \$5,000, and that was not even fireproof. If a fire started at the New London base it would be impossible to prevent a complete disaster to the whole base.

I made up my mind that I would leave nothing undone to see that proper buildings were constructed at New London, especially for the service that causes the largest extent of physical exhaustion of any service in the Navy. Nothing has been done. The reason given is, "We just cannot do it. We have not the money." Like conditions exist in many other shore establishments and naval bases. It is most regrettable that we are unable in many instances to decently house the patriotic men who are serving us in the Navy.

But I must not digress further. All I am attempting to say is that perhaps we ought to do what the Senator from Washington [Mr. Bone] says we should do; but certainly we should not do it until the subject has been studied, certainly not until it is known how much more it is going to cost, how much more expansion will result from it. Certainly we ought not to do it until we know whether or not it is going to be really beneficial to the whole problem of national defense. Furthermore, I have a rather open mind on the question. Personally, after further study I might favor the expansion of our present navy yards to the point of doing all that is essential in connection with the building of naval craft; but I do recognize the fact that the naval program is a national one and that it is larger than personal wishes or local benefits by having Government employees rather than private works do the work.

I was impressed with the fact that in the selection of airplanes and, to an extent, in the selection of naval craft models, private industry is called upon to give the benefit of experience to help the Navy in its engineering department and in its planning department for the purpose of having the very best and latest equipment for our Navy, and I should dislike very much to see an abandonment of that policy and our Government not be in a position to get the benefits of national research and experiments by private industry.

However, I am not going to talk longer, Mr. President, except to say that, assuming the project has some merit, let us first have a thorough investigation made of the subject. Let us have it studied from all sides. Let us find out why the Navy is opposed to it, and what its reasons are. Let us find out what this new policy, if adopted, is going to

cost. Let us find out how many more navy yards we will have to build, how many present yards we will have to expand and equip, how many channels we shall have to dig to get into the navy yards, because some of the navy yards now have channels with a draft of water of only 15 or 20 feet; and if a draft of 25 or 30 feet is going to be required, considerable expense along that line will be necessarily involved.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, has there been any estimate along that line?

Mr. WALSH. None by the Navy that I know of.

Mr. NYE. O, Mr. President, on June 19 of last year the Munitions Committee submitted an extensive report carrying a very definite study made by the Interstate Commerce Commission for the Munitions Committee, setting forth what the cost would be in various fields of endeavor if the Government were to nationalize the munitions industry.

Mr. WALSH. Does that include the construction of naval vessels?

Mr. NYE. The estimate of additional capital that would be required by the Government if we were to produce all of our peacetime requirements of naval construction was about \$24,000,000. The figure was a little less than that, as I now remember.

Mr. WALSH. That is for naval construction?

Mr. NYE. For naval construction.

Mr. WALSH. Was the Navy Department consulted? Did it make an estimate?

Mr. NYE. As I now recall the matter, the Navy Department did not undertake to make an estimate; but the attitude of the Navy Department all through the study was one of great opposition to the mere thought of the Government doing more than it was already doing in the way of naval construction.

Mr. WALSH. I think the Senator may be correct in that statement. I believe I sense that attitude, too; and I think they feel very deeply, sincerely, and honestly that it is necessary for this country in time of war to have the benefit of private building facilities as well as its own facilities for building naval craft. I know they feel strongly upon this subject, and I think their feeling is sincere and honest. I really do not think any objections they have to the Government carrying on this work are due to any sinister purpose or influence; but they really feel that private enterprise and private industry, particularly in the shipbuilding line, ought to be available to this country in time of war.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. May I ask the Senator from Massachusetts how the time element of construction of the contemplated vessels would be affected if all of them were to be built in the present navy yards?

Mr. WALSH. If the amendment be adopted, it will postpone for several years the completion of the present naval program. In answer to the Senator, I will say there is a good deal of talk about our naval program being enlarged at the present time. It is not so. There is no expansion of our naval program at this time. No change whatever has been made from the provisions in the treaty we made with some of the great powers in reference to our naval strength; and with all we have planned and appropriated for, this country will not have until the year 1942 a Navy of the strength which our Government said, and other governments agreed, was necessary for our strength in time of peace—not in time of war.

Mr. TYDINGS. Parity.

Mr. WALSH. I refer to parity, as the Senator from Maryland mentioned. Parity will not be reached until 1942. If the proposed amendment shall be adopted, I do not know, and I do not know who else could know, when we could ever equal the number of vessels that were allotted us in the treaty.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand, the present arrangement of building half the ships in navy yards and half in private yards is of advantage to the country, aside from the value of the private yards in themselves, by reason of the fact that if we should be drawn into a war we should be able to call upon the private yards to build needed vessels. Is it not correct that from the standpoint of national defense it is necessary that we keep the maximum number of yards open, so that in any given emergency we can produce ships, if we are obliged to produce them, within a minimum of time?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. And if we were to build all these ships in private yards, it would mean a considerable delay in the completion of any naval program?

Mr. WALSH. There is no doubt about that. Furthermore, the Senate should remember that we have put in a restriction as to what profit private yards may make. By law, no private shipyard may retain or make more than 10 percent of profit in building our ships.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. I do not know whether or not the Senator from Massachusetts was in the Chamber at the time I called attention to the fact that my construction of the amendment would be, not that it would permit directly and affirmatively the construction in Government yards but because it places a limitation upon the funds, that it would simply prevent the use of these funds by the Government to carry out the provision of the law which provides that the building of ships shall be on a 50-50 basis. The result would be that none of the funds could be spent for building any ship in a private yard after the first one. The law requires that the ships be built alternately in private and public yards. The amendment, if adopted, would stop construction after the first ship is built.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator go so far as to say that would result, in his judgment, in closing down some of the Government navy yards?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes; because under existing law the Department is required to build one destroyer in a Government yard, the next in a private yard, and the next one in a Government yard, and so forth. This amendment provides that no part of the fund shall be used for the purpose of building in private yards, and, therefore, the Department would be estopped from having any built in private yards. As the law requires the Department to build ships alternately in Government yards and private yards, it cannot build consecutively in the Government yards without violating the provisions of the Vinson-Trammell law, which is obligatory upon it. Therefore, the amendment, if adopted, would stop all construction except that of the first destroyer and the first submarine.

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

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH. I yield first to the Senator from Washington, and then I will yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. BONE. I should like, in view of the statement made by the Senator from South Carolina, to ask the able Senator from Massachusetts, who is chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, and is an able parliamentarian, how long he thinks it would take in the emergency situation suggested by my good friend from South Carolina for the Senate and the House and the President, in conjunction with the Navy Department, always realizing the frightful position we are in, to pass a law correcting that situation? I suggest that it would take us but 1 day. We put the National Economy Act through in a few hours. In a great national emergency, and in view of the horrifying character of the situation suggested by the Senator from South Carolina, I am quite sure that the Congress would not find it difficult to act with celerity.

Mr. BYRNES. I think the answer is that it would take only so long as would be required by the Naval Affairs Committee to act on the measure of the Senator proposing to amend the law. The Senator from Washington now has a

bill before that committee; and if he can have it reported now, why should he not have it reported? If he can have it reported under such circumstances, he ought to proceed now to have it reported.

Mr. BONE. That is precisely why I should like to have a vote on this amendment and see what the sentiment of the Senate is.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH. I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. May I ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the President has the option of declaring whether a naval vessel shall be built in private yards or in Government navy yards?

Mr. WALSH. It has been developed during the debate this morning that the President has the final say and can decide, if he chooses, to build nearly all our naval craft in Government yards.

Mr. COPELAND. I understand that to be the law.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the very ramifications of the subject which we have been discussing here, the differences of opinion, the magnitude of the question, the expense involved, its relationship to our whole policy of national defense, indicate, it seems to me, that we cannot deal with a question of this magnitude on an amendment offered on the floor to this appropriation bill. I hope the Senator from Washington will withdraw his amendment, or not press it, so that we may have the question discussed in the Naval Affairs Committee and finally in the Senate after the Senate possesses more complete information.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The question of nationalizing the manufacture of armament is one of the few upon which the Munitions Committee divided. I hold to the view that if we were completely to nationalize the production of defense facilities we would necessarily create such a magnitude of productive equipment and machinery, a magnitude equal to the maximum defense demands for any one moment, that we would virtually be committing our country to a permanent production speed in armament, because we all know, in the natural course of events, that there is always political pressure to keep every facility going at a hundred percent. Therefore I think that if we should have a 100-percent equipment it would be followed by a 100-percent pressure to keep the equipment in operation, and the final net result would be a devastating influence in behalf of maximum armaments instead of any hope for disarmament.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has made an admirable statement. In particular would that statement be true in regard to aircraft. We have delayed embarking the Government in building aircraft, and properly so. If war comes, we cannot prepare ourselves by overnight building of naval craft; it takes 2 years to build a battleship, and it takes almost as much time to build a cruiser. Aircraft, however, can be built within 90 days, and it is very essential that the Government encourage every private industry, located anywhere, to be equipped for building aircraft in time of war, so that in a few weeks we could build 15,000 or 20,000 or even 50,000 aircraft if needed. In the meantime we must appropriate money to have men trained to man these ships and take care of them, for it takes a year to train a man to be a pilot and to have the necessary knowledge of gunnery.

Mr. BONE. At this point I should like to ask the Senator, in view of the fact of the pressing need for aircraft development and a more thorough understanding of the problems that inhere in aircraft, why the Navy Department comes down here with a proposal in this bill to destroy the aircraft factory at Philadelphia? In view of the Senator's statement, which I think is absolutely correct, why should the Navy Department want to destroy that infant?

Mr. WALSH. As I understand, that action was taken by the House and not by the Senate committee.

Mr. BYRNES. That has been corrected in the bill as reported to the Senate. The Senator from Washington is entirely in accord with the action of the committee in that

respect. I do not think he wants that provision of the bill as reported to the Senate defeated.

Mr. BONE. I am very happy to state that I am entirely in accord with the conclusion of the committee, in striking out the provision regarding the factory in Philadelphia. I think that factory ought to be expanded.

Mr. WALSH. It is gratifying to find the Senator from Washington and the Senator from South Carolina in accord on at least one provision of this bill.

Mr. President, I do not care to prolong the discussion further. I trust the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE].

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate for more than a few moments on the pending amendment, and yet I believe I shall desire at the same time to speak my mind concerning the bill in its entirety.

The armament race in which at the present time the world is engaging in the name of preparation for more war must to everyone who will give a second's thought to what is occurring be a matter of grave moment. I think it is fair to say that never yet has an armament race been followed by peace, and when we know that there never has been an armament race compared with the one upon which nations have now entered, there is little or no consolation to be found in the actual tramp, tramp, tramp which resounds throughout the world today. As for ourselves, I think there is not a power upon earth that would not give millions, indeed hundreds of millions, and perhaps billions of dollars, if it could have what we have in the way of a national defense created by nature that is costing the United States not a penny. I think there is no power on the face of the earth so little subject to attack as is our Nation, and no nation need fear attack so little as we of the United States do. Yet we find ourselves very much a party to the present-day armament race.

I have made up my mind as to where the difficulty is. It arises largely out of the fact that we have not a well-defined national-defense policy. We are all believers in maintaining an adequate national defense, but that term lends itself to so many descriptions, so many definitions, that we in the Senate find ourselves, for example, at loggerheads as to what constitutes an adequate national defense. We know it to be true that 20 years ago certain forces were complaining about the inadequacy of our national defense. Today we are spending, in the name of national defense, between three and four times more than we were spending 20 years ago, and yet those who then were complaining about the inadequacy of our national defense are among those who today are increasing their complaints about the inadequacy of our national defense. It comes down to the point that with some interests, some forces, the call for national defense has no specific goal in mind; the call of some people in the name of national defense is for more and more and ever more, and no one knows what the end of that demand is going to be.

Today the United States is spending approximately \$20,000,000 a week in the name of national defense, and yet among us are many who feel that our national defense is all too inadequate. We have listened to a debate here today which reveals that the pending naval appropriation bill is not particularly a construction bill, and that but a very small part of it enters into new construction, which drives us to the conclusion, then, that for all time to come, not counting any enlargements of our Military Establishment, we are going to have an outlay annually at least on a par with that being called for this year.

The sum of \$20,000,000 a week for national defense is to be expended at a time when in many communities and in many States there is wonderment that more money is not available to meet the very necessary needs that are arising by reason of economic adversities and emergencies.

Here in Congress we have spent days quibbling about what we ought to permit in the way of an outlay to meet the human needs of our own people, but there always seems to be just a little resentment if any delay whatever is oc-

casioned in the passage of so-called national-defense appropriations.

In our plans of effecting economy, in our plans of establishing a reorganization of governmental units, much consideration has been given by those who have directed their attention to the subject of consolidating the various departments and agencies of the Government. But very few, if any, have been the suggestions which for a moment would tolerate the idea of reorganizing our Military Establishment on such a basis as would bring the Army and the Navy under one head, a head of national defense.

Looking now at the very able Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], whose leadership on the Foreign Relations Committee this year has accomplished so much progress in the way of determining America's course in the future, I recall how we have been developing here at home a determination on our own part that we are going to stay at home in the future and do our fighting here, if it is at all possible to do so; that we have seen the end of that day when it can be expected that the United States will quickly follow off into other people's wars, certainly not until there can be better cause than there has been in the past, certainly not until there can be better promise of a chance, after it has won the war, for the United States to win what it goes out to win.

Our difficulty, it seems to me, lies in the fact, as I have said, that we are lacking a clear defining of what we mean by "national defense"; we are lacking in a national-defense policy.

We are not much alarmed about any possible attack upon us by a foreign foe. We are told upon occasion that from this country or that country there is some danger of attack, but when we make inquiry and ascertain the facts we find the people of such country are looking upon us as being more likely to attack them.

We find in this country occasionally developed a large suspicion when stories are circulated about fishing vessels of another nation surrounding our naval craft when they can, eyeing them with suspicion, and photographing them. That throws us into a state of fear that we are being spied upon and that a certain nation has its eyes set upon ways of demolishing our Navy. In the country to which I refer, without naming it, people tell with equal conviction of how Americans are spying upon the naval craft of their nation. We find ourselves building, through our fears and our suspicions, a state of mind that is never going to permit a reduction of the budgets which constitute so burdensome an obligation upon us, a burden that is increasing from year to year.

If we could have a well-defined national-defense policy, and if its definition were to be in keeping with what I take to be the desire of the American people today, I am satisfied we could have a national defense for hundreds of millions of dollars less than is occasioned by the Budget which has been laid before us annually. If we could have defined strictly what we mean by national defense, in addition to serving our needs in the way of economy, we would succeed in giving word to the rest of the world of an intent on our part to do our fighting at home, of an intent on our part to so conduct ourselves in a military way that other nations would not in their national-defense plans ever contemplate an attack from us.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], pending before the Senate at the present time, is one which I should like to see have the concurrence of the Senate. I think if the Government itself were to perform all its naval construction work, we would thereby take a first step in eliminating the most powerful influences which are at work keeping the American mind dissatisfied concerning the adequacy of its national defense.

Through the conduct of an investigation running over 2 years the Senate Munitions Committee ascertained some of the influences which were at work, some of the powerful urgings that had America moving in directions which were not, strictly speaking, the directions which the masses of the people wanted pursued. There can be no denying that

the motive of profit plays quite as large a part in programs involving preparation for war as it plays in programs incident to the actual waging of war. The motive of profit is known to cause men and institutions the world over to engage in programs which have anything but the peace of the world in mind.

I am not going to burden the Senate with an extended review of the findings of the practices of the private munitions industry and especially those engaged in the shipbuilding end of the industry. However, I desire to read to the Senate a summary which appeared in the report of the committee to the Senate, to be found at page 6 of report no. 1 submitted to the Senate in June 1935, as follows:

The committee finds that three big shipbuilding companies had \$53,744,000 of work at stake in the Geneva Disarmament Conference which the Navy had given to them a few months before the opening of the conference in 1927. It notes the admitted interest of the companies in the unfavorable outcome of that conference. It notes Mr. Shearer's testimony that he was urged to go to the conference by Admiral Pratt and was supplied with secret Navy information. It notes the secrecy of his employment by the shipbuilders and the explanation for that secrecy. It notes his activities in the promotion of a war scare with England in 1928 and 1929 while being paid by the shipbuilders. It notes certain discrepancies between testimony given by the shipbuilders at the Shortridge hearings and the hearings of the Munitions Committee. It notes Mr. Shearer's claim that "as a result of my activities, eight 10,000-ton cruisers are under construction." Further, that owing to the failure of the tri-power naval conference at Geneva, there is now before the Seventieth Congress a 71-ship building program costing \$740,000,000. It notes Mr. Shearer's further testimony of his activities at the request of various naval officials. It notes his description of his Geneva campaign as "fast and vicious." It notes his report of the "delight" of the shipbuilders at the result. It notes the payment by the shipbuilders of the costs of a pamphlet he wrote attacking certain private citizens, including Newton D. Baker and Franklin D. Roosevelt. It notes the payments he received from Mr. Hearst of \$5,000 in 1929. It notes the spreading through a friendly newspaper syndicate of an alarmist story concerning alleged Japanese intentions by the president of the Bath Iron Works, with the intent and result of activity by a Senator and Representatives from Maine in connection with an appropriation bill in 1932.

The committee finds, on the basis of this and other testimony, that there is a clear and definite danger in allowing self-interested groups, such as the shipbuilders and their allied interests, to be in the close position of influence, as they are at present, to such an important instrument of national policy as the Navy is and the danger in allowing them to remain in a position where it is to their financial interest to confuse public opinion between the needs of the country for a purely defensive Navy and their own continued needs for profits.

The committee finds further that there has been a large amount of bipartisan political activity on the part of the shipbuilders locally, in Congress, and also at the national headquarters of the two parties. It makes no claim to have gone into this field thoroughly.

The committee notes the claims of the Washington representative of United Drydocks in 1934 that he could get a bill through Congress for \$50,000, and that "there is no virtue in being quixotic at this state." It notes the placing of Congressmen on certain committees at the request of the shipbuilders. It notes their claim to have helped the Navy on certain bills and to have elected members of the House Rules Committee. It notes the reference to United Drydock Co. securing through Dave Hogan, secretary to Mr. McCooey, prominent Brooklyn Democrat, the award of \$6,800,000 in destroyers in 1933.

The committee finds that the matter of national defense should be above and separated from lobbying and the use of political influence by self-interested groups and that it has not been above or separated from either of them.

The committee finds further under this head that the main lobby for the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 was conducted by the shipbuilders under the leadership of Mr. Laurence R. Wilder, then president of American Brown Boveri (New York Shipbuilding Co.), and that a sum of over \$140,000 was spent in putting that bill over.

The committee finds further that New York Shipbuilding Co. was acquired as a speculative investment by the Bragg-Smith-Cord interests just prior to the 1933 naval awards.

The success of the shipbuilders in securing an allocation of \$238,000,000 for shipbuilding from P. W. A. funds has been their most recent demonstration of power. In this their purpose was aided by labor groups, who later, when the expected employment failed to materialize, spoke of the matter as a "double cross" to the Navy officials who had solicited their support for the measure.

Mr. President, one cannot view what is known and a matter of record concerning the activities of the private shipbuilding industry without knowing that there is large ground and real cause for such an amendment as that offered by the

Senator from Washington. If one desired to go back to the period of the war to find what those upon whom we count so largely in time of war really did when their Government called upon them to utilize their facilities and give all their service to their country in the full measure which was needed, he would know how utterly disgraceful was the course of private industry. Their action then was not merely a matter for the moment, it was such as ought to invite today from the Congress of the United States anything but encouragement, anything but aid and comfort; and aid and comfort is to be found in far too large a measure in the military appropriations which we are passing from time to time.

With the Senator from Washington, I hope there may be a record vote upon the amendment he has offered.

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, in connection with the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], I desire to call the attention of the Senate to an amendment which was suggested when this bill was before the House of Representatives. Representative FISH then suggested this amendment:

That the President is authorized and requested to invite such governments as he may deem necessary or expedient to send representatives to a conference at Washington or elsewhere to consider the limitation of naval armaments, for the purpose of reaching an agreement on a program to limit naval armaments, with special reference to the limitation of battleships, battle cruisers, light cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, submarines, and aircraft.

Mr. FISH called attention to the fact that this amendment was not germane to the legislation pending before the House, and he therefore did not actually offer it; and I assume, of course, that the same rule applies here, and that such an amendment would not be germane.

In the course of the discussion in the House this interesting statement was made:

A naval conference should be called immediately, to be held either here or elsewhere, because Japan and England have already stated—England through Mr. Chamberlain, its Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Japan through the head of its Navy Department—that they are willing to enter into such a conference right now. I could read what these governments have said in the last few days if I had time.

I should have been interested if Representative FISH had actually read what the representatives of these governments said, and had given us the authority for his statement that they are ready to consider a limitation of armaments.

Mr. President, the naval limitation treaty which was adopted as the result of the Washington Conference has now expired. I think no one statement is made more often than that there is now underway an armament race. The President himself has referred to it. The Secretary of State has called attention to it. I think it is recognized, as was stated by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYPE], that such a race contains the greatest threat to the peace of the world.

Before the Washington Conference, in 1921 and 1922, a similar condition existed. At that time, by reason of the fact that we were headed for an armament race, the Washington Conference was held. I think anyone who is fair will realize that a great deal was accomplished as a result of that conference.

I will read a statement written by Mr. Philip Whitwell Wilson, contained in the American Encyclopedia, which I think fairly sums up the result of that conference. It will be recalled that the treaty provided that the naval tonnage of the United States should be limited to 525,000 tons; that Great Britain should also be limited to 525,000 tons; that Japan should be limited to 315,000 tons; France to 175,000 tons; and Italy to 175,000 tons. The well-known ratio of 5-5-3 was there adopted. Of a result of that conference, this, it seems to me, is a fair summary:

Summing up the results of the Washington Conference, we may say that it cleared the air in the Far East of much inflammatory poison, greatly improving relations between the United States and Japan. It stopped the naval race—

I ask that that statement be especially noted:

It stopped the naval race between the United States and Japan, and furnished Great Britain with a convenient escape both from her Anglo-Japanese alliance and her traditional, but now impossi-

ble, command of the ocean. It restored Shantung to China, and Siberia to Russia. Its influence over Japan has been liberal and beneficial, and is reflected in some reduction of Japan's Army.

Mr. President, it seems to me no one can challenge the beneficial results of the Washington Conference. The reason why I now call it to the attention of the Senate is that the treaty which resulted from the conference has expired, and there is no limitation upon any nation in building naval armaments. That being true, it seems to me timely, at any rate, to call the attention of the Secretary of State and of the President to the subject, and to remind them of the importance of having at an early time a conference to limit naval armaments.

I have great confidence in both the President and the Secretary of State. I believe they are entirely aware of the serious importance of this naval race. I also believe they are watching for the opportunity to join other nations in limiting their naval building programs for the future.

I also am interested in a resolution which Representative FISH has introduced, calling for a conference of the signatories of the Kellogg-Briand Pact to consider some machinery for implementing the pact.

It will be remembered that some years ago, when that pact was adopted, there was a great deal of optimism that somehow the nations of the world would cooperate through it to end war. As a matter of fact, in the only test to which the Kellogg-Briand Pact has been subjected, it proved utterly futile. The Secretary of State called the attention of Italy and of other nations to its existence last year, but nothing was done. It is a perfectly futile instrument; and unless it can be implemented, unless some instrumentality can be established to make it workable, it would have been just as well if it never had been ratified by 61 or more nations of the earth.

I simply desire to commend the Representative who introduced this resolution and who suggested this amendment for consideration when the naval bill was before the House. I desire to join with him in calling the matter to the attention of our officials, in order that we may not go on everlastingly without any limitation upon this race in armament. It seems to me that unless something of that kind is done, we are headed toward very disastrous consequences as a result of the naval building program in this country and in the other countries of the world.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, the Senator understands that this Government has not gone beyond the limitations set in the disarmament treaties; but I assume the Senator has in mind that, unless some action be taken, we may have to follow the example of other countries which appear to be about to engage in a naval armament race.

Mr. POPE. I understand that. I think our Government is to be commended for staying within the terms of the treaty. I am glad to note that the present Navy bill is less in amount than that of last year. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that without any limitation for the future this country is or will be compelled to engage in an armament race. It will be compelled to go beyond any provision of the Washington Treaty in order to defend itself, at least in the opinion of our naval authorities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Burke	George	La Follette
Andrews	Byrd	Gerry	Lee
Austin	Byrnes	Gibson	Lodge
Bachman	Capper	Gillette	Logan
Bankhead	Caraway	Green	Lonergan
Barkley	Chavez	Guffey	Lundeen
Bilbo	Clark	Hale	McAdoo
Black	Connally	Hatch	McGill
Bone	Copeland	Hayden	McKellar
Borah	Davis	Herring	McNary
Bridges	Dieterich	Holt	Minton
Brown, Mich.	Duffy	Hughes	Moore
Brown, N. H.	Ellender	Johnson, Calif.	Murray
Bulow	Frazier	Johnson, Colo.	Neely

Nye
O'Mahoney
Overton
Pittman
Pope

Radcliffe
Reynolds
Robinson
Russell
Schwartz

Schwollenbach
Sheppard
Steiner
Thomas, Utah
Townsend

Tydings
Vandenberg
Wagner
Walsh
White

Mr. MINTON. I desire to reannounce the absence of Senators indicated on the previous roll call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. Bone].

Mr. BONE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] to the provision in the bill on page 25, line 13, and the next two or three lines, for the appropriation of the sum of \$10,000,000, which was the amount appropriated by the Congress in 1935 for the construction of a floating drydock to be constructed on the Pacific coast for use at Pearl Harbor. Under the provisions of the bill as it now reads, this \$10,000,000 which has been previously appropriated for that purpose is taken away from that purpose, and is re-appropriated for the purpose of the payment of personnel.

As I read this provision, naturally it struck me that it might be construed to be a statement of the Congress that it intended to abandon the effort to build this floating drydock. As I indicated a few minutes ago in the course of the question which I submitted to my colleague, the bid which was received for the construction of this floating drydock from a private shipbuilder, the Bethlehem Steel Co., was some \$21,000,000. The Navy Department has not made public the exact figures of the estimate by the Bremerton yard and the Mare Island yard, but the indication is that they run somewhere around \$16,000,000. The Navy Department has asked the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives to increase the authorization for the amount of this floating drydock, and that matter is, as I understand, before the Bureau of the Budget at this time.

I have prepared an amendment, to strike out on page 25, line 13, the figures "\$78,484,680" and to insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$88,484,680", and then to strike out commencing with the word "and" on line 13 down to and including the word "paragraph" on line 17.

If it is the intention of the Committee on Appropriations to have the bill construed to indicate the abandonment, so far as the Congress is concerned, of the floating drydock construction, I will present the amendment and ask for action upon it. If I may receive assurance of the Senator from South Carolina that it is not the purpose of the Committee on Appropriations to bring about an abandonment of that project, but that it is the intention of the committee simply to have this fund, which is now lying idle, put to use during the period of time while we are waiting for an authorization for a larger amount, and that the Committee on Appropriations, so far as it is now concerned, will treat with favorable consideration the action of the Navy Department if they ask for a larger appropriation for the floating drydock, then I will not submit the amendment. I am making this statement for the Record.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, there is no justification for the construction of the action of the committee as an abandonment of this project. The fact is that the authorization for the drydock, as the Senator from Washington has stated, was \$10,000,000. When bids were asked for the completion of the project the private bid was in excess of \$21,000,000, and for a bare dock, without pumping equipment and other essential and desirable equipment, it was \$16,000,000. The Navy Department could not proceed with the construction because the bid was in excess of the authorization.

The Department has presented to the legislative committee, or is about to present, the estimate for an authorization of an amount sufficient to build the drydock. The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate did not pass upon the matter for the reason that no estimate was submitted or could be submitted in the absence of the necessary

legislation. Therefore there could be no justification for construing the action of the committee in transferring the \$10,000,000 as an intention on the part of the committee to oppose the construction of the drydock. As the Senator has indicated in his remarks, it was simply making provision for the use of the \$10,000,000 until such time as the Congress would authorize the construction at a cost which would permit the Department to go ahead with the construction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DUFFY in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, line 23, after the words "more than", it is proposed to strike out "nineteen" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty."

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I offer this amendment at the request of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who is temporarily absent from the Chamber. I am willing that the amendment be adopted and go to conference, where an opportunity will be afforded to determine its exact effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from South Carolina, in charge of the bill, concerning certain language in the bill. Beginning in line 19, on page 29, is this language:

Rent of rendezvous and expenses of maintaining the same.

What is the meaning of that? Is it as mysterious as it sounds?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I think the Senator is in a facetious humor. That phrase is one which has been put into these bills year after year, and, as I understand, has no application to anything except the place where the troops are gathered. The provision is for the rent of the place and the expense of maintaining it. The rendezvous is the place where the men are gathered. That language has appeared in these bills year after year. If the Senator objects to it, I am willing to accept an amendment to strike it out.

Mr. NYE. No, Mr. President; but, quite seriously, the rendezvous is the recruiting place, is it not?

Mr. BYRNES. That is, as is always understood, what the general language has reference to. As the Senator will notice, the language is:

Apprehension and delivery of deserters and stragglers, and for railway guides and other expenses incident to transportation; expenses of recruiting for the naval service.

It is for the expense incident to keeping up the place where the recruits are gathered before being sent to one of the training stations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the bill be read a third time?

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. FRAZIER. On the passage of the bill I call for the yeas and nays. The people ought to know how the Senate stands on so important a bill, calling for an appropriation of over \$500,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the demand seconded? [A pause.] Not a sufficient number have seconded the demand, and the yeas and nays are not ordered.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I expected that would be the result, and if it had not been for one or two Senators—

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I have no objection to a yeas-and-nay vote.

Mr. BYRNES. I join with the Senator from North Dakota in demanding the yeas and nays.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I appreciate that action on the part of the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from

South Carolina. If it had not been for the action of one or two Senators on the floor Friday afternoon, the bill providing for an appropriation of more than \$500,000,000 would have been disposed of without any explanation.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MINTON (when Mr. GLASS' name was called). I announce the general pair of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD].

Mr. LONERGAN (when Mr. MALONEY's name was called). My colleague [Mr. MALONEY] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. If present, my colleague would vote "yea" on this question, and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). Upon this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. Therefore I shall vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained in an important meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent attending to important matters in the various Government departments.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are detained on important public business.

Mr. BULOW. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. HITCHCOCK] is detained from the Senate because of illness in his family.

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 11, as follows:

YEAS—64

Adams	Chavez	Herring	Overton
Andrews	Connally	Hughes	Pope
Austin	Copeland	Johnson, Calif.	Redcliffe
Bachman	Davis	Lee	Reynolds
Bankhead	Dieterich	Lodge	Robinson
Barkley	Duffy	Logan	Russell
Bilbo	Ellender	Loneragan	Schwartz
Bone	George	McAdoo	Schwellenbach
Borah	Gerry	McGill	Sheppard
Bridges	Gibson	McKellar	Steiger
Brown, Mich.	Gillette	McNary	Townsend
Brown, N. H.	Green	Minton	Tydings
Burke	Guffey	Moore	Vandenberg
Byrd	Hale	Murray	Wagner
Byrnes	Hatch	Neely	Walsh
Caraway	Hayden	O'Mahoney	White

NAYS—11

Black	Clark	Johnson, Colo.	Nye
Bulow	Frazier	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Holt	Lundeen	

NOT VOTING—20

Ashurst	Harrison	Maloney	Smith
Bailey	Hitchcock	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Bulkley	King	Pepper	Truman
Donahay	Lewis	Pittman	Van Nuys
Glass	McCarran	Shipstead	Wheeler

So the bill (H. R. 5232) was passed.

Mr. BAILEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to announce that I was absent when the roll was called on the naval appropriation bill. If present, I should have voted "yea."

ELIGIBILITY OF JOSEPH P. KENNEDY FOR MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, out of order, I ask leave to introduce a joint resolution, and I ask to have it read, with the intention of requesting unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 110) limiting the operation of section 201 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, with respect to qualification of member of the United States Maritime Commission, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the appointment of Joseph P. Kennedy as a member of the United States Maritime Commission and his service on said Commission shall not be deemed to be in violation of the provisions of section 201 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, approved June 29, 1936, notwithstanding any pecuniary interest he may now have or may have had within 3 years prior to his appointment in any carrier by water, shipbuilder, contractor, or other firm or corporation or in any person who derives a substantial portion of his revenue from any business associated with ships or shipping.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution. In explanation of the measure, I will state that, under a provision contained in the maritime act of last year, the act approved June 29, 1936, a question has arisen as to the eligibility of Mr. Kennedy to receive the appointment as chairman of the Commission because of his alleged ownership of a limited amount of stock in certain corporations, which ownership may be construed to be in possible violation of the terms of the act.

Mr. Kennedy is the former chairman of the National Securities Exchange Commission. He is a gentleman of notable business ability and broad experience. I find that Senators who assisted in drafting the Maritime Act are willing—indeed, many of them are anxious—that Mr. Kennedy serve. It is my opinion that he would not desire to do so with a cloud upon his title such as might exist should the joint resolution offered by me, or some similar measure, be not passed.

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

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK. I think it is only fair to point out that the fact of Mr. Kennedy's ownership of stock in the Todd Shipbuilding Co., to be exact, was called to the attention of the President and of the Commerce Committee of the Senate by Mr. Kennedy himself. So far as the direct ownership of the 1,100 shares of the Todd Shipbuilding Co. stock is concerned, that matter was submitted to the Attorney General of the United States, who rendered an opinion to the effect that, in his judgment, the ownership of the 1,100 shares did not amount to a substantial interest within the meaning of the law. Subsequently, however, Mr. Kennedy called the attention of the Commerce Committee to the fact—it being his intention, I may say, to dispose of the 1,100 shares mentioned of the Todd Shipbuilding Co.—that he had established some years ago an irrevocable trust for the benefit of his children, of which he now has no control, but which does own a certain amount of stock of the Todd Shipbuilding Co. He also has a mortgage on a small ship, given him voluntarily to secure a personal loan which he had made to his brother-in-law. I may say that, in my opinion, neither of these circumstances would amount to a disqualification within the meaning of the law, but, in view of the very scrupulous attitude which Mr. Kennedy himself has assumed, and because of the desire on the part of all concerned, so far as I am advised, and in view of Mr. Kennedy's outstanding qualifications for the position, I think it would be a most excellent thing to have the joint resolution proposed by the Senator from Arkansas passed.

Mr. McNARY and Mr. COPELAND addressed the Chair.

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I desire the floor in my own right.

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well. Then I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, the Commerce Committee has been embarrassed by this matter, and particularly so because of Mr. Kennedy's own anxiety to let it be known to all the world what the situation is. Under date of March 12 he wrote me, saying:

The restrictions of the law as to qualifications are so far-reaching that I was quite concerned about my eligibility.

Then he recites the reasons, referring to his stock holding, which has just been mentioned by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. President, I think I am correct in saying that there is perfect unanimity on the part of the Committee on Commerce that the selection of Mr. Kennedy was a wise one, a happy one, that he will carry to the office a degree of ability which the office demands.

The appointments of members of the Maritime Commission have been delayed for about 8 months since the passage of the bill. During that time we have had no permanent Commission. Many matters of the greatest import are awaiting the Commission and it is very necessary that there should be early action. I take it that if this joint resolution shall be passed, Mr. Kennedy's name will then be before the Committee on Commerce without prejudice; but, of course, the passage of the joint resolution will not serve as a confirmation of Mr. Kennedy's appointment for this position.

I hope the Senate may deem it wise to pass the joint resolution. I was not advised of it until a few moments ago, and was not a party to it in any way, but I myself am convinced that if the President had gone over the entire United States to find a man to head the Maritime Commission he could not have found a better one than Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. Kennedy takes the place, if he takes it at all, very reluctantly. He has large affairs of his own and will make a sacrifice in order to render this service. If he shall do so, it will be in order to render a public service. I trust my friend from Oregon will see fit to allow the joint resolution to be considered and passed.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, unquestionably Mr. Kennedy is an able financier and a fine executive. I shall oppose the proposition submitted by the Senator from Arkansas without in any sense meaning to reflect at all upon the great ability of Mr. Kennedy. It is a most unusual request. With the long experience I have had in the Senate, I do not recall its parallel. The Senate Committee on Commerce has before it the names of five members of the Maritime Commission. Mr. Kennedy's name, like that of Abou Ben Adhem, "led all the rest." Then came a letter from Mr. Kennedy, stating that he was of the opinion that he was disqualified until he could dispose of his stock. He says he does not wish to undertake the service until he has ample and reasonable opportunity to sell the stock in the Todd Shipbuilding Co. It is a frank and sincere statement. I want to see him accorded that opportunity, and he shall be.

Mr. President, the Commerce Committee of the Senate has jurisdiction over this matter. It must pass upon the qualifications of the gentlemen who have been nominated as commissioners, and must report to the Senate conformably to a rule which is ancient in the practices of this body. Here we are attempting to take away from the Commerce Committee the opportunity to pass an opinion which it must eventually render upon the qualifications of Mr. Kennedy. It is an attempt by the Senate to prejudge the situation without having anything before it. It is an attempt upon the part of the Senate to take away the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee and bring the nomination here and rush it through in the form of a joint resolution. It is unthinkable and unheard of.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator quite means that.

Mr. McNARY. I mean everything I have said.

Mr. COPELAND. I think the purposes of the joint resolution, if passed, would but indicate that the Congress is willing that the Commerce Committee should consider the name of Mr. Kennedy in spite of the fact that he holds certain shares of stock. I do not think the power of the committee is to be limited in the least. When the matter goes back to the committee my feeling, as chairman of the committee, is that we must still determine whether we will recommend Mr. Kennedy for confirmation.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate the generous attitude of the Senator from New York. Mr. Kennedy is his constituent. I admire his great legal ability. I am sure the Commerce Committee is capable of passing upon the very question

it is now attempting to have the Senate pass upon without any data or information before it.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McNARY. Gladly.

Mr. COPELAND. I never saw Mr. Kennedy in my life. My position in the matter has no relation to the fact that he is one of my constituents. I do not know whether or not he voted for me. He is such a wise man I doubt if he did, but that has nothing to do with it. I know my own feeling is that Mr. Kennedy has demonstrated such remarkable ability that I should like to see him placed at the head of the Maritime Commission where we all know ability is needed. That is the reason why I favor the joint resolution. If he lived in Oregon, I should be just as enthusiastically for him.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that. I did not intend the Senator from New York to become serious about the matter. It was only a pleasant passing remark upon my part.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas for immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have not concluded my remarks.

The Commerce Committee, having jurisdiction over this matter, must pass upon the qualifications of the five gentlemen who have been named to the Commission and submit a report to the Senate. One of the things for the committee to consider and ponder is whether Mr. Kennedy comes within the provisions of the act creating the Commission. It is true that the Attorney General has rendered an opinion, which is before the committee, approving the qualifications of Mr. Kennedy. He may be qualified. I am not discussing that. He is qualified from the standpoint of experience and ability. He may be disqualified by reason of ownership which runs counter to some of the provisions of the Maritime Act.

No aid could be given the Commerce Committee by action at this time. What is proposed would constitute a precedent without a parallel. I shall object, and when the matter comes again before the Commerce Committee we shall take it up and consider it and report to the Senate upon Mr. Kennedy, along with the other members who have been nominated by the President to be members of the Maritime Commission.

In passing I ought to refer to a matter which I have had in mind and which does not influence me in the immediate case. I expect eventually to support the confirmation of Mr. Kennedy's nomination; but of the five commissioners appointed to serve on the Maritime Commission, not a member proposed comes from the Pacific coast, which has the longest coast line of any section of the country. I recall when the Maritime Commission was created, instead of placing in the measure the geographical description which was formerly found in acts of a similar nature, the statement was made that the President would deal fairly with each section of the country. This is the first opportunity I have had to state that we have not been treated fairly in the matter, and, while that does not enter into the question involved in this particular case, it may in some other case.

Mr. President, I conclude by announcing again that I emphatically object to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, before the matter is finally passed over, let me point out that if the services of Mr. Kennedy are to be availed of, it will probably be necessary to pass the joint resolution.

There is a provision in the law to the effect that if anyone has owned an interest in a shipbuilding concern or in ships within 3 years before the time of his appointment, he thereby becomes ineligible. As stated by the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], an opinion has been rendered to the effect that this does not make Mr. Kennedy ineligible; but Mr. Kennedy is in doubt about the matter. Members of the Commerce Committee are in doubt about the subject. I, myself, feel that a question is involved as to his eligibility.

The joint resolution does not in any sense interfere with the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce to pass upon the nomination. As stated by the able Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], it simply removes a question of doubt as to their right to consider the nomination favorably.

It has been said, I think, during the course of the discussion that Mr. Kennedy did not seek this position; that he never asked for the appointment. He was tendered the appointment because the appointing power felt that he was an able and good man, well qualified to perform the functions of the office.

After his appointment Mr. Kennedy himself, evidently having doubt as to his eligibility under a technical construction of the statute, brought the subject to the attention of the Commerce Committee and told them of the securities he owned, told them of the existence of the trust referred to by the Senator from Missouri, and also mentioned one or two other small property interests which relatives had, and perhaps another which he himself had, in concerns which are related to the shipbuilding industry.

This was commendable action on his part. The only course that I see that can be taken to permit consideration of his nomination is some such action as that which is proposed in the joint resolution.

As stated by the Senator from New York, quite a long time has already elapsed since the original bill was passed and since the necessity arose for the administration of its provisions.

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

Mr. ROBINSON. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. In line with what the Senator from Arkansas has said as to the necessity or desirability for the commission immediately to begin functioning, and particularly in view of the Senator's statement, with which I probably agree, that it will probably be necessary to pass such a joint resolution as the one now pending, I simply desire to call attention to the very great and pressing necessity in the matter due to the fact that the commission is confronted by two deadlines.

By the terms of the act itself, at a day certain, I believe April 30, or before that day certain, the commission must pass upon the question of personnel, because the personnel in office at that time, at the effective date, will be automatically converted into the civil service, and if it is desired to make any changes in personnel prior to conversion into the civil service, it will be necessary for the commission to begin operations at the earliest practicable date.

Also under the terms of the act it is necessary for the commission to negotiate new contracts for the carrying of mails and operation of ships, or to adjust old contracts on or before June 30 of the present year. It seems to me, in view of the fact that they must organize and pass upon all these exceedingly important questions, the commission has little enough time even now to effect the necessary decisions.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ROBINSON. Certainly.

Mr. McNARY. As I recall, the organic act creating a Maritime Commission of five members was passed in May 1936. Today is the 22d of March 1937. Why the present haste, when the President of the United States has had nine and a half months in which to act, without taking action?

Treating Mr. Kennedy's case as not the case of the commission, the names of the commissioners are now before the Commerce Committee. Let us bring them all down here, and then the Senate can pass upon the qualifications of Mr. Kennedy as applied to the state of facts brought to the attention of the Commerce Committee. We do not need any amendment of the organic act. The nomination simply brings up the question whether Mr. Kennedy's holdings are substantial and whether they come within the provisions of the act.

I suggest to the Senator from Arkansas that merely bringing the names before the Senate on a favorable report will raise the question. If it does not do so, then the Senator had better have his joint resolution to amend the act referred to the Commerce Committee.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I fully agree with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] that it is very strange that 9 months have elapsed since the bill became a law without the appointment of the members of the commission. I have fretted about the matter for a long time; but that does not absolve me as a Member of the Senate from taking as early action as I can after the nominations reach us. I am not going to fall back on the delinquency and failure of the White House to act as a defense for my failing to act. I think it is very vitally important that the Maritime Commission should be appointed and made to function, because otherwise we shall be in great distress.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. ROBINSON. Certainly.

Mr. BYRNES. With reference to what has been said by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], I only wish to say that I cannot indulge in any criticism of the White House because of the delay. If a delay of a few months can result in the selection of men like Mr. Kennedy, I hope there will be more delay in the selection of other appointees hereafter. The members of the Banking and Currency Committee and the members of the Appropriations Committee, who are in position to know the service rendered by Mr. Kennedy as Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, know that during many years we have not been so fortunate as to have a more efficient public servant than Mr. Joseph Kennedy; and if the action of the Senate can straighten out the matter so as to enable him to accept this position, I hope such action will be taken.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, as I stated earlier in my remarks, the act was approved June 29, 1936. Great difficulty has been encountered in finding men who are eligible and who are capable of carrying on the work of this very important commission. Delay has already occurred. No divestiture of his holdings would relieve Mr. Kennedy from possible criticism of ineligibility under the original act, because the act provides that no one shall be eligible who held securities of the character already described and well understood within 3 years before the time of his appointment; so that if Mr. Kennedy should sell or give away every interest he has that would not affect the question of his eligibility.

As I see the matter, it is solely an issue as to whether Senators desire the services of Mr. Kennedy. He feels that he ought not to be expected to run the gantlet of attack here on the ground of ineligibility when he has frankly stated the circumstances and conditions which surround that question.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. ROBINSON. I do.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. In line with the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the President acted quite promptly; and in the month of September or early October of last year he advised my predecessor, the late Senator James Couzens, that he wished him to accept the place as Chairman of the Maritime Commission. Of course, the unfortunate passing of Senator Couzens caused some further delay.

I may say in that connection that, of course, I regret that the area which I in part represent—the Great Lakes area—is not represented upon the commission; but I wish to call attention to the fact that the President acted promptly under the circumstances.

Mr. ROBINSON. Another question which has been raised, I think, by the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], relates to the action of the committee. He seems to have proceeded on the theory that the committee is under obligation to report all names at one time. It frequently happens in cases of this character that some names are reported

and others are held for further consideration. The committee may act upon this nomination at any time that it chooses.

If the Senator persists in his opposition to the consideration of the joint resolution—and, of course, he has the power and the right to do so, because it has not been considered by a standing committee of the Senate—I can and will ask a reference of the joint resolution to the Committee on Commerce. I can and will and do ask the committee, in the event it becomes necessary to do so, to give prompt consideration to the joint resolution, and to report it, if practicable, at the next session of the Senate, when, the day following that, I may be able, or some member of the committee may be able, to move the consideration of the joint resolution, which motion will be determined not by a single objection but by a majority vote.

I understood my friend the Senator from Oregon to announce that he would not consent to the consideration of the joint resolution at this time.

Mr. McNARY. I think I made that very clear; and I am glad the Senator from Arkansas has followed my advice, and has now requested the reference of the joint resolution to the Commerce Committee.

Mr. ROBINSON. No; I have not yet done so.

Mr. McNARY. I am quite sure the Senator will do so before the day is over.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, of course any one Senator may object to the consideration of a joint resolution when it is introduced. I did not need the advice of the Senator from Oregon—although I always appreciate it—to inform me of that fact; and I did not need the information that if the joint resolution goes to a committee and is reported by the committee, the Senate one day later at its will may then proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution.

I ask that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the joint resolution will be so referred.

EXTENSION AND COMPLETION OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, my information is that later on the Senator from Arkansas will make a motion that the Senate take a recess until next Thursday. Therefore at this juncture I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1170, so as to make it the unfinished business for consideration when the Senate meets again.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask to have the title of the bill stated before the request is acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the title of the bill.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1170) to provide for the extension and completion of the United States Capitol.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Texas does not desire to proceed with the consideration of the bill today. Believing that consideration should be promptly had of the joint resolution which was introduced a few moments ago, it is my intention to move an adjournment of the Senate until tomorrow; and then the Senate may proceed with the consideration of the pending bill, and the Committee on Commerce may have an opportunity to report tomorrow, if it chooses to do so.

I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DUFFY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the

United States submitting sundry nominations in the Army, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters, which were ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further reports of committees, the calendar is in order.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Guy K. Bard to be United States attorney, eastern district of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Andrew C. Pickens to be Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, with the rank of rear admiral.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William G. Du Bose to be Chief Constructor and Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair with the rank of rear admiral.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for promotions in the Regular Army.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc. That concludes the Executive Calendar.

ADJOURNMENT

The Senate resumed legislative session.

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 23, 1937, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 22 (legislative day of Mar. 19), 1937

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Maj. Morris Simpson Daniels, Jr., Cavalry, with rank from August 1, 1935.

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

First Lt. Bernard William McQuade, Infantry, with rank from August 1, 1935.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. Charles Edward Wheatley, Jr., Cavalry, with rank from August 1, 1935.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Elias Earle Cooley, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937, subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Thomas Dreux Hurley, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Josiah Baker Henneberger, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Paul Miller Crawford, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. George Sawyer Woodard, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. John Howard Sturgeon, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Raymond Wright Whittier, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Wood Sue Woolford, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Charles Benjamin Kendall, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Cadmus James Baker, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Herbert Lee Quickel, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Leon Alexander Fox, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Charles Kettig Berle, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. George Charles Henry Franklin, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. William Thomas Weissinger, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Samuel McPherson Browne, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Frank Lamont Cole, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Gerald D. France, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Miner Frank Felch, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Rowland Daniel Wolfe, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Clarke Blance, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Val Emile Miltenberger, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Edgar Fremont Haines, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Herbert Lentz Freeland, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Henry Fuller Philips, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Curtis Dudley Pillsbury, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. James Porter Crawford, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Henry Colmore Bradford, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Harry Hunt Towler, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Percy James Carroll, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. John Wade Watts, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. George Albert O'Connell, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Joseph Cushman Breitling, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Irwin Beede March, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. John Randolph Hall, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Louis Anatole LaGarde, Jr., Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Royal Kendall Stacey, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Charles Augustus Pfeffer, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Adolphus Alfred McDaniel, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. James Hubert Blackwell, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Floyd William Hunter, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937, subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Robert Earl Thomas, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Leonard Watson Hassett, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. John Roy Oswalt, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Joseph Edward Campbell, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Erick Martin Paulus Sward, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Paul Newkirk Bowman, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Merton Almond Farlow, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Herbert Wellington Taylor, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Harry Elton Hearn, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. William Joseph Froitzheim, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Thomas Hill Stewart, Jr., Medical Corps, from April 6, 1937.

Maj. Carlton Lakey Vanderboget, Medical Corps, from April 13, 1937.

Maj. Francis Elwood Weatherby, Medical Corps, from April 16, 1937.

To be captains

First Lt. William Titus Sichi, Medical Corps, from April 3, 1937.

First Lt. James Goree Moore, Medical Corps, from April 3, 1937.

First Lt. Robert LaShore Callison, Medical Corps, from April 4, 1937.

First Lt. William Donald Graham, Medical Corps, from April 7, 1937.

First Lt. Eugene Coryell Jacobs, Medical Corps, from April 10, 1937, subject to examination required by law.

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. George Magnor Krough, Dental Corps, from April 6, 1937.

To be captain

First Lt. Charles Joseph Cashman, Dental Corps, from April 1, 1937.

CHAPLAINS

To be chaplain with the rank of lieutenant colonel

Chaplain (Maj.) Charles Wadsworth Ball Hill, United States Army, from April 6, 1937.

To be chaplain with the rank of captain

Chaplain (First Lt.) John Thomas Kilcoyne, United States Army, from April 18, 1937.

APPOINTMENT TO TEMPORARY RANK IN THE AIR CORPS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Lt. Col. Millard Fillmore Harmon, Jr., to be colonel with rank from April 1, 1937.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES GENERAL OFFICER

Brig. Gen. Harold Richards Barker, Rhode Island National Guard, to be brigadier general, National Guard of the United States.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 22 (legislative day of Mar. 19), 1937

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Guy K. Bard to be United States attorney, eastern district of Pennsylvania.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Andrew C. Pickens to be Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, Department of the Navy.

William G. Du Bose to be Chief Constructor and Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, Department of the Navy.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Elmer Cuthbert Desobry to be colonel, Adjutant General's Department.

Jesse Beeson Hunt to be lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery.

Arthur Foster Gilmore to be major, Quartermaster Corps.

John August Otto to be major, Infantry.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 22, 1937

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Oh that men would praise the Lord for His goodness and for His wonderful works to the children of men. The Lord Jehovah liveth. The righteous shall flourish like the palm tree and shall spread abroad like the cedar of Lebanon.

Arouse, O Lord, in our land that conscience that saves from the clutch of selfishness, sin, and rebellion. We entreat Thee to break through the deep vault of every section until they are powerless against the majesty of righteousness, justice, and truth. Make our national life clear and benevolent, that all problems may be worked out in the calmness of brotherhood and cooperation. In this, the Passion Week of our Lord, we would tarry in Galilee. We would walk with the Master, hear His warnings, heed His entreaties; we would confess Him at the throne of eternal love and follow Him until daybreak in the garden, and Thine shall be the glory forever. Heavenly Father, preserve the health of our President and clothe him with great wisdom; do Thou sustain the health and strength of our most brotherly Speaker and all Members of this Chamber. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 19, 1937, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 328. An act for the relief of the estate of Letha F. McCubbin, the estate of Mary B. Hodge, and the estate of Walter H. Mansfield;

H. R. 1231. An act for the relief of John Munroe;

H. R. 3067. An act for the relief of John Edgar White, a minor;

H. R. 3201. An act for the relief of Bertha M. Harris;

H. R. 5487. An act to amend section 4551 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. II, title 46, sec. 643); and

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Greater Texas and Pan American Exposition, Dallas, Tex., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 595. An act for the relief of Mada Landtiser;

H. R. 3451. An act for the relief of F. M. Loeffler;

H. R. 3812. An act for the relief of the estate of Rees Morgan; and

H. R. 4951. An act to amend section 704 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (49 U. S. Stat. L. 2008-2009).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 74. An act for the relief of Melba Kuehl;

S. 191. An act for the relief of Orson Thomas;

S. 274. An act for the relief of Joseph N. Wenger, lieutenant, United States Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 316. An act for the relief of Edward Y. Garcia and Aurelia Garcia;

S. 434. An act for the relief of Rufus C. Long;

S. 435. An act for the relief of B. W. Winward;

S. 470. An act for the relief of Joseph M. Cacace, Charles M. Cacace, and Mary E. Clibourne;

S. 544. An act for the relief of M. K. Fisher;

S. 595. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, approved June 19, 1934, for the purpose of promoting safety of life and property at sea through the use of wire and radio

communications, to make more effective the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1929, and for other purposes;

S. 750. An act to grant relief to persons erroneously convicted in courts of the United States;

S. 1470. An act authorizing and empowering the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the old post-office building at Oakland, Calif., and to convey to the city of Oakland portions of the site for street-widening purposes in accordance with the provisions of public act approved August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 800);

S. 1550. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional circuit judges for the ninth judicial circuit;

S. 1570. An act granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota with respect to the Red River of the North; and

S. 1684. An act for the relief of the State of Pennsylvania.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) entitled "Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution providing for the prohibition of the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent countries; the prohibition of the transportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war by vessels of the United States for the use of belligerent states; for the registration and licensing of persons engaged in the business of manufacturing, exporting, or importing arms, ammunition, or implements of war; and restricting travel by American citizens on belligerent ships during war', approved August 31, 1935, as amended", requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. ROBINSON, and Mr. BORAH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be permitted to sit today during the session of the House.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert an address delivered by Hon. James M. Landis, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, before the Harvard Alumni Club, of Boston, March 17, 1937.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is James M. Landis still functioning as a Government official or is he now dean of the Harvard Law School?

Mr. MAVERICK. He is still head of the Securities and Exchange Commission. This is a high Government official speaking on a subject that concerns strikes.

Mr. RICH. Is he working for the Government now or is he connected with the Harvard Law School?

Mr. MAVERICK. He is working for the Government of the United States; he is doing a good job, too; he will soon be the dean of Harvard Law School.

Mr. RICH. Is he located in Washington?

Mr. MAVERICK. He is located in Washington, D. C., United States of America.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture considering the sugar bill be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House today and tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I presume this is in accordance with the desires of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. KLEBERG. Yes.

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

There was no objection.

SIT-DOWN STRIKES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for half a minute, and that I may be permitted to revise and extend my own remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the motto, "He who hesitates is lost", has application only when a question of principle is involved. It has no application when politicians are considering political expediency. Then the course is hesitation, indecision, vacillation, statements framed, if possible, to please everyone; thus loss of votes may be avoided.

No one desires violence, bloodshed, the shooting of strikers, nonstrikers, or innocent bystanders. Concededly, the sit-down strike in Michigan, which has degenerated into successful armed rebellion against authority of State and Nation, has neither legal, moral, nor economic justification.

From some stores, business places, comparatively small factories in Detroit, sit-down strikers have been thrown out by the police. But not many blocks away, sit-down strikers in automobile plants are guaranteed protection by the attitude of the Governor, who at Flint prevented police from interfering with or enforcing the law against sit-down strikers.

The strikers in the stores and small factories have no political influence.

Other unsuccessful sit-down strikers who were without political influence are Walter Doyle and his mother, Gertrude Doyle, who were ousted from their home in Ocean City, N. J., by Sheriff Paul M. Scull and four deputies, who moved their household goods out on the sidewalk, under an order obtained by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation of the Federal Government.

One class of sit-down strikers is made to feel the hand of the law. Another group enjoys immunity. Why? The answer is clear to one familiar with recent political events. It is, "Have you political influence?"

"Sit-downers" in the motor industry are supported by C. I. O., which has at its command millions of dollars and more millions of votes. They have political influence. This political influence, this vast sum of money which can be used for political purposes—the contribution last year was a half million—may explain—to my mind, it does explain—the break-down of the law in Michigan, where Governor Murphy is quoted in the New York papers of March 20 as saying that, in Detroit—

There is a general picture of high wages, good condition, security, and recognition which is one of the best in the country.

Wages here are the highest of any place in the country or the world.

He is also quoted as saying there would be no "compulsion."

The Governor further said:

All parties, in my opinion, are desirous of complying with the orders of the court, as the authorities of Michigan will expect everyone to do.

But it is not forgotten that when the sheriff of Genesee County wanted to enforce the order of the court to oust the sit-down strikers, Governor Murphy prevented him from doing so.

Why did not the Governor himself enforce the law and the court orders, as he now states it is the duty of all to do?

The Governor's failure in the first instance to enforce the laws and court orders, when but few were involved in this rebellion, is the chief contributing cause to the present defiance of Michigan's laws and court orders.

An unequivocal demand from the Governor of Michigan and the President of the United States for obedience to the law would end sit-down strikes and lead to arbitration and final, permanent settlement of the issues involved.

Hundreds of thousands of law-abiding citizens, workers who want their jobs and the opportunity to work, and hundreds of thousands of property owners call upon the Governor of Michigan and the President of the United States to make good the oath of office they took when they assumed

office and to protect them in their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. There is no need, there is no excuse for the President to remain silent until we have drifted into a state of civil war and then to assume the functions of a dictator. Let him act now—under the Constitution and the law which he took oath to maintain and enforce.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief joint statement by Hon. Manuel L. Quezon, President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, and Hon. Francis B. Sayre, Assistant Secretary of State, and also a resolution from the Philippine veterans in the Philippines.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] at Kalamazoo, Mich., on the evening of Friday, March 19, 1937.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE OF CONDOLENCE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE FRENCH CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the French Chamber of Deputies:

MARCH 20, 1937.

Cable via French, Paris.

President of the Chamber of Deputies to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, Washington, D. C.:

I express to you in behalf of the French Chamber of Deputies our deep sympathy for the catastrophe which has stricken the American Nation with a loss the more moving and affecting as it has killed so many of its young children, and beg to convey to their families our deepest sympathy.

EDOUARD HERRIOT, *President.*

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Speaker will address an appropriate reply to the President of the Chamber of Deputies of France.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, COMMERCE, AND LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1938

Mr. McMILLAN. 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. 5779) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and for other purposes; and, pending that, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON], the minority member of the committee, as to the time for general debate today, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] and myself.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, my suggestion is that we run along and see how we come out so far as today is concerned. I have a considerable number of requests for time on this side.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is contemplated, however, that general debate will close with today, at least?

Mr. BACON. May I say to the gentleman from Texas that is satisfactory to me.

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

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. 5779) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and for other purposes, with Mr. BUCK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the many municipal or city-owned electric plants which are already furnishing electricity at wholesale to farm membership electric companies are not acting alone from benevolence or public spirit but because they are not only increasing their profits but are reducing the cost of electricity to the consumers of the towns and cities.

By contracting with the farm electric company to furnish electricity at wholesale to farmers, the municipal or city-owned plants are increasing their production—the volume or output of electricity—one-third, or doubled, or many times over, accordingly as the farm consumers require.

THE ECONOMIC LAW OF COSTS

It is a well-recognized and accepted principle under the law of economic cost that the cost of a service or the cost of any product is determined by the scale of operation or the volume or amount of production under which the service or product is provided.

Under this economic law, the larger the scale of operations the lower will be the cost of the service, or the larger the volume of production the lower will be the cost of the product, and under which operations the small-scale operations make low cost impossible.

For this reason, it is greatly to the interest of the electrical consumers of every town or city operating an electrical generating plant, to take over the production of electricity to supply the surrounding farm territory for the purpose of increasing its output and reducing the unit cost to its own consumers.

WILL REDUCE RATES TO BOTH CITY AND FARM CONSUMERS

Such joint or cooperative operations by and between municipal or city-owned plants and farm electrical companies will not only reduce the rates of electricity to the lowest possible minimum, but the economy of larger scale production will bring down the costs for electricity, the same to the farm and the towns or city consumers.

The reason why farm and rural areas cannot be served separately and apart from the towns and cities of the territory at low and reasonable rates is the identical and same reason why the consumers of towns and smaller cities cannot be served separately and alone from the consumer at such low and reasonable rates.

Municipal or city-owned electrical plants generating electricity for double the consumers, their own and the farmers of the surrounding territory, will reduce the costs or price to both in proportion to the increase of electricity generated. This is the economic principle of mass production operated not only for the benefit of the few but for the consuming mass of the people.

HOW LOW COSTS INCREASE USE AND CONSUMPTION

While not equally true for city consumers, it is true of farm electric consumers that a low rate or charge to consumers makes the use of electricity practical for almost an unlimited number of farm operations and doubles farm consumption of electricity or multiplies consumption many times over.

"This increased farm consumption operates to the benefit of city consumers as well as to the farm population." Every unit of increase of the city plant to supply the increased demands of farmers (in the same ratio reduces or) lowers the cost of electricity to the city consumers.

FARMERS WILL USE ELECTRICITY FOR MANY OPERATIONS

With a lower rate and charge for current, farmers will extend the use of electric power to other and many more farm operations to their profit and increased advantage, multiplying manifold their consumption of electricity in such farm and farm-home operations.

It is, therefore, greatly to the interest of town and city electricity consumers that their municipal- and city-owned plants take over the production of electricity for the farm electrical companies now being organized and provide electric power for both city and rural consumers.

In other words, it is as much or more to the interests and special advantage of the consumers of a city electricity

plant that the plant furnish the electricity at wholesale for the farm companies than it is to the farmers and rural consumers.

WILL NOT LOWER COSTS UNDER PRIVATE-COMPANY OPERATIONS

But this increase in volume of production under the economic law of cost only operates to reduce electric rates under municipal or city ownership and where production and distribution is carried on for use and service of the patrons or consumers and not for dividends, profits, and gains.

Under private company ownership operations solely for dividends, profits, and gains the increased output or production and the lower unit cost resulting would be shown only in the higher dividends, profits, and gains to stockholders and not in lower rates to consumers.

PRIVATE ELECTRIC COMPANIES OWNED BY HOLDING COMPANIES

To understand properly the reasons why the same increase in volume and production which lowers the cost of electricity to consumers under municipal- or city-owned plants will not operate to lower the cost of electricity produced under private electric plants, it must be realized and understood that the stock or shares of the local private plants are all held, manipulated, and controlled by certain foreign electric companies commonly known as holding companies, and all increased earnings are claimed for profits and dividends to stockholders.

WHERE ALL SAVINGS AND OPERATIONS WILL BENEFIT CONSUMERS

But municipal- or city-owned electrical plants are not required to take the savings realized from greater or increased production to pay millions for newspaper and other propaganda to maintain and justify their organization before the people of the country. And they have no stockholders to claim such savings in operations for increased dividends, profit, and gains.

LOW RATES WITH ELECTRICITY WITHOUT WATER POWER

Under more modern inventions and discoveries low and reasonable charges for electricity are no longer possible only at and near water-power sites. But electric power may now be developed at equally low or lower costs at any inland point in the country.

DIESEL AND HIGH-PRESSURE STEAM ENGINES

And now the marvel of the power developed by the Diesel engine is to be far outrivalled by the invention of a new design of high-pressure steam engines multiplying power manifold from a fraction or far less fuel consumed.

The invention of the Diesel engine and other forms of power now developed has made the production of electricity possible at lower and more reasonable cost at any town or inland county seat and available to electrical consumers of towns, cities, and farm territories alike.

WHY RATES ARE NOT LOWERED UNDER PRIVATE COMPANIES

There is a reason why under private electric companies, even with these new improved facilities multiplying and increasing manifold, the production and amount of electricity and lowering the unit cost of current the cost of electricity to consumers will not be brought down to the cost to the people.

These new power-producing inventions increasing the production of electricity at lower cost will not bring a reduction to the consumers under private electric companies. This is because the private electric company, under foreign holding companies, are required to apply all savings in operations to dividends, profits, and gains.

But municipal- or city-owned electric plants are not required to take savings in operation to pay millions for newspaper propaganda necessary to maintain and justify themselves before the people of the country.

ECONOMY OF INCREASED PRODUCTION NOT THE ONLY ADVANTAGE TO CITY CONSUMERS

But the economy of increased production and the increased sales of electricity is not the only profit and advantage gained by municipal- or city-owned plants in joining with the farm electrical company, and furnishing farm consumers with electricity.

There are many other services required to be performed by the farm electrical company which the municipal- or city-owned plant can perform for the farm membership at great profit and advantage to the municipal- or city-owned plant as well as to the farm electrical company.

MANY SERVICES THE CITY PLANT CAN PERFORM FOR FARM COMPANIES TO ADVANTAGE

After the rural lines are built, the farm electric membership company will require many services to be performed in the operation of their distributing system for which they are not especially equipped and for which they cannot properly prepare to perform without great present expense and outlay of money.

The rural electric membership will require constantly from time to time the services of an electrical engineer. This the municipal-, town-, or city-owned plant has already provided, and on its pay rolls, and such services can be furnished to the rural membership company, both at low cost to the farmers and at a great saving to the city.

MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR SERVICE

The rural membership electrical company will require a maintenance and repair service to restore fallen poles, wires, and make repairs, the equipment for which is costly not only to provide but to hold ready for service.

The town or city electric plants have such equipment already available and can furnish such services promptly to the rural electric membership at lower cost than can be provided by the farm company itself and at the same time effect great savings to the city.

Such repair and maintenance department of the town or city electrical plant is made or held subject to call from any part of the surrounding farm territory, and repairs are made promptly without delay, of great and valuable service to the farmers and at the same time reducing the operating expense of the city plant.

METERS, BILLS, AND ACCOUNTING

Then the rural meters must be read and the accounts billed out to the farm consumers and there must be an adequate accounting service maintained at all times, and reports made, for which the town- or city-owned plant is already fully equipped with facilities to make and keep prompt and accurate accounts.

The town or city plants can furnish such services to the rural electric membership company and perform the same efficiently and at lower costs than the farm membership could provide for, and at the same time effect a very substantial saving to the town and city electrical plant.

LEGAL AND OTHER SERVICES

And the same can be said of legal services and the many incidental services necessary and required by farm electric companies, and which can be performed by the town or city plant at comparatively low and trivial cost and at a great and substantial saving both to the city plant and to the farm cooperative company.

Such services performed for both city and farm company utilizing the same facilities and equipment always lying idle a greater part of the time will eliminate much loss and waste and work great economy in operations alike to city plants and farm company.

Under such a policy of providing electricity the charges can be brought down to the consumers at the lowest possible rate consistent with efficient and reliable services.

GREAT ADVANTAGES COMING TO MERCHANTS

But such a mutual arrangement for the performance of these incidental services will bring to the merchants of the town or city more than ordinary or usual business opportunity, the opportunity to negotiate with the farmers and solicit their orders and contracts for many electrical utensils and equipments.

Bills rendered for electricity used will constantly bring the farmers of the county to the town or city for adjustment and payment, there to meet and confer with the merchants for further electrical work and supplies, leading to a better and more familiar acquaintance, and the opportu-

nity to show equipment and quote prices, and submit offers or contracts for the work.

WIRING HOUSES AND FURNISHING ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT

After the farm distributive lines are built the Government will make another loan to the farm electrical consumers for the purpose of wiring farm buildings and providing necessary farm equipment to enable all farmers to begin the full use of electricity at one time.

LOANS MADE TO MERCHANTS SUPPLYING FARMERS

This all will average not less than \$150 for each and every farm consumer and will total in all from \$100,000 to \$300,000 to a county. These loans will be made to farmers direct with which to pay for wiring and equipment or to the persons, business firms, or corporations furnishing equipment or providing the service.

If the contract for furnishing electric current is entered into with the private farm electrical company this latter company will be afforded an opportunity, and of which opportunity advantage will be taken to solicit the wiring of the farm houses, and furnishing the equipment required. And the local business interests of the town or city will be without opportunity to negotiate for the business.

CLOSER RELATIONSHIP OF BUSINESSMEN WITH FARMERS

By the local municipal- or city-owned plant contracting with the farm electrical company to furnish current and other electric service, the businessmen of the town or city will be afforded a closer relationship with the farmers, and with the opportunity to furnish and provide the farmers with electrical appliances for any purpose required as users and consumers of electricity.

SOME OF THE APPLIANCES REQUIRED FOR THE FARM HOME

The following are some of the many uses which electricity can be made to serve to relieve from the irksome drudgery of woman's work on the farm, and the many comforts, conveniences, and pleasures which electricity will bring to the farm home and the electrical equipment for which the merchants of the town or city will be called upon to supply:

For churning,	For refrigerators,
For corn poppers,	For sewing machines,
For doorbells,	For sausage grinders,
For hair driers,	For toasters,
For hair clippers,	For vacuum cleaners,
For bottle heaters,	For waffle irons,
For water heaters,	For washing machines,
For curling irons,	For water coolers,
For flatirons,	For water pumps,
For lighting dwellings,	For dish washers,
For radio sets,	For air-conditioning systems,
For electric ranges,	And for other uses.

SOME OF THE EQUIPMENT NEEDED ON THE FARM

And the following are some of the tasks performed by electric power on the farm to relieve the burdens of farm work and the electrical appliances for which the merchants would be afforded the opportunity to furnish and sell to the farmers:

For cooling milk,	For grinding feed and grain,
For pasteurizing milk,	For threshing,
For bottling milk,	For heating water tanks,
For operating brooders,	For hoisting hay,
For charging batteries,	For making ice,
For making cheese,	For operating incubators,
For cleaning grain,	For milking cows,
For clipping horses,	For mixing feed,
For cold storage,	For repair-shop machinery,
For concrete mixers,	For running grindstones,
For shelling corn,	For sawing wood,
For separating cream,	For shearing sheep,
For cutting ensilage and feed,	For pumping water,
For running frost-preventing fans,	For lighting barns,
	For lighting stables,
	And other uses.

THE DEMAND WILL BE CONTINUOUS AND INCREASING

Such general use of electricity stimulated in such more and liberal greater volume as will be used under such lower and reduced rates will continually call for more and more

electrical equipment, both for wiring and installation of new appliances for the use of electricity on the farm.

The benefits from this part of the program will be generally distributed among the merchants and business interests in the sale of many electrical utensils and appliances which such increased use will call for.

THE KILOWATT-HOUR OF ELECTRICITY AND WHAT IT WILL DO ON THE FARM

The kilowatt-hour is a measure of electricity, is a certain amount of electric power, like the pound is a certain amount of rice or flour, or the bushel is a measure or certain amount of wheat, corn, rye, oats, or potatoes.

The following is a list of some of the uses and some of the labor-saving operations which electricity will bring to the farm home, and what one kilowatt-hour will do and the cost to perform the service, taking the average farm consumption as 100 kilowatt-hours under the Peru, Ind., municipal farm rate:

WHAT 1 KILOWATT-HOUR WILL DO IN THE FARM HOME

One kilowatt-hour, at a cost of 4 cents,
Will light a 40-watt lamp for 25 hours, or
Run a flatiron for 2 hours, or
Pump 1,000 gallons of water from a shallow well, or
Wash 70 pounds of clothes, or
Refrigerate food for 18 hours, or
Run a radio for 15 hours, or
Run a vacuum cleaner for 3 hours, or
Cook a meal on an electric range, or
Run a sewing machine for 8 hours, or
Tell time for 20 days, or
Operate a mangle for 30 minutes, or
Take care of door bells for a month and one-half, or
Toast bread for 8 mornings, or
Percolate 40 cups of coffee, or
Operate kitchen mixer for 20 hours, or
Heat 3 gallons water from 65 to 212 degrees, or
Run a 6-inch fan for 50 hours, or
Run pump for 3 hours, or
Heat pad for 15 hours, or
Heat curling iron for 42 hours, or
Operate radiant heater for 2 hours, or
Make 10 batches of ice cream, or
Run exhaust fan for 5 hours, or
Operate sun lamp for 1½ hours, or
Make 30 waffles, or
Operate moving-picture machine 4 hours, or
Operate razor-blade sharpener 40 hours, or
Stoke ¼ ton of coal, or
Heat a hot plate for 2 hours.

There are many other uses in the home, such as pants pressers, tie pressers, floor polishers, sick-room vaporizers, egg boilers, water coolers, hair driers, toys, trains, Christmas-tree lights, jigsaws, bottle warmers, massage machines, drink mixers, corn poppers, dumb-waiters, clothes driers, elevators, and electric razors.

The following is a list of some of the uses and operations which electricity will perform on the farm at great saving of time and labor, relieving farmers of many burdensome drudgeries and adding to their earnings and income and the cost to perform the work:

WHAT 1 KILOWATT-HOUR WILL DO ON THE DAIRY FARM

One kilowatt-hour, at a cost of 4 cents,
Will milk 30 cows, or
Cool 10 gallons of milk, or
Separate 2,000 pounds of cream and milk, or
Wash 2,000 milk bottles, or
Bottle 500 gallons of milk at 24 quarts per minute, or
Operate milk irradiator for 6 hours, or
Put a ton of ensilage in a 30-foot silo, or
Elevate 1,500 pounds of shavings.

Other uses include utensil sterilizers, feed grinders, fly screens, milk testers, food-handling and water-control machinery, bottle cappers, and precooling.

WHAT 1 KILOWATT-HOUR WILL DO ON THE POULTRY FARM

One kilowatt-hour, at a cost of 4 cents,
Will hatch four chickens in an incubator, or

Brood one chick through entire season, or
 Test eggs for 40 hours, or
 Light a 100-bird poultry house for 4 days, or
 Cut 300 pounds of green feed, or
 Grind 90 pounds of bone or shells, or
 Shred 500 pounds of roots, or
 Operate a 200-watt floodlight for 5 hours, or
 Cut 1,000 pounds of straw in 2-inch lengths.

Electricity is also used for sprouting oats, warming drinking water by an immersion heater.

WHAT 1 KILOWATT-HOUR WILL DO ON THE GRAIN AND LIVESTOCK FARM

One kilowatt-hour at a cost of 4 cents
 Will shell 30 bushels of corn, or
 Grind 400 pounds of shelled corn, or
 Grind 100 pounds of ear corn, or
 Grind 100 pounds of oats, or
 Grind 200 pounds of rye, or
 Grind 200 pounds of wheat, or
 Husk and shred 3 bushels of corn, or
 Grind 90 pounds of hay, or
 Thresh 4 bushels of oats, or
 Clean and grade 100 bushels of small grain, or
 Clean and grade 30 bushels of small seed, or
 Bale 4 bales of hay, or
 Shear 40 sheep, or
 Hoist 4 tons of hay, or
 Clip and groom animals for 5 hours, or
 Operate hay dryer 15 minutes (with fuel oil), or
 Grind 250 pounds of meat, or
 Operate seed tester for 12½ hours.

Other uses include pig brooders, feed mixers, branding irons, and animal exercisers.

WHAT 1 KILOWATT-HOUR WILL DO ON ANY FARM AT CONVENIENCE

One kilowatt-hour at a cost of 4 cents
 Will grind 50 axes, or
 Gum ten 5-foot cross-saws, or
 Run a paint spray machine 4 hours, or
 Grade 600 bushels of potatoes, or
 Mix 2 cubic yards of concrete, or
 Saw a cord of wood, or
 Operate 2 square yards of hot bed 24 hours where the outside temperature is 40°, or
 Operate one-fourth horsepower utility motor 5½ hours, or
 Operate air compressor 2 hours, or
 Charge batteries 7 hours, or
 Operate forge blower 5 hours, or
 Operate engine warmer 5 hours, or
 Operate drill 3½ hours, or
 Operate grindstone 3.8 hours, or
 Cook 62 pounds of bulbs, or
 Operate hedge trimmer 5 hours, or
 Operate lathe 1.8 hours.

Other uses include glue pots, soldering irons, cultivators, hive warmers, and potato kilns.

These are not complete lists but give a fair representation of the relationship between the kilowatt-hour of electricity and the work done. The figures will vary under different conditions.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] had to say the other day with respect to the report of the Brownlow reorganization committee as it related to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and other regulatory commissions or independent establishments of the Government. With him, may I say, that I am a friend of reorganization and hope to be able to support some of the intended legislation. I hope I may be able to support all of the legislation to be reported by the Joint Committee on Reorganization. I certainly cannot and shall not support it if the joint committee accepts some of the recommendations of the Brownlow committee which clearly would disorganize the present set-up wherein and whereby beneficent results have been accomplished.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

In a limited way I know something about the reorganization of administrative management of State and municipal governments, from observation and from experience.

I am much interested in the general proposition. I have been reading the reports of reorganization commissions and committees and President's messages to Congress suggesting administrative changes.

It seems to me and it is my present impression and opinion that to make the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and other similar independent commissions into bureaus in some department or other of the Government would be a most serious mistake.

I wish all of you would read what Mr. MAPES says about these independent commissions—their origin; the reasons for their being; their functions and their responsibility to Congress, and Congress alone. It is important that you get the picture before you. Incidentally, you can, if you wish, renew your familiarity with what the Supreme Court has had to say with respect to some of these independent commissions and their responsibility to Congress as the delegative agents of Congress. But see what Mr. MAPES said on pages 1856 et sequentes of the RECORD. I quote briefly as indicative of the nature of his remarks—RECORD, page 1857:

IMPORTANCE OF COMMISSIONS

It would be hard to overstate the importance of these commissions. Every one of us, every American citizen, is directly affected by their work in his everyday life. In recognition of their importance and in order that they might be as free as possible from political and other control, Congress in creating them has given them an independent status outside of the regular departments of the Government, which are under the jurisdiction and the control of the members of the Cabinet. Up to this hour they are and always have been responsible to Congress, and to Congress alone. The Brownlow committee would change all this.

RECOMMENDATION OF BROWNLOW COMMITTEE

It is impossible to get the full import and implications of the Brownlow committee report without a careful study of it; but, stated briefly, as far as its proposal relating to these regulatory commissions is concerned, it recommends that they be deprived of their independent status, placed in one or another department of the Government, and put under the control of, and made responsible to, a member of the Cabinet, a political appointee, and, through him, to the President. After that has been done, the work of the commissions is to be divided; the legislative, or quasi-legislative, part of it is to be separated from the judicial, or quasi-judicial, part and performed by a bureau or division, set up in the department for that purpose, the members of the commissions proper to confine themselves in the future to the purely judicial part of the work now performed by them.

MEANS POLITICAL CONTROL

This recommendation, if carried out, means a radical change in a long-established practice of the Government and involves a question of public policy of fundamental importance. It seems to me, and to others with whom I have discussed the matter, that it would change the very nature of the Interstate Commerce Commission; in fact, that it would destroy it as we have known it and as it has existed throughout the years. A former member of the Commission, testifying before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House a few days ago, gave it as his opinion that it would be better to abolish the Commission altogether than to put into effect this recommendation of the Brownlow committee.

Putting these commissions under a member of the Cabinet means political control. Can anyone imagine anything more unfortunate? It means direct and constant contact between the Executive and the commissions, which would deprive them of the independence which they now enjoy. Their work would hereby be subjected to political influence which might prove very powerful when an administration had some political policy or plan it desired to put across or when the exigencies of party politics seemed to demand it. Think of the power which an Executive would have under such circumstances to reward or punish if he saw fit to use it for that purpose.

BETTER ABOLISH COMMISSIONS ALTOGETHER

Who would want to make a political campaign upon the issue of whether railroad rates should be lowered or raised? When one contemplates the possibilities of this proposal, he can well understand the feeling of the former member of the Interstate Commerce Commission who declared it would be better to abolish the Commission altogether.

The friends of the work of these commissions may take some encouragement from the apparent uncertainty of the Brownlow committee itself as to the wisdom of the recommendation.

The report speaks of it as a "possible solution" only. Referring to it, the report says:

"The following proposal is put forward as a possible solution of the independent-commission problem, present and future."

That language indicates that the committee itself was not certain of the wisdom of its position. It may be that upon further reflection it will withdraw the recommendation which it has made as to these commissions. It is devoutly to be hoped that it will; but if it does not, then the friends of the work which they are delegated to perform must rely upon the good judgment of the reorganization committees of the House and Senate not to report any legislation which will attempt to put the recommendation into effect.

MORE BUREAUS OR CORPORATIONS

As between bureaus and the formation of corporations one stands between the devil and the deep sea. The answer is found in not permitting these independent commissions to be disturbed in their present state, if you ask me.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONS SHOULD BE INDEPENDENT

I may not be able to look at this matter as I should for I am unalterably opposed to any further increase in useless bureaus or trend toward bureaucracy. Above all things else which should be avoided, these independent commissions should not be subjected to domination by, or to the partisan political whim of, any group of men, or any one man, who temporarily may be snapping the whip.

GOVERNMENTAL MACHINERY INEFFICIENT

Governmental administration machinery, overloaded as it has been, has slowed down. It is inefficient in operation, due to enlargement of functions, increase of load, and changes in patterns.

No one should entertain the mistaken notion that this situation can or will be rectified in a minute, or that wholesale abandonment of existing set-up, the substitution of new parts for old in the machinery, a general overhaul, a remodeling of the plant, the installation of new machinery, the employment of inexperienced help can or does mean anything more or other than an increase in expense.

Such reorganizations as are contemplated do not make for economy. Savings never immediately accompany such changes, if ever. It is to be hoped that something along the line suggested might be accomplished and some saving eventually effectuated. Experience, however, offers no substantial basis for entertaining any such hope, and we might as well understand it.

OFFICE OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

For the present I shall confine myself, and desire to direct your attention, to the consideration of the report, insofar as it relates to the Office of the Comptroller General.

You all have a copy of the report of the President's committee. I commend to your careful consideration the recommendations of that committee, which are found on page 20, paragraph B, of the report under the heading "B. Direction and Control of Accounting and Expenditures."

I must be brief. I assure you I did not tend to take so much time. So, with the recommendation that you read carefully this portion of the report, I am going to pass to other matters.

PUBLIC, NO. 13 (67TH CONG.)

As a matter of legislative history, Congress enacted Public, No. 13, in the Sixty-seventh Congress, which was "An act to provide a National Budget system and an independent audit of Government accounts, and for other purposes."

By, and by virtue of, title 3 of that act there was created an establishment of the Government to be known as the General Accounting Office, to be independent of the executive departments, and under the control and direction of the Comptroller General of the United States. You should read this, and more than once.

HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 493 (72D CONG., 2D SESS.)

You should read House Document No. 493 (72d Cong., 2d sess.), which is a message from the President of the United States transmitting his recommendation "to guard, coordinate, and consolidate executive and administrative agencies of the Government as nearly as may be according to major purposes."

OTHER REPORTS HEREIN MENTIONED

You should read the report of the Joint Committee on Reorganization of the Administrative Branches of the Government, made by Mr. MAPES, of Michigan, for the Joint

Committee on Reorganization, created under the joint resolution adopted December 17, 1920, which is House Document No. 356, of the Sixty-eighth Congress.

In this connection I commend to your careful consideration Report No. 524, of the second session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, found in Senate Reports, volume I, as Calendar No. 476, reported by Mr. McCormick from the Special Committee on the National Budget; the report of Mr. Good from the Select Committee on the Budget, known as Report No. 362, Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, found in volume II, Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, of House Reports, identified as Union Calendar No. 114.

You should also examine the report from the Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill to provide a National Budget System and Independent Audit of Government Accounts, found in Report No. 1044, of the Sixty-sixth Congress, second session.

CHECK ON USELESS AND ILLEGAL EXPENDITURES

And lastly, so far as I am concerned, I suggest that you study carefully Report No. 14, Sixty-seventh Congress, first session, from the Select Committee on the Budget, made by Mr. Good, and I particularly call your attention to the statement therein made to the effect that:

The only way by which Congress can hold a check on expenditures is to continue a control and audit of the accounts by an independent establishment. * * * The creation of this office will enable it to furnish information to Congress and to its committees regarding the expenditures of the Government. * * * The creation of this office will, it is seen, serve as a check not only on useless expenditures but will keep the Bureau more keenly alive to a rigid performance of its duties.

In conclusion it is desired again to point out that the provisions of the bill as framed by it carry no departure from the fundamental political principles of the present Government of the United States. It rather seeks to emphasize and make more effective those principles. It thus makes more definite the constitutional obligation that rests upon the President "from time to time to give to Congress information of the state of the Union and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient" and furnishes him with the means by which he may meet this obligation. It provides for no restriction on the part of Congress to modify the proposals of the President, but, on the other hand, seeks to have such proposals come before it in such a form, so itemized, classified, and supported by detailed data, as will enable it more effectively to perform this function.

LAW OBSERVANCE IN USE OF APPROPRIATED MONEYS

Now, Mr. Chairman, this law which we are considering was deliberately enacted and the General Accounting Office was set up for the single purpose and with the single intent to do one thing, namely, to require law observance in the uses of appropriated moneys—to aid the Congress in this regard in discharging a constitutional responsibility to the people. It has accomplished that purpose, and in so doing has carried out the intent of Congress.

As someone has well said, the authority of the congressional branch to require law observance in the uses of appropriated moneys and in executive expenditures goes back to the days of William of Orange. William had been called from Holland to rule England when the English found it impossible to rule themselves. After he was safely in England a political sand boil spurted up behind the Dutch dikes. William asked the English Parliament for more money. Parliament suspected he wanted the money to cover the costs of his armies in Holland.

"What for?" asked Parliament.

"None of your business", said William. (This may not be an absolutely verbatim report.) "I'm the King, what? Send me the money and I'll spend it the way I want to. I can do a far better job of spending than you can."

"Go, my fair liege", replied Parliament in effect, "and jump in the lake."

The principle that the money-producing body shall say how the money shall be spent has been upheld in English and American jurisprudence ever since.

CRITICISMS BECAUSE ACT WORKED AS INTENDED TO WORK

Mr. Chairman, at the bottom of all the criticisms of the act which established the Office of Comptroller General, and the real, uncampaigned reason underlying all other, given by

those who would offer a new scheme or system, is the fact that the act worked as it was intended it should work, and exactly as Congress proposed to have it work. It accomplished those very things which it undertook to effectuate, therefore it should not be changed or amended for the purpose of emasculation or repeal.

STRENGTHENED, NOT WEAKENED

That it has functioned as it was intended it should is the compelling reason for strengthening rather than weakening the provisions of the act, for its continuance, and for the position I have above taken. It should remain unmolested by those who would interfere with it, undisturbed by those who claim they have suffered interference by reason of it, and unassailed by others who have undoubtedly been inconvenienced.

Were the matter to be gone into on Congress' own volition and motion out of the experience of the years, there would of necessity come the conviction that the independent audit system should be strengthened, not weakened, emasculated, or crucified, as proposed by the President's committee.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL THE AGENT OF CONGRESS

Significant facts which should not be overlooked by Members of Congress are found in the language of the act creating a General Accounting Office, an office—

Which shall be independent of the executive departments and under control and direction of the Comptroller General of the United States.

In this act it is provided that:

Among other things, as the agent of Congress—

The Comptroller General or the Assistant Comptroller General may be removed at any time by joint resolution of Congress after notice and hearing when, in the judgment of Congress, the Comptroller General or Assistant Comptroller General has become permanently incapacitated or has been inefficient, or guilty of neglect of duty, or of malfeasance in office, or of any felony or conduct involving moral turpitude, and for no other cause and in no other manner except by impeachment * * *.

(b) He shall make such investigations and reports as shall be ordered by either House of Congress or by any committee of either House having jurisdiction over revenue, appropriations, or expenditures. The Comptroller General shall also, at the request of any such committee, direct assistants from his office to furnish the committee such aid and information as it may request.

(c) The Comptroller General shall specially report to Congress every expenditure or contract made by any department or establishment in any year in violation of law.

(d) He shall submit to Congress reports upon the adequacy and effectiveness of the administrative examination of accounts and claims in the respective departments and establishments and upon the adequacy and effectiveness of departmental inspection of the offices and accounts of fiscal officers.

Why should Congress be asked to surrender not only the right but its duty to require law observance? It should not.

Congress should insist that the Office of Comptroller General should be continued substantially pursuant to the terms and according to the provisions of the act by which it was created, strengthened, and circumscribed only with and by the limitations therein contained be empowered to function effectively and independently as prescribed and made possible by the act.

CONGRESS SHOULD DEFEND ITSELF AND PRESERVE ITS PREROGATIVES

Congress should protect itself. It should resent and show its unmistakable disapproval of every suggestion looking toward the surrender by it of any of its rights and prerogatives, and most emphatically should it decline to surrender its authority and duty to require law observance. [Applause.]

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, it is my desire today to call attention to the membership of this House the necessity for curtailing appropriations by the Congress of the United States. Continuing appropriations as we have been doing is not for the best interest of the Government.

To refresh your recollection, I will state in round sums the appropriations for the second session of the Seventy-fourth Congress and also what is likely to be appropriated for the first session of the Seventy-fifth Congress.

Total appropriations, 74th Cong., 2d sess. (including interest on public debt, sinking fund, and other permanent appropriations), being for the fiscal year 1937 and also embracing supplemental and deficiency appropriations for the fiscal year 1936	\$10,336,000,000
Less appropriations for Adjusted Compensation Payment Act (bonus)	2,237,000,000
All other	8,099,000,000

Total estimates of appropriations in the Budget as submitted to the 75th Cong., 1st sess. (including interest on the public debt, sinking fund, and other permanent appropriations), being for the fiscal year 1938 but not including relief or emergency conservation work (C. C. C.)	6,520,000,000
Relief and recovery (the Budget message expressed the hope it would not exceed this amount for 1938) ¹	1,537,000,000
Emergency conservation work (C. C. C.). (The law for the C. C. C. expires on June 30 next and continuance is dependent upon legislation at this session for a permanent policy. To date no bill has been taken up.) The appropriations for the present fiscal year total	403,000,000
Appropriations in first deficiency act at this session, consisting principally of relief, C. C. C., and crop loans	950,000,000
	9,410,000,000

¹ Appropriations for relief for the fiscal year 1937 consist of primary appropriation of \$1,425,000,000 and supplemental appropriation of \$789,000,000—a total of \$2,214,000,000. To hold relief to \$1,537,000,000 for 1938 means a decrease under 1937 funds of \$677,000,000, into which enters the factors of employment in private industry, improvements in business conditions, etc.

You can readily see that in all probability the expenditures for this coming fiscal year will be \$9,410,000,000; but this does not include any increase in appropriations for that which has already been authorized under the law. As an illustration, under the Flood Control Act \$30,000,000 are the Budget figures for this coming fiscal year. If any increase is desired, that will mean just that much more.

No one knows yet or no one can give an estimate of what the farm-tenancy and crop-insurance plans will cost. An estimate is \$175,000,000.

In the short statement that I am making I am not at the present time speaking about revenues that we collect, but I am trying to impress upon you the necessity for a curtailment of expenditures.

I might have added in speaking to you just now of the other expenditures that confront us that a great many are asking that the relief appropriations be increased up to two and one-quarter billion dollars, over seven hundred million more than the Budget calls for.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come when we, as Members of Congress, must seriously consider the necessity of curtailing expenditures, of committees' making authorizations for expenditures, and of the Appropriations Committee's reporting out appropriation bills. And the time is here when it is necessary for us to have a sit-down strike on making appropriations for and spending unnecessary money. [Applause.]

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the words of the gentleman who just took his seat. It is rather courageous for a gentleman on that side of the aisle to make a speech of that kind. They are usually reserved for Members of the minority party, but the alarm bells are now ringing on the New Deal. We note a good deal of impatience on the part of many of the majority party.

She was suing for divorce. The judge asked her, "Can you allege cruelty; has he struck you yet?" "No; but he goes about slamming his fist against the doors and saying under his breath, 'I wish it was you.'" [Laughter.]

Probably, and soon, many of you are going to slam your remarks against something that is not a door, and the results may be persuasive. The New Deal has a real case of acute indigestion at the moment. The doctors in attendance, Eccles, Morgenthau, and Wallace, very suddenly seem to have demanded a complete reversal of the treatment they them-

selves have been administering to the patient in large doses. Now will these other doctors, Ickes, Hopkins, and Perkins, cooperate? The gentleman from North Carolina, in his earnest appeal, indicated that he hoped so.

Certainly Dr. Eccles shocked the Nation with a statement of the patient's true condition, and although he is greatly to be commended now, and his logic is completely convincing, it would have been more satisfactory to many of us had he also been willing to acknowledge that he himself, to a large extent, had been responsible for the recent huge Government spending by his assertions that he did not fear a Federal debt of \$40,000,000,000, and that the Budget need not necessarily be balanced oftener than once in 10 years.

I have quoted this statement of his before. It is here in this volume for your delectation, if you wish to read it. Now he seems to have maneuvered himself into a very tight place and states that he is being misrepresented.

As I understand it, Mr. Eccles was a very prominent and successful banker in the State of Utah, who not only saved his own banks but his own fortune before coming to Washington.

I think he was an Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, and was afterward made Governor of the Federal Reserve Board. I certainly do not wish to misrepresent him, but, of course, I think he was the man most responsible for that complete somersault that your President turned in 1933. When he was seeking election he promised to balance the Budget; to cut the expenses of the Federal Government 25 percent; that he would not fill up the banks further with evidences of debt, as, he declared, the former administration had done. But somehow it seems that after he met Governor Eccles the Keynes-Eccles theory of borrowing and spending appealed to him as the very thing to do to bring back prosperity. This theory they have followed in full measure. Governor Eccles presented his views to our Banking and Currency Committee for many days in 1935. Here in this volume are the hearings. I was greatly disturbed, as I have said here often, and as I have a ranking minority place on the Committee on Expenditures, I suppose it is my job to be critical of these huge expenditures. I spoke recently on "a \$7,000,000,000 Government, permanently established." The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], who preceded me, says that we are to spend something like \$9,000,000,000 this year.

I was greatly interested in Mr. Eccles' many statements. He showed to us how "debt created money", and that if you and I were unwilling to give the banks our notes and create deposits, the Government must do so. The Government has certainly followed his suggestion. He then insisted that we need have no fear of inflation, and often through those hearings—and I have many excerpts here from his testimony—he stated that inflation was most difficult to achieve; that inflation could be controlled much better than deflation. And only last month, in the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, he asserted several times that he could see no immediate inflation. When the chairman of the committee remarked:

I am unable to see in the situation that exists where we are in any danger of going too fast or reaching a basis of inflation—

Mr. Eccles replied:

No; and at the moment I do not feel that we are doing it.

He has often told us how hard it would be to get inflation.

Two years ago we gave him enormous powers. He claimed that if we gave him the power of open-market operations without permission of the President, and the power to freeze the reserves, that undoubtedly he could control such a situation. He said open-market operations is the primary object that we want, and that the freezing of reserves was a secondary operation. I ask you, which do you think is now the primary or the secondary operation? Has he tried the primary, or open market, operations and has it failed? Only recently he has availed himself of the full power granted him to freeze the reserves. I do not wish to misrepresent him, but here is his testimony. He even suggested that the open-market operations would take care of such situations

and it would probably not be necessary to freeze the reserves. He stated that the power of raising of the interest rates, the open-market operations, and the freezing of the reserves would undoubtedly prevent another inflation. But now, within a week, we are apparently faced with immediate inflation and the cry is taken up by Secretary Morgenthau and Secretary Wallace and followed by appeals from Secretary Roper. Is this a trial balloon? Are these present calamity howlers meaning what they say, or is it a red herring drawn across the trail in order to get the President more power? Is it an argument to assist directly in backing up the President in his Supreme Court fight? Is it an alibi or is it real? If this is real—and we ought to accept it from such sources as real—what are we going to do about it? And what can we do about it? Such former testimony even of 1 month ago naturally leads us to have a little doubt about the real intent of such calamity statements at the moment. I trust that you who are interested will read other excerpts from Mr. Eccles' testimony of 2 years ago and even of 1 month ago. We sympathize with the statement of his present viewpoint, however, although we have taken issue with him heretofore. The administration has created these conditions and is now unable to check them. They have been forced to issue these solemn warnings. It must be assumed that such important statements would not have been given out without consultation with the President. It will be the death knell of many of these new projects mentioned by the previous speaker [Mr. BULWINKLE], such as farm tenancy, housing, and other similar projects.

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

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Of course the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and has given deep study to the question of inflation, as we all have, and he knows and understands the power of the Federal Reserve Board to prevent such things as inflation and even deflation by the manipulation of the money market of the country. What value is there to increase reserve requirements of the member banks for the purpose of raising the interest rate and to prevent inflation, if it results in deflation in the price of Government bonds at the other end of the line, and forces the Reserve Board out into the market to stabilize the bonds of the Government itself by open-market operations on them? What remedy has the gentleman to suggest for that kind of a situation that apparently exists now?

Mr. GIFFORD. I shall put into my remarks several remedies, the first of which is to balance the Budget and stop spending, stop this constant issuance of credit money, although I fear it may be too late. This country cannot stand a debt of thirty-five or forty billion, plus a contingent debt of five billion. In his testimony the Governor told us at one time that the debt of Great Britain was \$46,000,000,000, and at another time \$35,000,000,000. Since the deflation of the pound we do not know what it is; but we do know that if Great Britain were willing to dispose of only a few of her interests in her colonial possessions she could wipe out her debt with one stroke.

His attempt to soothe us by a comparison with England's position in the matter of indebtedness is not persuasive. Conditions are vastly different.

But what is the real trouble of the moment? I think I know what it is. A week ago bonds went down in the market as they have not gone down for several years. How many times have you listened to me and others say that when business recovers even slightly, and even a slightly higher rate of interest is offered, then, of course, the bonds will be dumped on the market, first by the local banks and then by the larger ones. They will wish to take advantage of that little higher interest rate.

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

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Are not bonds worth today twice as much on the markets of this country as they were when the gentleman's party went out of office in 1933?

Mr. GIFFORD. No, indeed. In 1920, when business loans commanded higher rates of interest, we had to sacrifice our Government bonds for as low as 83 when we needed the money in our business, where we could get higher returns.

Mr. KERR. The gentleman said he did not know. I will tell him that it is a fact that bonds today are worth more than twice as much as they were when the gentleman's party went out of office in 1933.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, no.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, no; that is ridiculous. Of course, they are worth more, because when my party went out of power March 4, 1933, things were in pretty bad shape. My party was not greatly to blame for that. That takes a little time to answer, but it is a fact. History will teach you that. Certainly Government bonds were down, but not to the ridiculous amount stated. It can easily be ascertained.

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

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not a fact that the per-capita national debt in the United States is much smaller than it is in Great Britain or France?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; but you do not count the citizens of those colonial possessions of Great Britain, for whose benefit the debt was so largely contracted. If you want to pursue that line, our debt would be so much more. There is no comparison. Oh, how statistics can easily be made to lie!

Why did Government bonds decline on the market? Are not the chickens coming home to roost? How many times must we tell you that you were mistaken in your gloating over the fact that the credit of the Government was so good that you could borrow money for long terms for 2½ percent? I have often said, "You will wish to God you had paid a higher rate, so that people would hold on to them." Governor Eccles says, "We must continue easy money. We must continue to have low interest rates, or if we do not our vast Government issues will be jeopardized." Just as if low interest rates would coax money to take the risks of business. No. You must have a reward for the money invested in a business. The Eccles theory is incorrect. He has proven his own theory incorrect; and now for the alibi. Now he is blaming John L. Lewis. But did not he hand Lewis a good one? He criticized labor demands and blames business for putting up prices as a result of them. That is all so funny. We have had two big doses of his medicine, and an alibi must now be found. He cannot continue easy money and have it assume the present great risks in business enterprises, with the Government constantly harassing business, not only through excessive taxation but actually in the conduct thereof; and now, above all else, lending comfort to the illegal strikes that are shaking the very foundations of our Government itself.

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

Mr. GIFFORD. Why should I yield when I need so much time to make reference to the opinions of shrewd commentators and many experts who write on financial subjects? You should be forced to listen to much of it. However, I do wish to arouse interest and discussion in the Chamber.

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

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MAY. I think this is a matter of current vital importance to the House of Representatives, and I think it ought to be discussed on a nonpartisan basis rather than partisan.

Mr. GIFFORD. It is being discussed on a nonpartisan basis by me this afternoon.

Mr. MAY. As I see the situation, there is just one of two or three things that Congress can do to correct what might happen in the future. The gentleman has said balancing the Budget will solve the problem. How are you going to balance the Budget if we continue to spend money for relief and other purposes that it is necessary to spend it for, without the levying of further taxes, and how are we going to stand any further taxes now?

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman is answering his own question by the tone of his voice in asking it. We cannot stand any new or additional taxes. We cannot continue paying out such large sums of money, even at the instance of

the Governors of the different States. Shame on the Governors of those States coming to Washington and demanding further raids on the National Treasury. The credit of their States is still good, is it not?

They are careful, indeed, about their own credit. Our municipalities are exceedingly careful in their town meetings not to greatly disturb their own credit. Are they, then, not interested in preserving the national credit, which is so much more important? The National Government must preserve its credit in order to relieve such States as may really need assistance and whose credit is exhausted.

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

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. MAY. What would the gentleman do when 15 or 20 Governors come here and swear and declare that their governments are bankrupt and that the matter of relief raises an imminent problem; that they have got to deal with it but that they have not got any money?

Mr. GIFFORD. I would have them prove their case. I want our President to be courageous. I ask him not further to keep silence in this hour of anarchy through which we are passing. This is a time when silence speaks volumes. Where is that courage that he exhibited during the first half year of his administration? I hope this will not be regarded as partisan, because I would surely say it of a Republican President under similar circumstances.

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

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Before I ask this further question, I want to say that I, as one Member of this House, always give the gentleman a respectful hearing, because I know he is a student of these affairs.

Mr. GIFFORD. And I speak frankly, do I not?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; the gentleman does. We have so far discussed the taxes of the United States in relation to those of other countries. Is it not a fact that the taxes in the United States are less than they are in Great Britain and France?

Mr. GIFFORD. I could not go fully into that, even if I were able, because it would take too much of my time this afternoon. I covered that subject matter the other day. The central government of Great Britain pays about one-half municipal expenses, and the expenses of a municipality there are nothing like those of ours. The gentleman can figure out that our taxes seem less according to our ability to pay, but we must take into account different conditions, especially their colonial possessions. I have dealt with this subject before.

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

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from West Virginia overlooks the fact that in Great Britain they have but one tax, whereas within the United States we have multiple taxes, which, added together, make a heavier burden than the British tax.

Mr. GIFFORD. I hope that speakers will not continue these manifestly unfair comparisons. The picture usually drawn is untrue; yet when we come to an income-tax bill how the Members love to say that the income-tax payer of Great Britain pays much more than the income-tax payer of the United States. That is true in some brackets, but the ordinary citizen in the United States pays more.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I hesitate to continue this line of questioning, but is it not a fact that the per-capita tax in those countries is greater than it is in the United States? I ask the question in that way, the per-capita tax. I feel certain that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Knutson] is incorrect in saying but one tax exists in the other nations.

Mr. KNUTSON. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will yield, income tax, yes; but when you add all the taxes the American taxpayer pays and compare them with what the Englishman pays, it will be found that the Americans pay much more than the Englishman.

Mr. GIFFORD. I trust I may be permitted to carry on the subject I started to discuss and to enlarge upon my intended subject matter, but let me give you an illustration of the last ridiculous tax bill. A neighbor of mine, a good citizen in the lumber and building-materials business, died recently. They found among his assets many second mortgages, many notes, many uncollected bills. He had been easy with his debtors. They found he owed a considerable sum, but not as much as his assets' indicated value. The creditors got together and cheerfully agreed to wait 5 years for full payment; that the estate could pay one-fifth of the indebtedness each year, so that the widow could continue the business. The company made good profits last year, but they could not pay the debts without a fine imposed by the Government. Had they done so they would have found that instead of paying the usual 12½- or 13½-percent tax they would have been fined up to 27 percent. So they paid the one-fifth, as agreed, and distributed the rest as bonuses to the workmen in the plant. Those workmen will probably say: "This Roosevelt policy is good; I guess we had better vote for Roosevelt." That is the result, yet it cripples business. Creditors may curse such tax bills all they please. What are we going to do about it? Apparently nothing. I made an address on this subject of taxation the other day. I hardly think I want to repeat it now.

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

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman has spoken of some of the bills that have been passed. The question that has been going through my mind is why so many of the Democrats will follow the President blindly in everything that he proposes in the way of legislation without knowing what the results will be? Can the gentleman answer that?

Mr. GIFFORD. I think that question should be answered easily.

Mr. MAY. Loyalty.

Mr. GIFFORD. Loyalty! It reminds me of an address I made last year on the subject of Blind Loyalty; and I might add, too, because so many of you newer Democrats, at least, came in on the coattails of the President, they feel that they must remain near to him.

Someone, I recall, asked a child, "Why were you born in Pennsylvania?"

"Oh", came the reply, "in order to be near my mother."

Mr. ARNOLD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARNOLD. Is it not the custom of the Republican sons to stay close to their mothers?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes, perhaps—if we can find our mother. I read this morning in an editorial:

What are we to do? What is by far the most important single measure for the Government to take in order to balance the Budget? Then other measures would be comparatively easy. What other method can be effected and what is necessary, apart from the imposition of a tax, to take care of the balancing of the Budget? Let us stay the rapid expansion of these old bureaus and cease the creation of new ones. It is a reverse to the present tendency, but let us turn these emergency forms of expenditure into permanent forms.

Then turn back to the States and localities some of the responsibilities that were taken from them.

We ask today, Is this another emergency simply created to order? Those are not my words. Those are the words of many of our writers. Many suspect that there is now another emergency made to order.

I want to comment upon that briefly, and this is not political. The President of the United States came into this Chamber and told us substantially that the members of the Supreme Court were too old, that they could not have the right viewpoint, that all of the judiciary should be overhauled, that they were greatly behind in their work; much of which has been proved not to be the case. So he resorted to another argument at the "victory dinner", stating that the Dust Bowl is blowing now, that one-third of our people are ill fed and ill housed now, and similar platitudes. The audience applauded hilariously under the spell of that beautiful voice. But when we come to our senses how ridiculous it seems to us. It always has been, and in the future it will

be, that perhaps one-third of the people will be relatively ill-fed and ill-housed, in spite of all their Government can do for them.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman is very busy with me this afternoon.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am happy to be busy with a man who is giving us something on which to ask questions.

Mr. GIFFORD. I hope to do so with a smile today. I know that sometimes I wear an unpleasant expression and I have been reminded of that, but may I paraphrase a verse that applies? "The gentleman is handsomer by far. But my face, I don't mind it, for I am behind it; it is you out in front that I jar."

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman said we applauded the President hilariously. The gentleman did not mean to include himself, did he?

Mr. GIFFORD. No; he would not have heard me. I was listening on the radio. I also heard the so-called Crown Prince speak over the radio the other evening and I thought he did a very wonderful job. I felt sure he had been sitting on his father's knee when I noticed his voice and its inflections and the familiar arguments.

Mr. KERR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. My friend made a statement a while ago that the President of the United States appeared before this body and made a statement that was absolutely false.

Mr. GIFFORD. No; I did not mean to say that.

Mr. KERR. In respect to the congestion of the courts as exist in this country, may I say the Attorney General of the United States made a most lucid statement about the situation, and if the gentleman will read that statement I think he will agree that most of the dockets of the courts of this country are behind.

Mr. GIFFORD. It is constantly stated that the work of the Supreme Court is not behind. However, it was so stated to us by the President of the United States as I recall it. Do not mention the Attorney General to me until you convert your own Senator GLASS, who says we need a new Attorney General more than a new Court.

Mr. Chairman, I have probably used most of my time, and as I have the permission to enlarge upon my remarks I will stop at this point, unless other Members wish to interrogate me.

I have read that the President is insisting that corrective measures are necessary now and that he has declared it as his ambition during the next 3 years "to abolish poor pay to workers, to remove slums, to save farmers from drought and overproduction, to shorten working hours and give workers time for recreation, to end child labor, to stop strikes, and to keep farm prices up." And all he needs in order to do these things, he explained, is an acquiescent Supreme Court. But neither Mr. Roosevelt nor any other Executive could accomplish what he speaks of in 4 years or in 4 centuries. The impossibility of his objectives cannot justify the stultification of the Supreme Court. It must be brought home to our people that in a democracy such as ours we cannot fully control labor and prices. Hitler can do it. Mussolini can do it. Stalin can do it. Blum cannot do it. The sacrifice of liberty for such power must not be granted. This does not mean that palliative measures should not be adopted in conformity with our form of government. Neither boastful nor demagogic statements must affect the foundations of our national structure.

However, the only thing we have to fear is fear.

And in these times we should be very tenacious of at least the appearance of adequacy. I repeat:

Are these warnings only trial balloons? Is it another emergency made to order? Is it a tool to be used in forcing public opinion to the side of the President in the Court fight? A search for the gentleman in the wood pile is on. Has the Keynes-Eccles theory really exploded with such violence? Shall not huge Government spendings go merrily on? Can we combat the demands of the beneficiaries, not only from individuals but from Governors and mayors,

who have been so anxious concerning their own municipal debts, but entirely careless of the debt of the Nation? Now, a great fear of the dreadful calamity of inflation is advanced by the administration itself. The Supreme Court upheaval has brought a great fear upon the Nation. The most illegal and dangerous form of strikes ever known is rampant and the silence of the administration has spread a great fear on all law-abiding citizens. Yes, "All we have to fear is fear."

Let us hope that Governor Eccles now means what he says and will pursue his recently declared policy; let us hope that the President is behind him and that they are determined to return us to national solvency.

Such a tremendous volume of Government securities issued at such low yields of interest to the holders is, and will continue to be, a constant menace to this solvency.

The following figures may be of interest:

Receipts:	
1934.....	\$3,100,000,000
1935.....	3,900,000,000
1936.....	4,100,000,000
1937 (estimated).....	5,800,000,000
1938 (estimated).....	7,200,000,000
Expenditures:	
1933.....	5,100,000,000
1934.....	6,700,000,000
1935.....	6,800,000,000
1936.....	8,800,000,000
1937.....	8,400,000,000
1938.....	(?)
Deficits:	
1934.....	3,900,000,000
1935.....	3,500,000,000
1936.....	4,700,000,000
1937 (estimated).....	2,600,000,000
1938.....	(?)
Public debt:	
June 30, 1933.....	22,500,000,000
1934.....	27,000,000,000
1935.....	28,700,000,000
1936.....	33,700,000,000
1937 (estimated).....	35,000,000,000
1938.....	(?)
Cost of Civilian Conservation Corps:	
1934.....	331,000,000
1935.....	435,000,000
1936.....	486,000,000
1937.....	368,000,000
1938.....	(?)

1938 estimated receipts
[In billions]

	Amount	Amount
Income tax.....	\$3.300	\$0.992
Social security.....	.774	1.450
Miscellaneous revenue.....	2.500	1.233
Enrichment.....	.082	
Carriers act.....	.134	
Customs.....	.463	1.014
Miscellaneous.....	.151	1.009
Sale of assets.....	.030	1.001
Total.....	7.434	

¹ Excess over 1937.

² Less than 1937.

Question marks for 1938 may well receive most careful attention by this Congress.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN].

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a bill which I have introduced today.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

A bill to provide \$30,000,000,000, which shall be expended within a period of 5 years, to furnish employment and to end poverty in the United States and its possessions

Whereas there are many millions of persons unemployed in the United States, and many of those who are unemployed are young men and women; and, because of this unemployment situation, men and women have been compelled to go into bread lines and do many other things which are humiliating to them; and

Whereas there is an abundance of the necessities of life, and yet many of our citizens are compelled to go hungry; and

Whereas this human misery has been brought about because our people have been unable to find employment; and

Whereas if we became engaged in war we would spend billions of dollars in the destruction of property and humanity; and

Whereas if we spend billions of dollars for construction purposes we would be promoting the welfare of mankind: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That \$30,000,000,000 shall be expended by the Federal Government within a period of 5 years to provide employment and to end poverty in the United States.

Sec. 2. The money shall be expended for the prevention of floods, forest fires, dust storms; soil erosion; purification of rivers and streams; slum clearance; construction of homes that can be sold or rented at reasonable cost, schools, hospitals, roads, bridges, reservoirs, canals, tunnels, subways, and disposal plants; elimination of dangerous grade crossings; rural electrification; the purchase of railroads and other utilities, which shall be owned by the Government; development of our natural resources; and for medical, surgical, dental, biological, geological, and every other art and science; and for every other purpose which will solve the unemployment problem and promote the welfare of the people of our country.

Sec. 3. No person employed by the Federal Government under the provisions of this act shall be compelled to work more than 5 days per week nor more than 6 hours in any one day, and the wage paid shall be no less than 75 cents per hour.

Sec. 4. Union organizations must be recognized under this act.

Sec. 5. The President of the United States shall be authorized to appoint a committee of at least five members, or as many as he believes is necessary, to devise ways and means to secure the money to carry out the provisions of this act. It shall be the duty of the committee to obtain the said money from such sources which will work the least hardship on the taxpayers of our country.

Sec. 6. This act shall become effective within 90 days after its passage.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

It is not my desire to take up the time of the House with a recitation of all of the activities and problems that the committee has had to deal with in the course of its deliberations in preparing this bill for the consideration of the House.

For 2 months the subcommittee, of which I have the honor and the pleasure of serving as chairman, has been engaged in hearing the testimony in justification of the needs of the four departments for funds to carry on their activities.

With the fine cooperation that has been extended to me by my colleagues we have completed the bill, and I now present it to you for your consideration with the unanimous approval of the entire committee on every item contained therein.

I believe Members of the House who have never served on the Appropriations Committee have little idea of the intricate detail that must be considered in the preparation of appropriation bills for the various departments from year to year. With the able assistance of the older majority members of the committee, Judge TARVER, of Georgia, Mr. McANDREWS, of Illinois, and Mr. RABAUT, of Michigan, and with the fine cooperation of my genial and distinguished friend from New York, Mr. BACON, the ranking minority member, we have arrived at our conclusions on the different items after a period of about 9 weeks of continuous hearings and study. I also want to say a word of commendation of the two new members of the subcommittee, Mr. CALDWELL, of Florida, and Mr. CARTER, of California. Their devotion to our task is greatly appreciated, and their counsel and wisdom have contributed much in the formulation of the results that have been accomplished.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a word in connection with the services rendered by the clerk of this subcommittee, Mr. Jack K. McFall. He has been with us for a number of years. I may say without any hesitation that the committee without the services of this very fine, able clerk would be constantly in trouble with the many problems with which it is constantly confronted.

The bill before you carries appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice and the judiciary, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Labor. Over 200 paragraphs of appropriations were considered in connection with the committee's deliberations. Many of these paragraphs were divided into subitems, each of which required careful consideration.

Knowing how uninteresting a recitation of figures can become, I shall limit my remarks to certain general observations of the activities of the departments that I think will be of most interest to the Members of the House. If, at the

conclusion of my remarks, or at any time during the reading of the bill for amendment, Members may desire information on any of the different services provided for in the bill, I shall be glad to try to answer your questions.

The bill carries a total appropriation of \$121,177,000, a reduction of \$3,112,000 under the estimates as submitted in the Budget for the fiscal year 1938. While this sum is in excess of the appropriations for the current year by \$3,373,000, I think it proper to state that this increase over the appropriations for 1937 is more than offset by the amounts that have been included in the bill for two activities, both of which I am sure the House will feel are extremely deserving and for which ample funds should be supplied.

The number of unfortunate airplane accidents that occurred with surprising frequency during the past few months has focused attention upon the need for additional safety facilities being afforded this rapidly growing medium of transportation. In order that a program of installing new aids and improving old aids to air navigation might be instituted, the Budget has recommended a program which will require the expenditure of approximately \$5,000,000 over a period of 2 years. Developments in aeronautical radio have revolutionized the science of air safety. It is to keep pace with the development of science in this field that the committee has recommended an increase of approximately \$2,328,000 over last year's appropriations. A large part of this sum will be devoted to the installation of radio beams, additional radio stations, high-frequency radio location markers, and the improvement of existing radio facilities to make them more efficient and dependable.

We have also recommended an increase in the bill of \$1,805,000 for grants to States for maternal and child health, services to crippled children, and child-welfare services, under the provisions of the Social Security Act. Congress has now defined a policy of social welfare and has authorized certain sums to be allotted to the States to carry out a joint Federal and State endeavor. The Appropriations Committee, therefore, unless it should choose to impair the program, has no alternative except to recommend funds sufficient to meet the amount that the various States are entitled to under the terms of the act.

These two sums that I have just mentioned total \$4,133,000, which is required to meet these two well-defined needs. It will thus be seen that if the amount of \$4,133,000 be deducted from the total amount as recommended in the bill, it will show a reduction of approximately \$760,000 under the appropriations for the fiscal year 1937.

The committee hearings reveal the fact that some of the departments have been indulging in the practice of transferring personnel from one bureau to another for an indefinite period of time, but retaining the employee on the pay roll of the bureau from which he is transferred. Such a practice, if abused, defeats the purpose for which the funds are appropriated. Let me give an example. An employee in Bureau A will be transferred to Bureau B, but the salary of this employee will continue to be paid from the appropriation for Bureau A. Under the law these assignments may be made for a period of 3 months, and then renewed for a period of 3 months. The plain intent of the law sanctioning these transfers is to provide sufficient administrative elasticity to meet emergency conditions when they arise. In some cases, however, these employees have been carried in this transferred status for years. The report on the bill has called attention to this condition, and I am hopeful that in the future the law authorizing these temporary assignments will be complied with. I am sure Congress will always lend an attentive ear to pleas for transfer of funds from one appropriation to another if the conditions warrant. This is the proper remedy.

One of the more important changes that the committee recommends this year has to do with the consolidation of traveling-expense funds in a single appropriation for each department with a few exceptions. This policy is recommended for all traveling expense in the Department of Labor, for practically all in the Department of Commerce, and for a large part in the Department of Justice. No change

is made in the State Department for the reason that practically all traveling expense for the Department proper and the Foreign Service is already confined to two separate travel-appropriation headings. The amount expended for travel by the four departments totals nearly seven and one-half million dollars. As a result of the consolidations that have been made, approximately \$150,000 has been saved, and the committee is convinced that this reduction will not seriously impair a single service now being rendered by these four departments. Some years ago a uniform policy was adopted by the Appropriations Committee of placing all appropriations for printing and binding under one heading for each department. The arrangement has been entirely satisfactory, and I am certain that economies have resulted. Experience must answer for the application of the same principle to the expenditures for traveling expense.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Before entering into any discussion about the Department of State I want to commend to the Members of the House the testimony of Secretary Hull that will be found in the hearings accompanying the bill. Those of us who had the pleasure of serving with him when he was a Member of this body, I am sure, have always been impressed with his sincerity of purpose and his devotion to his ideals. His statement contains an interesting account of the problems that have beset the Department during the past fiscal year and also contain illuminating evidence on the matter that is most dear to his heart—the reciprocal-trade agreements.

FOREIGN SERVICE SALARIES

As a matter of first importance, I think the House should be acquainted with a condition that to my mind is appalling. It concerns the pay of clerks in our embassies, legations, and consulates throughout the world. During the past summer I attended a meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union for the Promotion of International Arbitration, which was held in Budapest, Hungary, as a delegate representing this Government. At the completion of the meeting of that body, I took occasion to visit several of our missions in Europe, and let me say here that that trip gave me a sense of pride at the type of representation that our Government is having in the services of our splendid corps of Foreign Service officers. In accordance with the rules of the Appropriations Committee, I submitted a report of my findings while on this trip, and, if any Members may be interested, it will be found printed in the hearings on the bill.

To get back, however, to the question of the pay of the clerks. Out of a total of over 900 of these employees, only about 30 draw in excess of \$960 per year. Wherever I went I found them to be the very backbone upon which the work of the post proceeded. Many of them speak and translate fluently 4, 6, 8, even 10, foreign languages. They handle passport and citizenship work. They do expert accounting. They prepare legal documents. They interview local businessmen in the interest of promoting American trade. They adjust trade complaints. They examine prospective immigrants. In fact, there were but few types of work that they could not do; and yet I found these people compensated by our Government in a manner that prevents them from having anything but the bare necessities of life. I think this Congress should know that in one instance I was informed by a Foreign Service officer that a collection was taken up among the officers at that post to provide burial expenses for a faithful clerk who died, leaving a wife but no money whatever even for the expenses of his own interment.

After going into this question thoroughly, the committee has concluded that it would be derelict in its duty if it did not recommend that some funds be provided to at least partially remedy this distressing situation. We have therefore included in the bill about \$75,000, in order that the Department may make promotions among these lower-paid employees where their efficiency is such, and their need is such, as to justify this being done.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question on this very point?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Has the Committee any information as to the percentage of American citizens among the clerks in the embassies and legations?

Mr. McMILLAN. Offhand, I am not in a position to answer the gentleman's inquiry, but I think a list of the clerks, foreign and native, in our foreign missions, is to be found in the record of the hearings.

PASSPORT DIVISION

With the revival of business, the Passport Agency of the State Department continues to show a progressive increase in work. The applications for passports are running over 30 percent more than last year. An increase of \$5,000 for the maintenance of the Passport Bureau has been recommended to take care of this unit that is so ably administered by Mrs. Ruth Shipley.

DIVISION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS

At the time the hearings were held on the bill Congress had not authorized the continuance of the reciprocal-trade program. As a result, the amount carried for the personnel that administer the work connected with the negotiation of treaties was reduced by about \$140,000. Since then the bill has become law, authorizing the continuance of the treaty work, so a supplemental estimate for funds to pay salaries of additional employees will doubtless be submitted to Congress before the expiration of the present session.

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

We have allowed sufficient funds to employ 20 additional Foreign Service officers. Many posts in the Service are undermanned. Some have but one officer assigned to duty. At these posts the leave problem is always acute, and sometimes it is not possible to fully comply with the leave laws. This condition will be largely remedied and all of the candidates who successfully passed the last examination given by the State Department can be inducted into the Service.

Continuing the program instituted by the committee last year to bring home officers who have not been back to the United States for many years, we are providing \$110,000 for this purpose during the next fiscal year. We feel that it is important that these men be brought back to their home country at reasonable intervals, not only in order that they may not lose touch with America but also that they may familiarize themselves with the business and economic conditions of the country in general, and of their own department in particular.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

Funds have been provided in the bill for three conferences to be held in 1938—the Eighth International Conference of American States at Lima, Peru; the Telecommunication Conference, Cairo, Egypt; and the Aviation Conference, likewise at Lima, Peru. Our participation in these conferences is a matter of treaty obligation.

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION

Three separate amounts totaling \$2,525,000 will be found in the bill under the heading of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico. The three objects of expenditure are for the rectification work along the Rio Grande, flood control, and construction of a diversion dam. All of these projects come under the head of public works and are, of course, authorized by existing law or treaty with Mexico. There will still remain to be appropriated about \$4,900,000 if all the work either authorized or in progress is to be completed in accordance with existing plans. We have omitted an appropriation of \$1,100,000 to commence canalization work on the upper Rio Grande.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND THE JUDICIARY

Attorney General Cummings appeared before the committee and gave us a very interesting picture of the work of his Department, which you will find in the hearings. The committee is recommending that you approve an appropriation of \$39,380,000 for the Department of Justice and the judiciary. If you concur in our recommendation you will have reduced the appropriation of the current year by \$1,976,000 and the estimates by \$883,689.

Certain consolidations of appropriations have been made looking to affording a greater degree of administrative free-

dom in the expenditure of moneys, while some appropriations previously carried in lump sum have been broken down in their component parts and have been carried as separate items. The effect of the latter is, of course, to place a greater degree of legislative control over the expenditures. I will not bore you by going into all the details of these changes, but if any Member is particularly interested I may refer you to the report on the bill, which explains everything that has been done in this connection.

In keeping with the ever-growing volume of work in the Department resulting in some degree from the imposition of additional duties necessitated by the new crime laws passed by Congress, we have allowed increases where it was felt the facts warranted. For example, in the criminal and the tax divisions, where the load appears to be the heaviest, \$40,000 additional has been allowed for each division. The request for additional attorneys in the antitrust work has been approved. It appears that their difficulties have grown not so much out of the fact that they have additional litigation but that the litigation that they now have is of such an involved nature as to require the services of many more attorneys to properly handle the work.

BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

I now desire to take a few moments to tell you about a bureau that by its capable direction and remarkable results has captured the fancy of the American people. I refer to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Let me suggest to you new Members, and the old Members as well, that it would be well worth your time to go down and visit this Bureau in the Department of Justice. I am sure you will come away with the knowledge that you have witnessed one of the most efficiently operated units in our entire Government.

The growth of this Bureau has been phenomenal. In the identification unit nearly 7,000,000 fingerprints are on file, from which over 400,000 identifications were made last year. Over 10,000 law-enforcement agencies regularly contribute to the fingerprint collection, which is growing at the rate of 4,400 per day. Over 5,700 fugitives from justice were identified during last year. Outgoing letters increased 50 percent in the course of a year. I could continue citing these statistics to indicate this tremendous growth, but I am unable to take the time. I am, however, greatly concerned about the welfare of the employees working in the Bureau. During 1936 these employees performed over 110,000 hours of overtime. It seems that the volume of work is always a pace ahead of the appropriations to carry it on. The committee has recommended an increase of \$75,000 over the Budget for this Bureau. If you approve our action, it will make available \$6,000,000 for the fiscal year 1938. While I am certain this will not provide the complete solution to this problem of overtime work, it should at least somewhat relieve present conditions. The Mattson kidnaping case has drawn heavily upon the manpower resources of the Bureau, and when it is considered that there are over 15,000 cases pending, of which over 8,000 are unassigned, I am sure the House will sustain the action of the committee in increasing the appropriation.

PENAL INSTITUTIONS

I want to take this opportunity to express my own feeling, as well as what I think to be that of the committee, at the loss the Government has sustained in the resignation of Mr. Sanford Bates, former Director of Prisons. He was an exceptional administrator, always cooperating 100 percent with the committee in working out our common problems. The Federal penal service today is a monument to his ability and devotion to his task. I may add, however, that the Government is fortunate to secure the services of Mr. James Bennett, who succeeded Mr. Bates and who had worked as his assistant for many years.

Unfortunately for the country, the prison population continues to grow, and hence the problem of supplying proper housing facilities for the prisoners is ever present. In order that the parole system might be strengthened we have allowed several of the existing institutions additional parole officers and clerks. Additional guards have likewise been

provided at the different prisons, both for the purpose of complying with the leave law passed at the last session of Congress and for affording increased guard facilities commensurate with the increase in population.

The probation system has had an astonishing growth in the 10 years of its existence. We are allowing 10 additional probation officers in order to reduce the average case load per officer, which averages 180 cases at the present time. In one judicial district over 900 cases are handled by one officer. No adequate supervision of probationers can be had by any officer charged with handling over 100 cases.

The Public Health Service directs all medical relief in the various penal institutions and under the able direction of Dr. Treadway adequate medical facilities are being provided.

Three new jails are in process of being constructed—one in California, one in Minnesota, and one in Florida. Their completion will somewhat relieve crowded conditions in existing institutions, as well as provide a place of incarceration for prisoners who are now cared for by contract in State and county institutions.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

I want to recommend to the new Members of the House particularly that they secure a copy of the hearings on the Department of Commerce bill and read the engrossing statement of the Secretary of Commerce contained therein. In a very succinct way he has painted a picture of all the activities of this Department. I would know of no better way for one to acquaint himself with the activity of the Department of Commerce than to diligently read Secretary Roper's remarks.

BUREAU OF AIR COMMERCE

Knowing the concern and responsibility we all have as Members of the House in providing adequate facilities to insure safety of air transportation, we have endeavored to develop most fully in the hearings the entire program the Bureau of Air Commerce proposes to do to prevent airplane disasters in the future such as have recently occurred. With the sum allowed in the bill, plus authority to obligate appropriations for next year to the extent of \$2,000,000, about 212 projects will be undertaken. These projects look to either the establishment of new air-navigation aids or the modernizing or improvement of existing aids.

Traffic control at key airports is now being successfully undertaken under the Bureau's supervision, and this program will be further extended. There have been and are continuing to be such rapid developments in the field of aeronautical transportation that what is provided for today may be obsolete tomorrow.

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

The committee has made certain consolidations in the appropriations for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce to afford better administration. The only increase contained in the Budget is in an item to establish a division of industrial economics. The theory underlying this new division is to afford a means whereby business could be extended a governmental service similar to the aid extended agriculture by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and to labor by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It was proposed in order that certain economic studies desired by business might be undertaken. Among others, studies of distribution and retail prices were to be made, and some of the fund would be devoted to making an analysis of data contained in the old N. R. A. records.

The committee always questions the establishment of a new division in the Government, because once under way, it is difficult to eliminate. We were, however, impressed with the fact that some of these price and distribution studies may be desirable, so we have provided \$125,000 under the regulation activities of the Bureau to undertake some of this work.

You will also find in reading the bill that we have added about \$73,000 over the estimates for the division charged with the compilation of foreign-trade statistics. These statistics are compiled from the customs declarations that are filed at the various ports of entry, and have a wide and important use among businessmen engaged in exporting and importing.

In addition they are used extensively, and are in fact essential today, in the negotiation of reciprocal-trade treaties. Due to the increase in trade, the present staff of the division has been unable to handle the work, although working considerable overtime. Many inaccuracies have occurred in the statistics compiled and many complaints have been received as a result. The committee has assurances from the Department that with this additional appropriation the work can be done both properly and expeditiously.

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

The bill contains an appropriation of \$2,175,000 for the operation of the Census Bureau.

In reading the bill you will find two new items, one of \$25,000 for gathering age records as an aid to applicants under the Social Security Act and the other for the expenses of the Sixteenth Decennial Census, amounting to \$50,000. Heretofore it has been customary to appropriate \$100,000 the year previous to the taking of the decennial census for the work preparatory thereto. The Director believes, however, that this preparatory work can be more efficiently performed over a 2-year period. This explains the \$50,000 item carried for this expense. A similar amount will be provided next year.

BUREAU OF STANDARDS

The only increases to be found in the regular activities of the Bureau of Standards are occasioned by reallocations of certain administrative positions by the Civil Service Commission, which creates a legal obligation on the part of the Government to pay the increased salary rates.

A new item, however, does appear under this Bureau. It deals with the investigation of building materials. The Central Housing Committee, which is composed of nine Federal agencies interested in housing problems, has recommended that the Bureau conduct a research of materials and methods of construction.

Lack of adequate facilities for this type of research has been a drawback in the Federal housing program, and inasmuch as all nine of these Federal housing agencies have enthusiastically endorsed the suggestion, the committee has recommended to the Congress an appropriation of \$200,000 for research and study in this field.

BUREAU OF MARINE INSPECTION AND NAVIGATION

Four laws were passed by the last Congress designed to more adequately protect life at sea and to promote the welfare of the American seaman. To carry out these laws the bill contains an increase of \$631,000.

The Government has suffered another unfortunate loss in the resignation of Mr. Joseph B. Weaver as director of this service. Under his extremely efficient management and leadership a more or less moribund organization has been given new blood, and by means of the new legislation has placed itself in a position of rendering a real service in the protection of life at sea.

Mr. Weaver has given the committee several recommendations that he feels should be adopted in the interest of the public in its relation to our shipping interests. Among these recommendations is one that a schedule of fees should be authorized for services performed by the Government to ship operators in the enforcement of regulations looking to safety of life at sea. If a schedule of fees were authorized by appropriate legislation, many hundreds of thousands of dollars in revenue would result to the Government. Such a system is now in effect in England, and I share with the committee the thought that legislation should be considered to extend the principles of the English system to our own service.

BUREAU OF LIGHTHOUSES

Over one-quarter of the total appropriation for the Department of Commerce is found under the Bureau of Lighthouses. This agency is one of the oldest in the Government. An item of \$1,296,000 is recommended in the bill for 22 public-works projects. Many of the lighthouse tenders and lightships maintained by the Bureau have passed the age of usefulness. The cost of repairs to some of these antiquated vessels is out of proportion to the capital invested in them.

Under the public-works program some of these old boats will be replaced and some will be reconditioned. In addition, some of the projects look to the installation of additional aids to navigation in various lighthouse districts. I may refer you to the hearings for a complete statement as to the work to be undertaken in this regard.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

This unit of the Government devotes itself primarily to making surveys of the coasts of the United States and its Territories; determines the topography of the land under the ocean and along the shores, and engages in collecting certain basic geodetic and seismological data. In addition to preparing charts of our navigable waters, it is also engaged in the preparation of aeronautical charts. These charts are the road maps of all aviators—commercial, private, or service fliers. Inasmuch as both the charts and various photographic work done by the Bureau are of immediate interest to national defense, the committee is hopeful that the Army will cooperate with the Bureau to the extent of supplying an airplane to do this essential work.

BUREAU OF FISHERIES

In 1930 Congress passed what is known as the Jones-White Act, which authorized the construction of 34 fish hatcheries or laboratories on the basis of a 5-year program. After 20 hatcheries had been constructed up to 1932, the era of economy forced the abandonment of this program. These hatcheries, it is believed, can be constructed on an average cost of \$50,000 each, and when completed can produce millions of fish available for distribution in the locality of the station. Not only do these hatcheries provide a food supply to millions of our population but there is a very definite, even though intangible, recreational value that results from this fish propagation. The committee has decided that this program of hatchery construction should be continued and that all the hatcheries authorized by the Jones-White Act be constructed under a 3-year program. We have accordingly inserted \$220,000 in the bill to begin this construction program.

This should permit the building of about a third of the 12 stations and 2 laboratories that remain to be constructed under the act. We have also added \$40,000 to the bill to enlarge and improve some existing hatcheries. Complaints have come to the committee that the Bureau has been unable in many instances to make delivery of fish. In order that this situation may be remedied, we have included an item of \$15,000 for the purchase of trucks in order that the Bureau may transport from their hatcheries the fish they propagate.

During the current fiscal year \$172,000 is recommended to make scientific investigations relating to food fishes, their habits, migration, supply, and so forth. This is certainly a modest sum when one considers the hundreds of types of food fishes, the supply of which we should protect as a measure of food conservation. The committee has added \$70,000 to the amount under this head for 1938 in order to conduct investigations concerning the shad and the pilchard, the former on the Atlantic coast and the latter on the Pacific coast. Both of these studies are desired in order to secure essential facts and statistics on the habits and supply of these two species of fish.

PATENT OFFICE

The committee is always delighted to hear the evidence of the Commissioner of Patents regarding the need for funds to operate the Patent Office because this Bureau produces revenue to the Government. I think the Members of the House will be interested to know that for 12 years prior to 1933 a deficit in the operation of the Patent Office resulted each year. Since the incumbency of the present Director, Mr. Coe, however, there is a net profit to the Government of \$540,000. This is an impressive record and I want the record to show that the committee is appreciative of the successful administration of this Bureau.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

I now direct your attention to the items in connection with the appropriation for the Department of Labor.

Secretary Perkins appeared before the committee and her comprehensive statement of the activities of the Department will be found in the hearings. If you eliminate from consideration the appropriation of \$1,805,000, which has been added to the bill this year for grants to States under the provisions of the Social Security Act, the appropriation in the bill for 1938 would be about \$6,500 under the total appropriation for the current fiscal year.

One of the proposals presented to our committee by the Budget and sponsored by the Department was to transfer from the National Youth Administration to the Division of Labor Standards, a division of personnel engaged in stimulating apprentice training in the States. There may be a great deal of merit to this program but I do not feel that work created under an emergency agency without specific sanction of law should be taken over by a permanent establishment of the Government by a rider on an appropriation bill. The Labor Committee of this House should go into this matter thoroughly, and if it is felt that the work is justified a bill can be brought in and the House can then determine as a matter of policy whether they desire this program of apprentice training to be undertaken. If the Congress does so decide, then your Appropriations Committee can determine what financial assistance should be rendered to make the work effective.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for a question, is any report available on the work of the conciliation commissioners?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes. I think I have referred to it in the report, and I may say the hearings do reveal quite a bit of detail in connection with the conciliation commission.

SILICOSIS CONTROL

Included in the appropriation for the Division of Labor Standards and Service is an amount of \$18,000 for studies aimed at the control of silicosis. Secretary Perkins feels that if all the known mechanical engineering and scientific protective measures are continued for 2 or 3 years this disease can be wiped out completely within the next 10 years. This fact has been established by a report of experts which has been submitted recommending a program for the prevention of the disease. We all cherish the hope that this much-dreaded disease will be completely conquered.

DIVISION OF PUBLIC WORKS

A new item of approximately \$300,000 is carried in the bill for a new division of public contracts to enforce the provisions of the so-called Walsh-Healey Act. This represents a reduction of approximately \$55,000 under the Budget estimates.

The report accompanying the bill calls attention to what the committee believes to be an erroneous interpretation of the section of the act which exempts from the operations of the statute goods that may be purchased in the open market. The decision that is ultimately made in this matter will affect materially the volume of work that the division will be called upon to perform, and the committee has requested the Department to secure a ruling from the Comptroller General on the point involved before proceeding to expend the money contained in this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I was very much interested in the gentleman's statement with respect to the much-dreaded disease—silicosis. I notice the gentleman mentioned an appropriation of \$18,000. Does the gentleman expect this disease can be conquered by an appropriation of \$18,000?

Mr. McMILLAN. May I say to the gentleman the \$18,000 carried in the bill is in nowise intended to be used in treating the disease. This appropriation is intended merely for purposes of investigation.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is what I want to bring out. I assumed that.

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman covered the subject rather briefly. I thought it might be interesting for the RECORD if the gentleman would explain in a little more detail just what is the purpose of the \$18,000 appropriation.

Mr. McMILLAN. This is merely for the purpose of conducting a scientific investigation and to undertake a study of this disease.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was a larger amount than that requested?

Mr. McMILLAN. No; the amount was allowed as requested.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

We have approved the Budget estimate of \$880,000 for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This amounts to an increase of \$30,000 over the amount available for this year. This increase will be devoted to enlarging the field covered in the collection of statistics on wages, hours of labor, working conditions, and cost of living. The testimony before the committee indicates that there is a growing demand for the basic data collected by the Bureau in the various fields and that the increase requested is justified.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

About 40 percent of the entire appropriation for the Labor Department is expended by the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization. There has been a continuing increase in the number of applications for naturalization and it has taxed the facilities of the Bureau to keep pace with the work.

Under the act of February 5, 1917, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to draw on appropriations made for this Bureau in an amount not to exceed \$200,000 "to enforce the law excluding contract laborers and induced and assisted immigrants." It has come to our attention that some of the personnel employed under this authority of law have not been devoting their time to the problems defined in the act. We have placed a limitation of \$95,000 on the amount that may be expended under this authorization, and want it specifically understood that we will expect that all expenditures, if any, under this limitation will be made in accordance with the provisions of law. The hearings contain an interesting report on deportations, naturalization, seizures made, and so forth, and I recommend their reading to any Member who may be interested.

CHILDREN'S BUREAU

Now that the social-security program is being adopted by the States, we are called upon to make additional appropriations to meet the needs of States qualifying for benefits under the terms of the act. As I have stated, we are carrying an increase of \$1,805,000 for these grants during the next fiscal year. The committee has likewise approved an increase of about \$100,000 over appropriations for the current year for the administrative expenses of the Children's Bureau. Advice and counsel must be given the States in the formulation of their program for maternal and child health, care of crippled children, and child welfare. It is only by these studies and advice that we will get a dollar value for a dollar spent.

WOMEN'S BUREAU

A small increase of \$1,800 has been allowed over the budget for this Bureau in order that it might extend its investigations touching on the welfare of women in industry. Studies are being made of hours, wages, employment conditions, health standards, and so forth, of women, with a view to improving their standards in the economic and industrial field.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

The United States Employment Service was set up under the terms of the Wagner-Peyser Act which was designed to establish a joint State and Federal employment service. Only 3 States of the 48 have not yet actually accepted the act and 37 States have already become affiliated with the Service. During the past 3 years over 8,700,000 applications for positions have been filed in the States affiliated with the Service and over 5,000,000 placements have actually been made. The Service has established a system of job classification in all of the major industries so that scientific selection of personnel may be made. A veterans' placement representative is maintained in each affiliated State in order to give especial consideration to veterans who are seeking employment. Another specialized branch of the Bureau is a farm placement service that assists in supplying farm labor

in the agricultural States. The bill carries an appropriation of \$925,000 for administrative expenses for this service and \$1,500,000 for payments to the States. These sums represent a saving under the Budget estimates of \$25,000 and \$90,000, respectively.

In closing I desire to thank the House for its courteous attention to my remarks and to express the hope that you will join me in supporting the recommendations of the committee for the appropriations which have been included in the bill for the next fiscal year. [Applause.]

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. May I compliment the gentleman and the members of the subcommittee on the splendid report they have made on the pending items?

May I ask the gentleman particularly about the increased funds which would be made available for air-navigation aid? I do this because in my own State of West Virginia we have during the past 4 years attempted by every possible and rightful means to secure funds from the Bureau of Air Commerce for the erection of radio-beam stations and air beacons in the State of West Virginia. I may say to the gentleman and to the committee we have been unable to get a single improvement in our State of this type.

Today the American Airlines is operating passenger service daily both east and west from Washington to Elkins, Charleston, the capital of West Virginia, Cincinnati, and Chicago, yet on that line not a single radio beam or beacon has been established by the Bureau of Air Commerce between Washington and Cincinnati.

I do not believe the failure of the Bureau to give us this vital and needed navigation aids for our aviation travel has been because of the Bureau's failure to understand the problem. I believe it is largely because of lack of funds. May I ask the chairman whether in connection with this increased appropriation for air-navigation aids material was brought before the committee indicating such a territory would receive aid?

Mr. McMILLAN. I may say I think the gentleman may look forward to a brighter day so far as his territory is concerned. The committee has included a substantial increase, \$2,328,000, over the current budget for the next fiscal year, and has also authorized the Bureau to incur contract obligations of some \$2,000,000 next year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. May I say that with this \$5,000,000 program for installation and improvements of airway aids the Bureau of Air Commerce feels there will be 212 projects undertaken in order of priority. I am unable to tell the gentleman from West Virginia where his State or his projects stand with respect to that list of priorities, but it is estimated this \$5,000,000 program for the next fiscal year will provide for some 212 projects which have been submitted by the Bureau.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do not want to get into a technical discussion, but I do want to say that West Virginia, almost at the Nation's Capitol door and a rugged mountain section over which to fly, has not a single radio-beam station, which shows the importance of the item to which the gentleman has just referred.

I also wish to mention in this connection the fact the air route traveled by transport planes running from Washington to Pittsburgh to Detroit has changed in recent years, yet the Department has been unable to change its radio beacons from the old routes to the new routes. I refer to the pressing need for such a facility at Martinsburg, W. Va.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman made an extremely fine statement.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am very grateful to my friend the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very pleased the committee has increased the appropriation for the Foreign Service. I know our Foreign Service officials do a splendid work.

I notice the committee has added to the appropriation for men going into the Consular Service.

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I also notice in the report the committee saw the lack of coordination between the Department of State and the Department of Commerce. Does the gentleman feel he can tell us what this means?

Mr. McMILLAN. I may say in that connection there has recently been perfected between the two departments certain amendments to the coordination agreement, and it is hoped that with this new agreement the work may be expedited and the two departments will not have what I have always regarded as an apparent conflict or overlapping of duties.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have been very much interested in both departments. I think the Department of Commerce does what the Department of State's foreign service cannot do, perhaps, more in a business way.

Mr. McMILLAN. This new agreement will, in my judgment, eliminate a great deal of this overlapping and duplication.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the appropriation for labor statistics provide money for a census of the number of children employed in industry all over the country?

Mr. McMILLAN. My understanding is the Bureau contemplates taking care of that item at some later time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am delighted.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield.

Mr. FLANNERY. I wish to compliment the gentleman and the members of the committee for their manner of handling this measure, and also to compliment the gentleman on his dissertation, and in view of the charges and countercharges of lax supervision, and political interference in respect of the Bureau of Air Commerce, may I ask the gentleman whether the pending bill has a provision to transfer the jurisdiction of that Bureau to the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. McMILLAN. There has been nothing before the committee on that point. There may be something pending in the other body about it, but so far as our committee is concerned, the question was not raised, and I am not in position at this time to tell the gentleman what, if anything, may be undertaken in that respect.

Mr. FLANNERY. Am I correct in assuming that the Bureau of Air Commerce does not have the authority to issue a decree for the regulation of air traffic or to enforce such a decree if made?

Mr. McMILLAN. The Bureau of Air Commerce does initiate and promulgate such regulations, and, of course, when they are promulgated, they enforce them.

Mr. FLANNERY. The reason I asked the question is because I was talking with Mr. St. Clair, of the Department of Commerce, this morning with reference to one of the American air lines, to be specific, and was informed they could recommend to the Post Office Department but could make no decrees or exercise any regulations.

Mr. McMILLAN. No; the regulatory features of the Air Commerce Act are under the control and jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce and are enforced and administered by the Bureau of Air Commerce.

Mr. FLANNERY. If the authority were transferred to the Interstate Commerce Commission, in the opinion of the committee, that would not change your views with respect to these appropriations?

Mr. McMILLAN. It would not.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes at this time, and I do this because I cannot refrain from congratulating the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] on one of the ablest presentations of an appro-

priation bill it has been my pleasure to listen to before this body. [Applause.]

I may add that not a single partisan or political question arose at any time during the hearings or the discussion of this bill before our subcommittee.

This is a unanimous report of the subcommittee, and I concur 100 percent in everything that the gentleman from South Carolina has said. The gentleman has been a splendid chairman of our subcommittee and is one of the most conscientious, hard-working men we have in this body. [Applause.] I commend the gentleman for the splendid work he has done and for the very enlightening and comprehensive statement he has just completed before the Committee. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein three tables compiled by myself.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, on January 8, 1937, the Postmaster General of the United States was quoted by the Associated Press, in part, as follows:

James A. Farley's Post Office Department went \$88,316,324 into the red last fiscal year, but Farley hastened to explain yesterday free mail for Congressmen and other "nonpostal items" were largely responsible—

Placing the emphasis upon "free mail for Congressmen."

This statement was apparently given out at a press conference through newspaper services and appeared in practically every daily newspaper, large and small, in the United States. Members of Congress know what the reaction to a statement such as this is and will be in their respective districts. The country at large is imbued with the idea that the Post Office Department would pay expenses were it not for the tremendous amount of free mail sent out by Members of Congress. This is absolutely not true.

The fact is that during the fiscal year 1936 the amount of mail franked by Members of Congress was less than 2½ percent in weight and lost revenue of the total free mail for that year. The deficit of the Post Office Department is due in a large measure to the abuse of the franking privilege, but that abuse is not by Members of Congress but by the departments of Government, practically every one of which is directly responsible to the Chief Executive and whose heads have been appointed by the Chief Executive.

I am inserting into the RECORD today tables giving the actual figures as to the number of pieces, the weight, and the lost revenue of mail franked by departments and by Members of Congress. I compiled these tables personally, every figure being taken from the annual reports of the Post Office Department, with the exception of the figures for the year 1937. The 1937 figures were taken from the testimony given by post-office officials on the Post Office appropriations bill when that bill was being considered by the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. I have asked unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD at this point table I and table II.

TABLE I.—Franked mail sent by departments (exclusive of Post Office Department)

FOR FISCAL YEARS ENDING JUNE 30, 1934, 1935, 1936, AND 1937 (PRESENT ADMINISTRATION)

	Number of pieces	Weight	Lost revenue
		Pounds	
1934.....	530, 471, 016	81, 212, 639	\$23, 094, 882
1935.....	624, 194, 119	85, 207, 595	31, 281, 600
1936.....	669, 352, 068	91, 125, 145	32, 236, 269
1937 ¹	669, 352, 068	91, 125, 145	32, 236, 269
Total.....	2, 493, 369, 271	348, 670, 524	118, 849, 020
Yearly average.....	623, 342, 232	87, 167, 631	29, 712, 270
Daily average.....	2, 045, 178	285, 795	97, 417

¹ Estimate submitted speaker by Post Office Department.

FOR FISCAL YEARS ENDING JUNE 30, 1930, 1931, 1932, AND 1933 (LAST ADMINISTRATION)

1930.....	302,126,259	42,737,534	\$9,347,505
1931.....	353,795,225	43,342,958	9,886,456
1932.....	319,890,040	43,118,907	9,151,899
1933.....	373,440,968	43,326,622	14,315,414
Total.....	1,349,252,492	172,526,021	42,701,274
Yearly average.....	339,750,830	43,131,503	10,675,319

TABLE II.—*Franked congressional mail*

	Number of pieces	Weight	Lost revenue
		Pounds	
1930.....	34,525,581	3,978,579	\$718,060
1931.....	33,413,032	4,385,007	723,671
1932.....	38,551,744	4,418,216	778,436
1933.....	36,171,088	6,867,788	1,019,621
1934.....	20,882,779	7,724,910	775,785
1935.....	16,097,050	2,683,086	577,162
1936.....	29,747,411	3,922,109	751,579

These tables show that while congressional franking was reduced from 34,000,000 pieces in 1930 to 29,000,000 pieces in 1936—it is the 1936 deficit to which Mr. Farley refers—departmental franking has during the same time increased from 302,126,259 pieces in 1930 to 669,352,068 pieces in 1936. Departmental franking has been increased almost 100 percent in weight and nearly 300 percent in lost revenue under the present Democratic administration over the last Republican administration. By departments I mean all departments of Government, excluding only the Post Office Department itself. The reason the Post Office Department is not included is because Post Office franking is included in the postal deficit as a legitimate charge, while other departmental franking is included in the nonpostal items to which Mr. Farley refers. Taking the estimates of the Post Office Department for the year 1937, these departments will have mailed during the 4 years ending June 30, 1937, the enormous amount of 2,493,369,271 pieces of mail, or a yearly average of 623,342,232 pieces, or over 2,000,000 pieces of free mail for every working day in the year.

I wonder how many people appreciate just how large this vast amount of mail is. Let us assume that one of our postal clerks, the most expert clerk in the Postal Service, were given the job of counting and sorting it. Let us assume that he counted and sorted one piece of mail every second and worked 40 hours a week, 48 weeks in the year. If he had started counting and sorting when Abraham Lincoln signed the emancipation proclamation he would be counting yet. If he had started counting when George Washington crossed the Delaware he would be counting yet. And if he had started counting when the Pilgrim Fathers landed upon the Plymouth Rock 300 years ago he would be counting yet. And if he did not take off any holidays and took no sick leave he would finish the job in the year 2004. And all this tremendous amount of mail the departments of Government, not Congress, sent out during 4 short years.

This mail weighed 348,670,524 pounds, with a yearly average of 87,167,631 pounds, or nearly 300,000 pounds for every working day in the year. Again it is difficult to realize just how much paper it required for this enormous amount of franking. It would take 140 railroad engines, hauling 50 railroad cars, each with a 50,000-pound capacity, to haul this enormous amount of mail out of Washington. It was sent from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the rock-bound coast of Maine to the sunny slopes of California, from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico and the Rio Grande, and some of it went into Canada and Mexico, Puerto Rico, the Philippine Islands, and Alaska. They sent preachers documents telling them how to kill hogs and hog killers documents telling them how to preach sermons. They told lawyers how to practice medicine and doctors how to practice law. Every conceivable kind of information was sent to the people—statistical figures that would make a certified public accountant gasp with astonishment; legal documents that even the President's proposed Supreme Court of 15 Justices would fail to construe; political propaganda of all kinds. Think of it! Three hundred and forty-eight million six

hundred and seventy thousand two hundred and fifty-four pounds sent out during 4 years of the present administration, or more than 55 pieces of literature, weighing nearly 8 pounds, for every one of the 45,646,000 voters who cast their ballot in the last election.

And what did this actually cost the taxpayers of the country? The Postmaster General's Department says that there was lost in revenue \$118,849,020. This is almost three times as much in lost revenue as that Department reported for these same departments during the 4 years of the last Republican administration, those figures being \$42,701,274. This was a yearly average of \$29,712,270 as against a yearly average in lost revenue for the last Republican administration of \$10,675,319. But that does not tell the entire story. We had to pay for these 7,000 railroad carloads of paper it required to do this printing. We had to pay for the printing of this more than 348,000,000 pounds of paper. Mr. Chairman, I have asked unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD at this point a table showing the actual cost of the paper and printing and the lost revenue for the period from July 1, 1933, to July 1, 1937—table III.

TABLE III.—*Departmental franking (not including Post Office Department)*

LOST REVENUE PLUS COST OF PAPER AND PRINTING FOR PERIOD FROM JULY 1, 1933, TO JULY 1, 1937	
Lost revenue.....	\$118,849,020
Cost of 348,670,523 pounds of paper, at 0.0695 cent per pound.....	24,232,601
Cost of printing 348,670,523 pounds of paper at 0.2133 cent per pound.....	74,371,422
Total lost revenue and cost of franking from July 1, 1933, to July 1, 1937.....	217,453,043
Annual cost.....	54,363,260

The Government Printing Office informs us that the average cost of paper they buy is .0695 cents per pound. Using those figures, the paper alone cost \$24,232,601. The Printing Office purchased last year 82,414,682 pounds of paper, and the total cost of all printing by the Government Printing Office in 1936 was \$18,756,268, or 0.2133 cents per pound. While some of the Department paper was mimeographed, the statement was made before a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee recently that mimeographing is more expensive than printing because departmental labor is higher. Taking this method of computing the cost—and it is the only method I know of—of printing this 348,670,524 pounds of paper it cost the taxpayers another \$74,371,422. Parenthetically, if anyone, either here or in the departments, knows of any better way of figuring this cost of printing, I would be pleased to have him place those figures in the RECORD.

The table shows the total amount of lost revenue, cost of printing, and cost of paper for the 4-year period from July 1, 1933, to July 1, 1937, to be the enormous sum of \$217,453,042, or an annual cost of \$54,363,260. In other words, 7,000 railroad carloads of free mail cost the taxpayers \$217,000,000 in 4 years. This is almost three times as much as the lost revenue and cost for the similar service during the period from July 1, 1929, to July 1, 1933, or during the preceding Republican administration. Conceding that there is a legitimate increase due to new agencies and new departments, no increase of 300 percent can be justified by anyone. That there is an enormous amount of political franking and semipolitical franking by the departments in their work must be conceded. Allowing an increase of 100 percent over the cost of the last administration there would be approximately \$72,000,000 that must be conceded either political or semipolitical franking. This amount equals nearly \$3 for every Democratic vote cast in the last Presidential election. It is 10 times as large as the entire Republican campaign fund spent by the national committee during that election. In view of this \$72,000,000 of political and semipolitical propaganda sent out to the public at large, it is amazing that the Republican Party was able to carry even Maine and Vermont.

Compare this with the 2.5 percent of the total amount of franking sent out by Members of Congress during the year 1936, to which Mr. Farley refers in his newspaper interview.

I listened closely to the wonderful praise given and the glowing tributes paid James A. Farley at the recent banquet given by the Democratic Party in his honor, and again at the big ovation that was tendered him at the \$100-a-plate feast which was held 2 weeks ago. Much was said about the wonderful leadership of Chairman Farley in that campaign. I listened carefully, but in vain, to hear one word of praise for this wonderful contribution of \$72,000,000 worth of political propaganda contributed by a Postmaster General, James A. Farley, at public expense, to Chairman James A. Farley, of the National Democratic Committee. And now Postmaster General James A. Farley has the colossal nerve to broadcast over the entire Nation, through the various news services, that the 1936 postal deficit was largely due to congressional franking. James A. Farley, the Postmaster General, should place the responsibility for the postal deficit upon James A. Farley, chairman of the Democratic National Committee. That is where it belongs. [Applause.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman talked about the cost of distribution in poundage, but did not talk about the value of that propaganda and remind us that it took a lot of it to send checks, did it not? [Laughter.]

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the plan to enlarge the United States Supreme Court reaches deeply into the fundamental principles of the American system of government. The question should not be a partisan one. It transcends the importance of any political party or political considerations. Democrats, Republicans, Progressives, and Farm-Laborites have taken up the cudgel against the plan.

I am opposed to the proposal because, in my judgment, it is designed to make a political football out of that Court and avoid the orderly process of changing the Constitution by amendments.

I am in sympathy with any move to increase efficiency and expedite action in the Federal courts, but insofar as the Supreme Court is concerned, that tribunal is not behind on its docket and the records show that decisions are customarily handed down within 2 or 3 weeks.

Enlargement of the Supreme Court would simply mean more Judges participating in each decision and would not mean more decisions. Obviously the plan is not designed to speed up the Court.

HOW DOES THE AGE ARGUMENT FIT INTO THE PICTURE?

Being a young man, I naturally like to see young men taking an active part in the affairs of government. But neither youth nor advanced years can be used as exclusive yardsticks of a man's mentality, his capacity for work, or his usefulness.

The President himself has refuted the age argument by his own actions. In the first place, two members of the Cabinet are over 70.

Furthermore, the records of the United States Civil Service Commission show that the President has signed 103 Executive orders since 1933 exempting that number of civil employees—all past 70—from retirement.

The President, therefore, has no fears of age itself. This argument is merely used as a club with which to beat the Supreme Court.

Nine influential Members of the Senate already are past 70, and 12 Members of the House have attained that age. In the House five additional Members will pass 70 during the coming year. If a man of 70 is not equipped to interpret the law, as the "court kickers" contend, men of 70 certainly are not equipped to make the law.

No one can recall the decisions and services of John Marshall, of Mr. Justice Holmes, of Justice Brandeis, and successfully contend that age was the criterion of their viewpoints. Retirement at age of 70 would have deprived the Nation of 20 years of Justice Holmes' services; would have shortened the judicial career of Marshall by nearly one-third; would have cut Mr. Brandeis' judicial service in half.

Since presence on the Court of Justices past 70 does not, and apparently has not, impeded its work, this question would appear to have no genuine or material bearing upon the present controversy.

These facts prove that the elements of age and speeding up cases are removed from the question at hand.

The whole thing resolves itself into one perfectly plain question that need not be confused with fancy words or high-sounding phrases:

Shall the Supreme Court be turned into the personal organ of any President?

Senator LA FOLLETTE and others have clearly acknowledged the truth of this purpose. They make no bones about it now, although the same degree of frankness was not shown in the beginning. In answer to this question I say no. Personally, I do not believe that any President, whether he be Republican, Democrat, Socialist, or what-have-you, should be permitted to make our courts his servants. If the Nation wants one man, whoever it may be, to control the policy and action of all three branches of government, then why not simply eliminate Congress and the Court?

If one group can take political control of the Court now, there is nothing to stop another group from doing the same thing another time. The result is that the Court becomes a political football, to be kicked back and forth, and the country ceases to have an independent judiciary.

If this purpose is accomplished, confidence in the integrity of the law will be undermined, reaching and penalizing all the courts of the Nation.

POLITICAL FORCE OR ORDERLY GOVERNMENT?

When men in high places deliberately tear down confidence in our courts, when they sow seeds of distrust and disrespect, is it any wonder that the country reaps a harvest of lawlessness? Is it any wonder that we witness defiance of law and order?

And if we who make the laws close our eyes to the defiance and the truth of this statement, we must share the blame.

The entire American court system stands at the crossroads. Shall political force prevail—or orderly government?

Recent events are strengthening the determination of thinking citizens of the Nation to stand by their courts; to insist upon the rule of law rather than the rule of mobs.

In considering this court enlargement plan, may I suggest a couple of homely comparisons:

First. It would be like a football game for which a majority of the referees and umpires had been chosen with an advance understanding that they would render all their decisions in favor of one team.

Second. The American people frequently cry, "Kill the umpire", but when it is all said and done, they abide by his decisions. If they want to change the rules, they do it in the orderly way and not merely at the dictation of the pitcher on the mound or the quarterback on the field at the moment.

Third. Getting back to the courtroom, how fair do you think it would be if you had to enter a case in your local court in which the prosecutor had most of the jurors "in his pocket", so to speak?

IS THERE MERIT IN THE CLAIM THAT IT TAKES TOO LONG TO SECURE ACTION ON A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT?

Here again the answer is "no." It is not a long-drawn-out process, as some would have you believe, when the force of public opinion is behind the proposal. If the force of public opinion does not support the measure, then it can only be said that the will of the people has been expressed in keeping with our plan of democracy.

The contention that amendments take too long has been artfully developed upon the basis of the child-labor amendment. Let us face the facts. This amendment was originally considered and rejected by 35 States. Now it is being reconsidered. New York State has not yet approved it. Ohio did so but recently.

As the gentleman from New York said a few days ago:

In all, the Constitution has been amended 21 times thus far. The first 10, of course, were approved practically in one group. Counting all the 21 ratifications and grouping the first 10 in 1

unit, we find that the average time between submission and ratification is 1 year and 7 months.

The twenty-first amendment, repealing the prohibition amendment, was ratified within less than 10 months after submission to the people. The thirteenth amendment, which grew out of public issues raised by the Civil War, was approved in about the same amount of time. The seventeenth amendment, providing for direct election of United States Senators, was ratified within approximately 1 year; the women's suffrage amendment within less than 18 months; and the so-called "lame duck" amendment, proposed by Senator NORRIS, in 11 months.

The last five amendments have come within the present era of rapid communication, and each of them has been ratified in just about a year.

In view of these facts, just ask yourself if the talk of delay is a justifiable excuse for rejecting the method prescribed by the Constitution itself for the purpose of making it responsive to the requirements of the times and the people's needs.

If the President wants honest, orderly, well-considered court reform; if he is not aiming at political control—then he should submit the enlargement plan to the people in the orderly American way, by giving them a chance to act upon a constitutional amendment based upon logic and not upon emotion or purely political grounds.

The people themselves have set up the constitutional requirements of government, and to ignore them would mean disobedience to the rules they have made. If they want to change the rules, they have the right and the method for doing it through constitutional amendments—which, after all, simply means the people's right to govern themselves.

CAN THE LAST ELECTION BE LOOKED UPON AS THE MANDATE OF THE PEOPLE IN SUPPORT OF THIS MOVE TO ENLARGE THE COURT?

This question has been raised and may now be in the minds of many people. The answer is found in the platform upon which the Chief Executive ran. It pledged the use of constitutional amendments submitted to the people. It is likewise answered by the great galaxy of courageous Senators and Members of Congress who have loyally supported his policies and who now believe in them, but who also oppose this enlargement of the Court. It is answered again in the minds of millions of citizens who were convinced that nothing of this kind was in mind or would be attempted.

Many of them are now asking why the proposal was not brought out in the open then.

If the last election could in any way be interpreted as a mandate in favor of this Court proposal, there should certainly be no fear in submitting an amendment to the people.

In the last election the Nation accepted a 27-to-17 decision with sportsmanship and tranquillity. Had it been a 27-to-25 decision, the result would have been the same. There was no talk of a revolution, no wolf cries of "crisis", no wall about a split decision.

Recovery was proclaimed then. If the claim was true, why all this sudden need for haste; why all these vague threats of crisis?

If acting on a political basis, the opponents of the President should be the first to condemn the Supreme Court for declaring a closed season on the N. R. A. bird; they should be downright mad because the Court took Top Sergeant Johnson's punch-drunk parrot off the President's window sill.

ABOVE PARTISANSHIP

The talk of a mandate or of narrow partisan opposition is carried to a more conclusive point of absurdity when we stop to think of the great Democratic newspapers opposed to this Court proposal.

I myself have counted 72 of them in the last few days. The Plain Dealer, in Cleveland, Ohio, is a notable example. It has long been an effective supporter of New Deal legislation. No one can say that partisanship prompts its present effective and important opposition to the Court plan. The same thing can be said of Scripps-Howard papers, the New York Times, the Cincinnati Enquirer, the Brooklyn Eagle,

the Birmingham (Ala.) Herald, the Galveston News, the Memphis Commercial, and hundreds of others all over the country. They supported the President's legislation; they oppose his Court plan with equal vigor and courage.

In its March 5 editorial, the Cleveland Plain Dealer says, the President—

Uses the figure of the three-horse team of the American system of government, which must "pull together" if the field is to be plowed.

To us it seems that one member of the three-horse team is conspiring with another member of the team to reduce the third horse to a position of complete subservency. Two of the three want to do all the planning, going whither they will and when, while the third member is merely to go along where its teammates wish, whipped into complete submission.

Ohio has two Senators. They both belong to the same party. Senator BULKLEY favors the plan and Senator DONAHEY opposes it. Certainly no one could properly belittle Senator DONAHEY's position with a cry of partisanship.

Virtually upon its submission Senator BULKLEY endorsed the Court-control plan. Since then he has made a radio speech by which he sought to add to the fog around the issue, for nowhere in his discourse was there a paragraph which so clearly stated the real purpose of the proposal as did the two sentences of Senator LA FOLLETTE, when he said:

Of course the President's proposal will affect the decisions of the Supreme Court.

It was intended to do exactly that.

On the other hand, Senator DONAHEY stated his opposition to the plan in the following words:

This entire controversy vitally affects the judiciary, the coordinate branch of the Government, and should be referred to the people—the source of all political power.

The Supreme Court has not issued a prohibition against humane legislation. It has ruled that one Congress must resort to constitutional means of accomplishing these and any other purposes, the same as every other Congress has been required to do.

DELUGE OF DECEPTION

The deluge of deception which has characterized this movement from the beginning makes any thoughtful person question the motives behind it all.

According to recent arguments, one should believe the Supreme Court is responsible for the depression, the drought, the floods, the recent wave of influenza, and Aunt Sarah's corns. Maybe those of us in northern Ohio who are interested in the Cleveland baseball club have overlooked the possibility that the Court was responsible for the fact that the Indians failed to win the pennant in 1936.

Said Raymond Moley—and we all know who he is:

I should welcome the opportunity to speak to the man of whom we heard Thursday evening; to the man who, in the sweat of his brow, piles sandbags on the levee at Cairo. And, if I spoke to him, I would say that there is no evidence whatsoever that the Supreme Court has ever placed obstacles in the way of flood control. I would tell him, too, that there is no evidence whatsoever that the Supreme Court stands, or has stood, in the way of the efforts of the Federal Government to provide work for the unemployed, to protect home owners and farm owners from foreclosure, to guarantee the safety of bank deposits, to expand credit or restrict it, to protect the small investor on the stock exchange, to adjust the value and nature of the currency, or to do any one of many other things in the interest of the little fellow.

Only one important New Deal law—the Wagner Labor Relations Act—is now in danger in the courts. The administration apparently has a court-proof substitute for A. A. A. in the present soil-conservation law, which is adequate to deal with the Dust Bowl. The biggest project which the Supreme Court will not allow the New Deal is another N. R. A., and six new judges could not make that constitutional, for the Supreme Court was unanimous upon it.

PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

The most terrible error of all, to my humble way of thinking, is the deliberate misrepresentation used to show that the Supreme Court is the device of privilege, of position, of wealth. If it were, I would be in favor of throwing it out the window entirely, not merely these halfway measures.

Instead, the protection which this tribunal has afforded to humble, deserving citizens, who had no other source of

protection, constitutes the main reason why I am willing to fight for its independence.

The safeguards of an independent judiciary are not simply the protection of one moment or one set of circumstances. They are the guaranties which, at all times and under all circumstances, preserve the rights of a people and keep a nation free.

Has this been true of the United States Supreme Court? Has it preserved the human rights of the great masses of our common people or has it been a tool of the mighty, scorning the plight and privileges of the humble citizen?

For the answers to these questions let us consider some of its decisions.

Take the *Scottsboro* case, for example. Local courts, State courts, and all along the line, those three obscure colored men were beaten. They had neither wealth nor power. And it remained for the United States Supreme Court to protect their rights. When they did this it was not only a decision for those three men but the guaranty of a free and fair trial to every colored person in the United States; and the same to any other citizen, regardless of class, creed, or race.

Time after time the Supreme Court has protected the legal rights of organized labor, including the right of strike and peaceful picketing. Mr. PETTENGILL, the gentleman from Indiana, cited these cases in detail in his eloquent radio broadcast last Saturday evening. He stated that the Supreme Court has decided 80 out of 100 of such cases in protection of labor.

Yet some of the leaders of this group are asking their followers to uphold the enlargement of the Court. Is it not significant that many of the foremost friends of labor legislation are vigorously opposed to the move?

The device of wrapping up this Supreme Court proposal in the same bundle with the aims of farm legislation or labor legislation seems a rather far cry from the true picture when you think of the fact that many of the men in the Senate and House who have carried the brunt of the fight for years in behalf of farm and labor legislation are among the most bitter opponents of the plan to control the Court.

Then let us take a look at the protection afforded to foreign-language groups.

In 1923 the Supreme Court declared unconstitutional an act of the State Legislature of Nebraska prohibiting the teaching of certain foreign languages in the schools. Every foreign-language group in the country should be interested in this decision.

In 14 cases involving denominational and private schools, the precious birthright of religious freedom in America, which belongs to all religious beliefs alike, has been preserved. This right was attacked in 22 different States. Attorneys representing every religious denomination helped fight for this protection in the Supreme Court. Another human right was saved for all citizens.

In 1924 the Supreme Court declared unconstitutional an Oregon statute requiring every child between 8 and 16 years of age to be sent to a public school. Speaking for the Court in this case, Mr. Justice McReynolds said, in part:

We think it entirely plain that the act unreasonably interferes with the liberty of parents and guardians to direct the upbringing and education of children under their control.

In 1926 the Supreme Court ruled that a Federal officer cannot make a lawful search of a person's premises under a warrant invalid under the Federal law, even though it might comply with the State law.

The Supreme Court declared unconstitutional a Texas statute providing that "in no event shall a Negro be eligible to participate in a Democratic Party election."

The Supreme Court held unconstitutional a Minnesota statute which forbade creameries to buy cream at higher prices at one place than at another.

The Supreme Court held unconstitutional the Kansas Criminal Syndicalism Act and said that the act could not, in the absence of violence or crime, be applied against a per-

son who sought to persuade people to become members of a branch of the Industrial Workers of the World.

The Supreme Court declared unconstitutional arrests and seizures without warrant made by New York State troopers.

The Supreme Court has ruled that a Negro on trial is entitled to have the jurors asked whether they have racial prejudice which might prevent the giving of a fair and impartial verdict.

The Supreme Court in the case coming up from Alabama ruled that it is unconstitutional for a person to be convicted of a criminal offense in a trial where he has been deprived of assistance of counsel. In another case coming up from Alabama the Supreme Court said the systematic exclusion of Negroes from grand jury and trial duty in cases of criminal action against Negroes constitutes a denial of the equal protection of the law.

PRINCES OF PRIVILEGE?

The people involved in these cases are not "Princes of Privilege" except insofar as the humblest American citizen is the "prince" of his own domain of freedom and liberty. In talking about threats against these privileges of the humblest kind of citizens, no one may say, "It can't happen here." These cases show it has happened here.

These examples are endless. More than a political doctrine is at stake. I do not accuse the President of having designs against any one of these rights, but I do say that one group may use authority wisely; another may intend to, yet fail; and still another may use exactly the same power with no good intentions and with results utterly disastrous.

If the Nation will permit the abandonment of the orderly processes of government and depend upon varying political and emotional winds to determine the legality of laws, we might easily find ourselves in a position where any law, the right of free speech, trial by jury, religious freedom, free assemblage—a piece of labor or farm legislation—was held operative one minute and inoperative the next, depending upon the changing swing of the moment. Any law now in existence or hitherto written would be menaced by such a condition. There will be no stability if the legality of legislation is left to these shifting winds of emotion and politics.

The issue today is to save the Nation from disrespect of courts and from one-man government—now or henceforth—no matter who that one man may be.

An independent judiciary, free from manipulation, free from political control, is the priceless safeguard of every American citizen against the encroachments of all groups at all times. My plea is, do not let down the bars. Keep the American court system independent from political control. [Applause.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. It is with interest that I have listened to the able address made by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WHITE] upon the President's proposal to reorganize the Federal judiciary. The gentleman prefaced his address by advising the House and the country that the proposed reorganization is an American issue and not a partisan one. In this declaratory and patriotic statement I heartily concur. And yet it is a curious thing to note that not a single Republican in the House of Representatives or in the Senate or any Republican of note throughout the Nation has endorsed the President's plan. And when one considers the subject matter from that angle, he may reach the conclusion that from the standpoint of Republican politics the question is partisan. This thought is corroborated by a number of letters and petitions that I have received through the mail from my constituents wherein local Republican politicians are leading the way in denouncing the President's judiciary program. It is a difficult thing for me to challenge the sincerity of one's motives upon any question, and yet, knowing some of the "dyed in the wool" reactionary Republicans in my own district who are moving heaven and earth to see that I am properly informed upon this question, I am constrained to conclude that these gen-

tlemen are basing their conclusions solely upon the ground of partisan politics.

Let me advise my colleagues that I have not completed my research work upon the great problem before us. My mind is still open as to what is the best thing to do under present conditions and circumstances as they may affect the future state of the Union. At this juncture let me say firmly and from a heart chiseled with sincerity that my final decision upon the subject before us will be made in the interests of what I believe to be best for the future of my country. I proclaim here and now that the question of self, political expediency, and party or partisan loyalty shall be submerged in what I conceive to be for the best interests of this great Government of ours and the country of the future which I love and revere. [Applause.]

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, we are now discussing the appropriation bill for the State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor Departments; and I cannot help but commend the chairman of the subcommittee and the other members of the subcommittee for trying to hold down these various departments, even though the appropriation bill this year is \$3,373,405 over that of last year. It is a difficult task for the Appropriation subcommittees to hold down Congress on its spending spree, because Congress makes the laws that require so much Federal spending; however, the Appropriation Committee can function greatly in holding down the departments by not granting the amount they ask for.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to spend my 15 minutes this afternoon in talking upon this bill. I have taken as my text this afternoon, "Spend less, tax more, or 'bust'!" In 15 minutes I could not do justice to that subject, so I am going to spend most of my time this afternoon upon the subject "Spend less." I was very much interested in hearing the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] take the floor this afternoon and give you a résumé of the spending of this Government. Some more Democrats evidently want to know the answer to where are you going to get the money? It seems to be the desire and the idea of Members of Congress that all they are sent here for is to get money for their districts, and that the more money they can have spent in their districts will be the measure of determining whether they are good Congressmen or not, without regard to the welfare of the Nation as a whole. Sometimes it seems to me that Members of Congress fail to appreciate, as was suggested by the gentleman from Illinois a few minutes ago, that this is America, and I am an American first before I am a partisan; I do not care whether that means Democrat or Republican. The Members of Congress must now look to the things we are trying to do from the broad viewpoint of whether we are American citizens or are partisans, where one is doing something as a Member of Congress for his own district and that is all. God forbid that I shall ever stoop so low as to be only a Republican when the welfare of America is at stake, and I think we are today in the most critical period of American history.

Mr. Chairman, someone in this country of ours in public office is responsible for this great expenditure of funds. Who is the first man? He is the President of the United States. He is the first man who is responsible. In my judgment, who is the second man? The Speaker of the House is the second man. And in turn, who is the third man? The third man is the majority leader. They are the men who are responsible for keeping down Government expenses. Yet what have they done to curb expenses? Then we come down to the various chairmen of committees, who are spending these vast, fabulous sums. They are responsible for the laws that we are passing. Most of the chairmen come from the Southern States. They are the men who are responsible for what we are doing in Congress. Then you have a body at the other end of the Capitol called the Senate. They must assume their responsibility. A funny thing happened a few minutes ago. I was called to my office, and over there a wool salesman named Worthington, from Philadelphia, was showing me some wool. I said to this salesman, "There is somebody in this country who

is pulling the wool over the eyes of the American people, and who is also pulling the wool over the eyes of the Congressmen. Who is that man? Who is the man that is responsible mostly for these enormous expenditures of funds?" When I get through with my quotations, judge for yourself who is pulling the wool over your eyes. I want to quote to you this afternoon from the man who is mostly responsible for the vast Government expenditures. First I quote from the Democratic platform, 1932:

We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagances, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent of the cost of the Federal Government.

The President of the United States said that he was for that platform 100 percent. That same President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his acceptance speech, July 2, 1932, made this statement:

For 3 long years I have been going up and down this country preaching that government costs too much. I cannot stop the preaching.

Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States for the last 3 years has forgotten all about that statement. He has not said anything lately about reducing governmental expenses. In my judgment, all he thinks about is spending more, spending more. At least he has not tried to stop it; or he could if he wanted to.

Let me quote again from the President's speech of October 19, 1932:

That (the Hoover spending), my friends, * * * is the most reckless and extravagant pace I have been able to discover in the statistical record of any peacetime government anywhere anytime.

I wonder if the President would recognize those remarks after seeing what he has done in the past 4 years? I am going to give you the figures, if I have time later, about his enormous spending spree.

I am going to quote from what the President said on July 2, 1932:

I propose to you, my friends, that government be made solvent and that an example be set by the President of the United States.

Is there any man in the House of Representatives or in this country who thinks the President has set an example on economy? If there is, let him speak now. Let me quote again from President Roosevelt's message to Congress on March 10, 1933:

For 3 long years the Federal Government has been on the road toward bankruptcy. With the utmost seriousness I point out to the Congress the proven effect of this fact upon our national economy. Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on the rocks of loose financial policy. We must avoid this danger.

I wonder if the President ever gives any thought to these statements that he made 4 years ago?

I want to say again with reference to this man who is most responsible for this Government spending, that in Franklin D. Roosevelt's inaugural address, March 4, 1933, he said:

Through this program of action we address ourselves to putting our national house in order and making the income balance the outgo.

When the President looks at the Treasury statement today the statement just referred to seems like a big joke.

Talk about economy; talk about Government expenses. I want to say this will be the most extravagant Congress that this Nation has ever seen before you get through with it. This Seventy-fifth Congress, before you get through with the appropriations, will be the most extravagant Congress in the history of the Nation. The Seventy-fourth was appalling in its expenditures and the Seventy-fifth will surpass it, I am afraid, even with the bonus left in the appropriation of the Seventy-fourth Congress.

I again quote from Franklin D. Roosevelt's Budget message of January 3, 1934:

Furthermore, the Government, during the balance of this calendar year 1934, should plan to build its 1936 expenditures, including recovery and relief, within the revenues expected within the fiscal year 1936. We should plan to have a definite balanced Budget by

the third year of recovery, and from that time on seek a continued reduction of the national debt.

I want to say to Mr. Roosevelt, in reference to those remarks, that should happen this year, but Mr. Roosevelt's Budget will be so unbalanced at the end of this year that it will be worse than any year in the history of Mr. Roosevelt's presidency up to this time. He just does not know what it is all about, and the public must advise him, because Congress does not seem to be able to. Congress is on a sit-down strike when it comes to economy in Government.

I do not want to condemn Mr. Roosevelt. I have not any desire to do so. He never did anything detrimental to me personally. I do not want to do anything detrimental to him personally, but I want him to assume the responsibility that is his. I would not do anything detrimental to him, but I want him, as Chief Executive, to come here and whip this Congress into line in economy in Government expenses, in consolidation of offices, which he promised the American people he would do. I want him to tell you to keep down these expenditures if you are going to keep this Government from being wrecked. Why is he so quiet on economy in Government, why the change in his attitude? He never has explained to the people.

I will read one more quotation from Mr. Roosevelt's address on November 4, 1932, in Brooklyn:

The people of America demand a reduction of Federal expenditures. It can be accomplished not only by reducing the expenditures of existing department but it can be done by abolishing many useless commissions, bureaus, and functions, and it can be done by consolidating many activities of the Government.

Mr. Roosevelt had the power in his hands to reduce and consolidate these Government bureaus and commissions, but he did not do it; instead, he has established more bureaus than any three Presidents in the history of this Nation. No President has ever been so ruthless in the establishment of new bureaus and new organizations as the present President, although he condemned that very thing in the past administrations. Oh, it is easy to criticize; but it takes will power to carry out a principle that is worth while.

I want to show you what we are doing in our spending. In 1932 the Government spent \$5,153,000,000. Then on June 30, 1934, the first full year of President Roosevelt's administration, we increased the expenditures over 1932 by 38 percent, or \$7,105,000,000. At the end of 1935 we increased the expenditures over 1932 by 43 percent, or \$7,375,000,000. At the end of 1936 Mr. Roosevelt increased the expenditures of this Government over 1932 over 72 percent. That is, over 1932, the very year he was condemning his predecessor in office, or \$8,879,000,000.

Let me say to you Members of Congress, before you get through 1937 you will have spent more money than you did in 1936, and unless you change the course you are on now you will spend more money in 1938 than you did in 1937, because you are drafting that legislation right here in the House of Representatives at this time.

Do you propose to do it? Mr. Speaker, Mr. Majority Leader, Mr. Chairman of Appropriations, Mr. Chairman of Ways and Means, and other important committee chairmen, I advise you to go with caution. Stop, look, and listen.

Now, if you cannot understand what these annual figures mean, I shall give them to you by monthly averages. We spent in 1934 an average per month of \$553,000,000. In 1935 the average expenditure per month was over \$546,000,000. The average expenditures per month in 1936 were over \$552,000,000; and the average per month expenditure in 1937 will be over \$593,000,000. These are staggering sums, too staggering for the ordinary mind to realize. Do you Members of Congress understand them? From time to time I have given you Treasury statements. I now come to the Treasury statements for the month of February, and I hope you may understand and grasp the significance of the figures I am about to quote you. If the people responsible cannot understand the picture when it is presented one way, the next step to take is to present it to them in another way. You have not heard the President of the United States say that we are going to try to collect the debts owed us by foreign countries, amounting to over \$22,000,000,000. Nor

Congress has not insisted they pay their debts. Why not? You seem to have forgotten that item of national moment. You are now negotiating reciprocal-trade agreements by proxy to the President and Secretary of State, and the foreign countries are getting the advantage of this Government when it comes to closing up those agreements. Instead of improving our financial condition, we shall wake up some day to find that we are still further in the red. The foreign countries will get the advantage of America, and they are doing it. Protect American agriculture and American labor from cheap foreign-made goods.

I call your attention to the Federal Treasury statement of February 1, when the Federal Government was \$4,851,000 in the red. That is, our receipts were less than our expenditures by these amounts. The Treasury statement of February 2 shows that the Federal Government was \$8,735,000 in the red for that day. The Treasury statement for February 3 shows the Federal Government lost \$12,263,000. The Treasury statement for February 4 shows that we were in the red \$8,782,000. We see by the daily statement of February 5 that the Federal Government was in the red \$12,590,000. Each day we spend more than we receive. How long can we keep it up?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The Treasury statement for February 6 shows the Federal Government \$7,248,000 in the red. On February 8 the Federal Government was in the red \$14,779,000. On February 9 the Federal Government was in the red \$8,649,000. On February 10 the Federal Government was in the red \$2,716,000. On February 11 the Federal Government was in the red \$7,562,000. On February 13 the Federal Government was in the red \$4,808,000.

At no time to date in February do you find a day when the Federal Treasury was collecting more money than it spent. On February 15 they were in the red \$17,000,000. And so it goes practically every day, you will find we spend more than we receive; this may be uninteresting, but, I ask you, Where are you going to get the money?

When I came to read the statements for March I felt that around the middle of the month, when the income-tax collections came in, that surely we would find days where the income exceeded the outgo, when we were collecting more money than we were spending; but when I looked at the statement of March 16, yesterday, and found that we were in the red \$52,768,000 for that day I almost fell through the floor of my office. It is the most serious thing that we Members of Congress have to face, these enormous expenditures of the Government and the rate at which we are unbalancing our Budget; but my time is up and I have confined my remarks on this occasion to spending less. At some future time I hope to have an opportunity to show you that we must lay more taxes if we do not cut down the expenditures; but we must cut down the expenditures first. I will do my duty. Will you assume your responsibility? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, some of my good friends in Congress, representing great dairying States, are very much concerned about what we are doing and just what we will do about going into the dairying business in the South. I mean on a scale that they believe would be injurious to these States that are now shipping into South Carolina and other cotton States. My good friend ANDRESEN, representing the State of Minnesota, takes up quite a lot of the time of the Agricultural Committee when we are considering farm legislation in trying to find out if, for instance, under the Soil Conservation Act whether or not this program tends to increase dairying in the South. My good friend, BOILEAU, representing the State of Wisconsin, a real dairying State, and also a member of the Agricultural Committee, apparently is not worried about what we are doing or what we will do along this line,

stating that it just cannot be done in the South to the extent that it would be harmful to the dairy interest of the great dairying States of the Union. May I state that the only farm product that we cannot produce in the South is coffee. However, our people want to produce cotton and will continue to make cotton their major crop if only they are able to get a fair price for their cotton. During the past 16 years during my service in Congress, I have tried to get over to my good friends representing those States where their main crops are hogs, corn, wheat, and dairying, that they should join with us of the cotton States in our every effort in making the cotton farmers prosperous, for the reason it would enable our people to continue to stick to their cotton production and continue to buy from these other sections. We of the South have all along proven to be large buyers of those farm products grown in the West and Northwest—flour, meal and grits, hog products, butter and can milk, as well as horses and mules.

However, I want you to get this: Do not think for a moment that we cannot succeed in growing all of these products, including mules and horses. I have grown 35 bushels of wheat per acre on my farm. We have at this time in South Carolina some of the finest dairy herds to be found in any State. What about hogs? Listen to a few recent reports of shipments of hogs in South Carolina: Mr. Craven, county agent, Bamberg County, reports during January and February farmers shipped \$53,233 worth of hogs. Mr. Massey, county agent, my home county, Orangeburg, states that four cars of hogs are being shipped today, and several more cars will be shipped in the next few days; Chesterfield County, March 15, the first carload of hogs ever to be shipped out of this county was shipped today to Richmond, Va. Kingstree, Williamsburg County, March 15, shipped the largest car of hogs today ever shipped by farmers from this county. Plans are to continue to ship each Monday. The papers of the various counties are carrying such information, which would indicate to you that our people can grow their hog products and to the extent of shipping to markets other than in South Carolina. This is also true with other cotton-producing States.

Without giving actual figures as to dairying and hog farming in my State, I am hoping that from what I have said on this subject I have made it clear that we can produce and compete with you along this line, especially to take care of the actual needs of the cotton States.

What I want to especially call to the attention of my friends and colleagues representing the West and Northwest is that you are only adding fuel to the fire when your State legislatures proceed to pass legislation denying any of the farm products of the South to be shipped into your States.

You remember two of us can play this game and, may I state, that this attitude on the part of your State to do this will tend to do two things: It will bring about the passage in the cotton States of legislation along the same line, and certainly it will cause our people to produce not only for the needs of the people of the South, but we can increase our shipments outside of the cotton States which will certainly interfere with your shipments to these outside markets where you now have no competition from the cotton States.

Let us see what sort of bill is now being considered before the Iowa General Assembly. I am quoting:

Lard substitute shall mean any manufactured product containing not less than 90 percent animal fat by weight used as or in place of lard or corn oil except butter substitutes, which are now taxed.

I am quoting from the bill:

There is hereby imposed . . . an inspection fee and excise tax of 5 cents upon each pound of any substitute for lard sold . . . or exposed for sale or given or delivered to a consumer, said fee to be paid to the secretary of agriculture prior to any such sale, gift, or delivery . . .

The purpose of this bill, in fact, the purpose of all these bills would be to put such a high tax on cottonseed-oil shortenings that they would be driven out of the Iowa market and thereby force the people of Iowa and other States passing such legislation to use hog lard. As stated, I want to warn

you, my good friends who so ably represent the great State of Iowa, as well as those representing other States, where the general assembly would be so short-sighted as to do such a foolish thing, that is, pass such legislation, that you should inform yourselves as to the large open and free market that you now have in the cotton States. May I state to you that the balance in trade in farm products between the Corn Belt and the dairying States, and that of the cotton South is overwhelmingly in favor of the Corn Belt and the dairying States?

Crisco and compound lard are made out of cottonseed oil, the purest of any and all types of shortenings. Millions of people today are using these products, including margarine, for the reason they are made out of pure vegetable oils, and for the further reason they are cheaper than hog lard and butter.

Why should either the Federal or a State Government tell any citizen what he should use as a table spread or a shortening? Taxing a legitimate product in order to increase the consumption of another is just one way of trying to dictate to consumers.

A tax on margarine is a tax on cottonseed, soybeans, and other crops, and a tax on beef cattle, sheep, and hogs.

I find that the old lobby representing selfish interests is working again, urging Congress and State legislatures to pass laws that will put an additional tax of from 5 to 20 cents a pound on shortenings other than hog lard and on margarine.

These are not bills for the purpose of raising revenue.

They are bills backed by the creamery interests and other State groups who, frankly, would like to see shortenings made out of vegetable oil and margarine taxed out of existence in order to increase the sale and price of butter and hog lard.

What is wrong with margarine?

Why should this food product be singled out for ruinous taxation?

I will give you the answer in a nutshell: Margarine's only crime is its great economy.

It sells for substantially less than butter.

I protest against this proposed taxation on the grounds it would be un-American and unfair.

Margarine is made from nutritious domestic vegetable fats that are produced from the crops of southern plantations.

It is a wholesome, economical food product that needs no defense.

It is used through preference, or necessity, in millions of American homes in both cities and on the farms.

It makes a delicious spread for bread.

Margarine is on my own table daily, therefore, I know what I am talking about. Thousands of people have been advised by their physicians to use margarine instead of butter.

Its food-energy content is measured at 3,400 calories to the pound, exactly the same caloric value as butter.

To tax wholesome margarine as a means of increasing the sale of butter would be as illogical as taxing apples to increase the sale of oranges; as taxing cotton to increase the use of wool.

And let me point out, the real burden of this tax would be borne by the people who can least afford to have their cost of living increased, the wage earners of America.

Finally, a tax of this character would result in depriving many persons in the low-income class of a wholesome and palatable spread for their bread.

This is another reason why I am for the President's Federal court program. During the 12 years I served under a Republican administration those of us interested in the under dog could not pass helpful legislation and if we did succeed in passing anything in the interest of farmers it was vetoed. Now, when we have a man in the White House interested in farmers, wage earners, and the masses of the people, and who has advocated the passing of legislation to help protect the great masses from the ravages of the selfish interests, the Supreme Court says, "You cannot do it."

Now comes this same selfish interest trying to put through legislation that would heap up an additional tax burden on that great class of people who are forced to buy cheaper shortenings and margarine so as to come within their ability to buy and so as to enjoy some type of spread on their bread.

I want my people in South Carolina and the people of the Cotton States to know just what is going on in the Corn Belt, the dairy States, as well as in Congress, so that they may be able to take same up with their Representatives in Congress, urging them to demand equal rights and fair play with every other section of our great country in the consideration of any legislation considered in the States as well as in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. FORD].

ADEQUATE FEDERAL PENSIONS FOR THOSE ABOVE THE AGE OF 60 YEARS

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the Members of the House of Representatives who are interested in old-age-pension legislation will recall the speeches I made 2 years ago, in which I predicted that under the Social Security Act then being proposed, and which was later adopted, many of the deserving old people in a number of the States would be left without assistance. This prediction was based on my knowledge of what would necessarily result from requiring the States to match Federal contributions dollar for dollar. I am sorry to report to you that my prediction, although disregarded when the legislation was being enacted, has proven true. I feel now as I felt on April 12, 1935, when I told you—

I cannot agree that the several States should be required to match dollar for dollar with any funds furnished by the Federal Government for payment of old-age pension benefits. Many States are absolutely unable to furnish any funds at all for this purpose, thus preventing any aged, needy citizens from receiving help in those States, while citizens of other States are being granted assistance. It is my contention that the Federal Government should set a definite sum per person to be granted each State for all persons in that State above a certain age. If the State is able to furnish additional funds, it should be allowed to do so. If the Federal Government agrees to furnish a certain sum per month for every person over a certain age, then let it furnish that sum, without requiring that the State furnish an equal sum per person.

This statement is an assertion of my principles regarding old-age assistance, and I am glad to urge the enactment of those principles into the living law of the land for the benefit of the aged.

An amendment in line with this feeling was offered by me on April 18, 1935, and was rejected by the House because it apparently did not want the Federal Government to be guaranteeing a certain sum regardless of the amount the States were able to furnish as supplementary funds.

What do we see today as a result of the rejection of the amendment which I offered? According to the figures which I have before me and which were compiled by the Social Security Board, in the month of December 1936 the average amount given the recipient of old-age assistance in Mississippi was \$3.92. Why is the sum so low? Because Mississippi is unable to match to a greater amount the funds which could be obtained from the Federal Government. Nine other States were paying less than \$15 a month, which means that those States were able to put up less than \$7.50 as their portion of the amount payable under the Social Security Act.

A number of the Members have introduced good bills at this session and if enacted into law would mean that the Federal Government would pay a pension to every person over the age of 60 years, regardless of what any State could or could not pay.

The matter is up to the Members of Congress. If we are to do equal justice to all of the people over 60 years of age, we must amend the present law so that the aged in the poor States will be put on an equality with those living in the rich States. The eyes of our older citizens are turned toward Washington prayerfully looking for relief that can only come as a result of affirmative action by Congress. We have started in the right direction, but we must finish right by giving a guaranteed Federal old-age pension of not less than \$15 a month to all persons who can satisfactorily prove that they are above the age of 60. I repeat that it is up to us,

and I plead with you to join with me and other interested Members in taking effective action at once to secure the necessary legislation along the lines I have indicated. [Applause.]

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in coming before the House at this time—and if possible I shall use less than the 20 minutes—is to present to the attention of the Members the situation with respect to the fisheries industry in the United States. I appeared before the Committee on Appropriations asking certain amendments, and I wish to congratulate the committee upon its interest in the fisheries. While I feel that they have not gone as far as they should, or as far as I should like to have them go, they have certainly manifested an interest in this industry which is so sorely distressed.

But there are some material facts that ought to be considered by the Committee as a whole, and there will probably be some amendments I shall offer for the consideration of the Committee.

The commercial-fishery industry is in as great, if not greater, need of aid as agriculture. It is made up of individuals widely scattered, unorganized, and dependent upon the Government for guidance and assistance.

The fishery harvest is marketed fresh, frozen, dried, pickled, salted, smoked, canned, and in the form of by-products. About one-third, or a billion pounds, is marketed fresh or frozen and about two-thirds in other forms. When ready for market in the various forms, those commodities are worth annually about \$250,000,000 to the wholesalers or manufacturers. By the time they are purchased by consumers, the value, largely because of waste and transportation charges, may be doubled or more. The investment in vessels, gear, shore property, and other equipment is close to \$250,000,000, while the operating capital undoubtedly is around \$150,000,000. This makes the fishing industry worth nearly \$1,000,000,000 to the economic structure of the Nation. This industry is based on a great natural resource, and one which under a wise plan of conservation and husbandry has promise of yielding a sustained production for future generations.

On an average, the annual harvest of our commercial fisheries amounts to nearly 3,000,000,000 pounds of protein food and edible oils, and about one-half a billion pounds of products are used in the arts and industries. In 1929, the volume of the edible fishery products was a little less than one-third the annual production of pork in this country, about one-third that of beef, about three times that of veal, and about four times that of mutton and lamb.

The harvest is made up of about 160 varieties or species, although 12 of these varieties make up over 80 percent of the total volume. These are salmon, pilchard, haddock, sea herring, cod, tuna and tunalike fishes, shrimp, oysters, crabs, flounders, mackerel, and halibut.

The catch as landed decreased in value from \$124,000,000 in 1929 to \$77,000,000 in 1931.

I call particular attention to this, because if there is anybody in the United States who may occupy the status of the forgotten man, it is the fisherman.

The average earning of a fisherman in 1929 was about \$1,000. In 1931 this was reduced to about \$630. On the basis of returns for 1932 and 1933, the average earnings per fisherman will be still less than in 1931. When economic conditions within the fishing industry become unbalanced, as they are at present, they are felt in every corner of the entire country, not only by the industry itself but by many others which depend upon it for a livelihood in whole or in part.

The canning of fish depends on other industries for its supplies and furnishes them markets for their goods. Statistics are lacking to show the entire picture. New agents are needed to make annual statistical canvasses of the fisheries of the United States. At present some sections are canvassed only on a biennial basis. In New England a statistical canvass was made for 1933 and the next for 1935. In the South

Atlantic the Bureau canvassed the fisheries for the year 1934 and are now making a canvass for 1936.

These statistics should be obtained annually and should cover the catch of fish, the value of the catch, the methods of capture, the number of fishermen employed, the number of persons employed in fishery manufacturing plants, the output of manufacturing plants, and the wages and salaries paid to the employees in manufacturing plants. This information is of value to determine the relative abundance of the fish population and for economic purposes, in that the figures can be used by the industry in conducting business operations.

These statistics should cover prices paid fishermen, cost of marketing prices to consumers, marketing data, and other needed information to secure a better price to the fishermen themselves.

The true picture can never be obtained by present methods. It is necessary to collect data on an annual basis, for the year missed may be either a good year or a poor year, and if so, a basis is not obtained for accurate conclusions.

AID GRANTED IN OTHER COUNTRIES TO THEIR FISHERMEN

In England there is a herring board to promote the orderly marketing of herring.

Norway aids its canned-sardine packers in securing export markets for their products.

Germany has a fleet of mobile kitchens mounted on motor trucks with which cookery demonstrations are held throughout the country.

Russia conducts economic fishery research in all of its phases.

Italy studies organizations for trading in fish.

Japan carries on extensive studies of the production, processing, and merchandising of fish.

There was submitted to the Senate in 1936 a report prepared by the United States Tariff Commission covering the subject of subsidies and bounties to fisheries enterprises by foreign governments. It is known as No. 116, Second Series. I commend its study to all who are interested in this subject or who fail to realize the need for the United States to do more in aid of its fisheries and to adopt some definite, well-planned policy. The study is comprehensive, and I shall undertake here only a brief summary of its findings.

This report shows that in all foreign countries the recipients of the various kinds of direct assistance are almost exclusively individual fishermen or fishermen's organizations.

In Japan direct assistance is practically confined to fishermen's associations or to owners of vessels.

Fishing bounties, in contrast to bounties on exports, are paid on various bases in different countries. Governmental grants for vessel construction, for the repair of old vessels, for the erection of freezing establishments, and for fish-meal manufacture represent a certain percentage of the expense involved in these undertakings. In other words, the government pays part of the cost. According to available information, these grants usually range from 15 to 75 percent of expenses. The grants are more flexible in Japan, where in certain cases they may cover total costs. The grant is usually paid in a lump sum, provided the prerequisites are complied with; in other cases the payment is spread over a number of years.

Fishery bounties are paid by the government in Canada, Germany, and Japan.

A bounty on exports is paid in four countries—namely, France, the Irish Free State, Italy, and Newfoundland.

Governmental aid is granted for the construction of new fishing vessels in Germany, Japan, and Newfoundland. Cold-storage facilities are subsidized in Canada, Japan, and Norway. In Japan, miscellaneous direct aid consists largely of grants to various activities if undertaken by fishermen's cooperatives.

Loans to fishermen from public funds are made in Canada, France, Germany, Iceland, the Irish Free State, Italy, the Netherlands, Newfoundland, Norway, Portugal, and the United Kingdom. Furthermore, in Canada, Norway, and the United Kingdom the Government guarantees the funds obtained from private sources by the lending governmental agency for the purpose of refunding them to fishermen.

In Denmark the Government assists the fishermen in obtaining loans from private sources and guarantees the loan.

Activities designed to stimulate the home market for fish products are carried on by governmental agencies with public funds in Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, and Japan.

In Canada, France, and Japan methods of preparation are demonstrated and exhibits are held in order to promote the domestic consumption of fishery products; in Denmark and Japan advertising and other means of publicity are used.

Fishermen or fishery products enjoy the benefit of reduced rates of transportation in Canada, Germany, and Newfoundland. In Canada and Germany the preferential rates apply to fishery products; in Newfoundland to fishermen.

In Canada preferential transportation is extended in the form of certain fish-collection services carried on entirely at Government expense; in Germany the preferential rates on fish are from 20 to 45 percent below the regular freight rates. In Newfoundland fishermen traveling to fishing operations are granted reductions ranging from 50 to 86 percent of the regular passenger rates.

Exemptions of fisheries from certain duties or taxes exist in 6 of the 15 foreign countries investigated—namely, Canada, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Newfoundland, and the United Kingdom.

In Canada fishery products and materials used in fisheries are exempt from the general sales tax, and a number of imported commodities used in fisheries are afforded preferential duties. In Italy fishing vessels are exempt from taxation, and fishing establishments from certain taxes.

In Japan there is exemption from duty on imported mineral oil if used in fisheries operations.

In Mexico fishery vessels are exempt from vessel dues. Imports of ice to be used in fisheries enter duty free.

In Canada and Newfoundland a number of commodities used in fisheries enter duty free. In the United Kingdom the duty on imported hydrocarbon oils is remitted in full if the oils are used in fishery vessels.

There are other aids and benefits too numerous to be specified here, but it may be said that miscellaneous indirect bounties and subsidies exist in Italy, Japan, Mexico, Newfoundland, and Norway. In Italy such aid consists of prize contests held in connection with fisheries activities; in Japan it is represented by inspection of exports carried on entirely by the Government and by regional assistance; in Mexico it is extended in the form of occasional grants to cooperatives.

Governmental aid designed to improve conditions in fisheries is known to have been given in 14 of the foreign countries studied. Facilitation services consisted chiefly of, first, research and investigations; second, fish propagation and conservation; third, provisions for port facilities; and, fourth, other services.

Research investigations are probably carried on in every fish-producing country. Fish propagation and conservation are known to exist in Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, the Irish Free State, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, and the United Kingdom.

Most, if not all, of the countries studied provide for port facilities for fisheries enterprises. Other types of facilitation are found in Canada, Denmark, Germany, the Irish Free State, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, and Portugal. They vary from compulsory cartel schemes in Germany and Portugal to technical education given to fishermen in Canada and Denmark. In a number of countries this type of aid is extended through cooperative bodies of fishermen.

The bulk of the governmental aid is granted in the form of indirect bounties and subsidies, such as government loans or guaranties of loans to fishermen or fisheries enterprises, and especially in the form of other governmental aid; that is, expenditures for facilitation services, such as research, fish propagation and protection, and for carrying on the administrative functions of fisheries bureaus or departments.

A few years ago, I think it was in 1934, there was passed by this House a bill to provide for a research vessel. It was not stipulated it was to be used in either the Atlantic

or Pacific, but it could be used wherever needed. A very comprehensive report was filed by the committee. It was deemed by the committee to be of the utmost importance that there should be a research vessel that should study the condition of the fisheries in the ocean. That bill was approved by the President. No appropriations whatsoever have been made.

One of the amendments which I propose to offer is an amendment to start that fishery research vessel. The information that was submitted to this House at the time that bill was passed was that there were such research vessels in every fishing nation in the world. These other nations are studying their fishery problems. Mr. Chairman, we are going to be confronted at no late date, in my opinion, with the necessity of an international conference dealing with the fisheries of the world. The reason I say that is because today the economic method of converting the fisheries seems to be that which obtains in the Pacific Ocean; that is, the sending out of cannery vessels with the conversion plants on board. They have a mother vessel or manufacturing vessel, and it is accompanied by many supply boats which go out and catch the fish. The fish are brought on board and converted into oil or meal or canned or otherwise processed.

Last year a very serious question was raised as to the depletion of the pilchard industry of the Pacific Ocean. The salmon industry is similarly affected. On the Atlantic coast an increasing number of trawlers are sweeping the seas. When we enter into an international conference, as we may sooner or later, and begin a discussion of the fisheries of the world, we need to have definite, scientific information with which our delegates to that convention may be armed for the protection of our own country. In addition we need the information for our own guidance and the protection of our own waters.

Mr. BACON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BACON. I am very much interested in what the gentleman is saying and am in entire accord with the purpose of his remarks, but I do not want this committee left with the impression it is the fault of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BLAND. Not at all. I am not making that charge.

Mr. BACON. It is not the fault of the Appropriations Committee the appropriation has not been made.

Mr. BLAND. If there is anything in the remarks I have made which seems to reflect on the committee in that respect, I wish it to be distinctly understood I am not criticizing that committee. I prefaced my remarks with the statement this committee had been generous. I believe that if an estimate had come up from the Bureau of the Budget for this item it would have received the favorable consideration of this committee. The committee is not at fault.

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COLDEN. In reference to the research vessel on the Atlantic coast, the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, of course, remembers that we passed a similar bill for the Pacific coast, and it was vetoed by the President. In the veto message the President stated a cutter or some naval vessel could be converted into such a ship. Does the chairman believe that is practical?

Mr. BLAND. That matter was gone into by the committee at the time the study was made of the first vessel. The bill was reported out and passed. The information presented to the committee at that time, was it required a special type of vessel in order to make the studies that were needed and that there were no such vessels available.

This was the study made at that time.

There is another matter I wish to bring to the attention of the committee. I have referred here to the need of statistics. In the last Congress we passed a bill, the number of which I have forgotten, which met with a Presidential veto. The veto was based largely upon the fact we had made provision for fish in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, and, besides, there was no need for legislative authority.

I am not criticizing the veto. While it did say aid was being provided in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, upon a subsequent investigation it was discovered the only provision which was made with respect to fish in that appropriation bill was to secure information as to the quantity of frozen fish on the market. These statistics are being obtained, are being given to the Bureau of Fisheries, and are being distributed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. But that is an infinitesimal part of the information needed. The bill provided for other things. It provided for a statistical study of the fisheries throughout the United States, and made provision so that those figures could be secured annually.

The bill also provided an extension service similar to that which is being granted for agriculture. This information should be secured and sent out to the fishermen.

We reported out of this committee a few years ago a bill for the organization of cooperatives. Some fishermen have taken advantage of this legislation, but they are disorganized, they are not united. They need instruction, advice, and assistance. It is an obligation of the Federal Government to teach these people the advantages of cooperative associations. The Government did that for farmers and it should do as much for fishermen.

We also provided an extension service which would carry to the fisherman the news as to markets in the United States, so that from the information given out daily he would know what market was glutted, where a famine existed, and so determine the market to which he could best ship his fish with reasonable prospect of a fair price. This service would advise as to prices in the different markets. This information should be sent to different centers of production throughout the United States.

The fisherman, in whom I am satisfied you are interested, and in whom I am interested, is the man who goes out and catches the fish, the man who has fish to sell which he has himself caught. We are interested in all other problems of the fisheries, but primarily the fisherman who, above all, needs protection. We desire the information to go to him as to the prices at consuming centers so that he may not be at the mercy of those who purchase his fish when he has no information by which he can determine whether the price offered him is a fair price or is too low.

Very recently, in the section of the country from which I come, I noticed that some of the fishermen declined to go out for the catch of shad because the price was so low. Such a service as this would have been of immeasurable benefit to these people in showing them what the conditions were at all consuming centers of the United States.

At the appropriate time I shall offer amendments to this bill, but my purpose now is to bring this matter before you. We have started a fight in the committee of which I am chairman, and we do not propose to give it up until we have been able to secure for the fishermen of this country the benefits to which he is entitled and which are no more than have been accorded farmers and other classes of industry. He has been unable to get far because of his lack of organization, but he is learning to organize. [Applause.]

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRISWOLD].

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Chairman, on Friday the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], in referring to the situation in Detroit, referred to the situation in Anderson, Ind., with, as I understood it, the statement the Governor of Indiana called out the troops for the sit-down strike.

The situation in the matter of the sit-down strike at Anderson did not occasion the calling out of the troops. So far as the sit-down strike at Anderson was concerned, it was handled by the local courts, because we in Indiana believe in handling our own troubles locally.

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

Mr. GRISWOLD. In a moment when I finish.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; but the other day when the gentleman said "in a moment", the gentleman did not yield. Is the gentleman going to yield in a moment?

Mr. GRISWOLD. I decline to yield, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. GRISWOLD. The facts are these—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GRISWOLD. I decline to yield, Mr. Chairman, and I resent the interruption.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I apologize most humbly.

Mr. GRISWOLD. There was trouble there between a citizen and some people engaged in a labor dispute. At that time the National Guard was called, not because of the sit-down strike situation but because this citizen fired a shotgun into a group of some 19 other citizens of the State.

Thereafter certain people, whom we assume were citizens of Michigan, entered the State of Indiana from Michigan, 31 automobiles containing 149 people. They came down the national highway, insisting on going into Anderson, where these labor difficulties were going on. These people were met by the State highway police and some officers of the militia, the State National Guard, who refused to let them go on into Anderson. They were stopped at Alexandria, a few miles from Anderson, where they insisted on blocking traffic, conducting a sit-down strike on the highway.

The Governor of the State of Indiana advised the officers of the Guard and the highway patrol to send them back. These people said they did not have gasoline to take them back, and therefore they were conducting a sit-down strike there. The Governor of Indiana, through the officers of the State National Guard, informed them that Indiana took care of all its destitute and that it had money to take care of the destitute of other States long enough to get them out. The automobiles were then run into a filling station at Alexandria, the gasoline tanks filled with 155 gallons of gasoline at a cost of \$31 to the State of Indiana, and the people were sent back to Michigan.

I state this in order that the House may know the true facts with regard to the matter to which the gentleman from Michigan referred.

The Governor of Indiana acted with wisdom and dispatch. His action and his understanding of the problem prevented bloodshed in Madison County. He did not attempt to settle the property rights of the disputants. The State of Indiana has laws governing the possession of property and eviction therefrom, which laws are enforceable by the courts; and the Governor did not attempt to usurp this right with military authority. Had the necessity arisen to use the guard to maintain peace and the authority of the courts I have no doubt but that Governor Townsend would have been equal to the occasion. He did not ask the Federal Government to send in assistance. It was not a Federal matter. Neither side had submitted its case to the Labor Relations Board under the Wagner Act. It was entirely a local matter, and the people of Indiana believe in local self-government. When the State has troubles within its borders it has a Governor big enough to cope with its troubles. Michigan should handle her troubles without assistance from outside.

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

Mr. GRISWOLD. I yield now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman claim I misstated anything the other day; and if so, what was it?

Mr. GRISWOLD. My understanding of the gentleman's statement is that the National Guard was called out because of the sit-down strike. So far as the sit-down strike in the lamp plant at Anderson is concerned, it was handled by the courts, and the courts are still handling it. I think some 20 or so citizens, I am not sure of the number, many were people from outside the State, have been indicted. They were put in jail. Some of them are now out on bond or, perhaps, all of them are out on bond, but the court is handling the local labor situation in the State of Indiana, protecting the property rights of Indiana citizens, and bloodshed has been prevented. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman say there was not martial law at Anderson?

Mr. GRISWOLD. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There was, was there not?

Mr. GRISWOLD. There was in the county.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will continue, Mr. Chairman. During the time of that disturbance there was martial law in Indiana, in that county, and the troops of Indiana met this motor cavalcade from Michigan, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRISWOLD] has stated, and turned them back at the county line. The State bought gas and you sent them back from whence they came; that is, you sent back those who were not arrested for their attempt to wreck a restaurant at Anderson.

Nineteen of them, who had gone down prior to the trip of the main body, attempted to storm a restaurant. They were met by the owner and his shotgun and they were repulsed. Nineteen of them were arrested by the military authorities, thrown into jail, later indicted by an Indiana grand jury, and turned over to the civil authorities for prosecution, and they will be, if they have not been, prosecuted in the Indiana court.

The course of your Governor was in accord with law. His conduct upheld the law of your State. It protected the right of your citizens under the Constitution of the United States and of your State. His conduct was in every way commendable, as was the conduct of your local officers.

I do want to congratulate the gentleman who comes from a State where the Governor has courage enough and is honest enough to keep his oath of office, enforce the laws of the State, and to guarantee to the citizens of the State the rights given to them under the Constitution.

It is my firm belief that, had the Governor of Michigan acted as did the Governor of Indiana and the Governor of Connecticut, upheld the hands of the court and of the civil authorities, this epidemic of sit-down strikes would have been prevented and bloodshed would have been avoided.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Of those 19, as I recall, none was a resident of Indiana. Am I right about that?

Mr. GRISWOLD. I could not say.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And but few, if any, were citizens of Michigan, although they had gone through Flint—had staged a strike there.

The point I was trying to make the other day was that if our President, instead of remaining silent on this subject, would tell his hired man, Murphy, and this lady down here who is running, or pretending to run, the Labor Department, to tell these "sit-downers" to get out, or if they had told them that at Flint when they first came there, we would not have had this trouble; but when you have a situation such as we had last week in Michigan with the Governor of our State giving the strikers encouragement, you cannot expect to settle a strike.

Mr. GRISWOLD and Mr. DINGELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GRISWOLD. The point I am trying to bring to the attention of the gentleman from Michigan is that so far as we are concerned in Indiana, and so far as the Governor of Indiana is concerned, we are not asking for any Federal assistance in labor disputes in Indiana.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is fine.

Mr. GRISWOLD. We will take care of them ourselves in Indiana and I am pleased that the gentleman congratulates my Governor on that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Sure, I do, and again I want to congratulate the gentleman on the attitude of his Governor in upholding the right of the men to work, in protecting them against nonresident armed men who would have kidnapped their factories and deprived them of their jobs. I wish the President, as long as he was picking Governors, had picked one for Michigan with equal courage and respect for the law and the rights of our citizens. [Applause.]

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

THE ADMINISTRATION'S FISCAL POLICY

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I have been wondering recently whether or not high officials in the administration have not got their wires crossed a little bit on financial matters. I recall a short time before Congress opened, the leaders of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate were sent for and interviewed at the White House, and following this interview the announcement was broadcast there would be no taxes during this session of Congress and no need for such taxes.

This announcement was made to the world, and a week ago today we were confronted with another announcement from an administration source that we must have more taxes at once in order to balance the Budget now. That "now", of course, Mr. Chairman, is getting to be quite a favorite word in the administration, but the definition of it is hard to understand. The Budget has been "balanced" in that same way for several years; in fact, almost since the beginning of the present administration, when in just a "very short time" the Budget was going to be balanced.

The Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Eccles, now comes out with the statement that we must balance the Budget in order to prevent inflation. I wonder how this is going to be done. No explanation has been given, unless it may be that certain taxes are going to be increased. I am in thorough accord for once with the position of the Democratic Party that we ought to balance the Budget, but I would like to see more action and less talk about it.

But I defy Mr. Eccles or any other advocate of making both sides of the ledger meet, to balance the Budget at the present level of expenditures without confiscating the property of the citizens of this country. Taxes have already reached almost the breaking point. Mr. Eccles' statement said there were certain sources of revenue that could be increased. If you increase the income tax and the estate tax, as he advocates, you will practically take over the property, since the present maximum rates of these levies are 79 percent and 70 percent, respectively. That is all right, if that is the way you want to do it.

When it is stated that we are going to balance the Budget very soon by taxation, how does that statement bear with the newspaper item I hold in my hand that today, and every day, we are spending, according to the official report, \$7,935,006 more than our daily income. It is going to be a very difficult problem to balance the Budget when you are daily spending nearly \$8,000,000 more than you receive. That is just a juggling of arithmetic that I did not learn in my early elementary education, and I do not think any Democratic official learned it either.

Why bluff the people with what you are going to do and cannot do. There is only one way of eventually balancing the Budget, and that is to reduce the items of expenditure. That can be done and that should be done, but for one I do not see any indication of the majority party or the administration endeavoring to do it. If they can fool the people that they are going to balance the Budget now, in view of the facts that are actually before the people, they have my best wishes in that effort.

I wonder whether Mr. Eccles was putting up a trial balloon on this question of balancing the Budget with new taxation. In view of the statement made officially last autumn that there would be no tax bill during this session of Congress, he now puts up a balloon advocating taxation. Which are we to believe? The statement of the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee after a White House interview that there would be no new tax bill this year, or the statement of Mr. Eccles last week that we must have more taxes? It looks to me as though it is a come-and-go proposition—heads I win and tails you lose. In other words, a tax bill every day looms nearer.

Who are paying the taxes today? A man's name does not have to be on the income-tax list to have him pay taxes. The worst taxes that we have are the hidden ones. Let any man on a salary, a clerk in a store on an ordinary

weekly pay, tell you what part is left at the end of the week from his household budget now, in comparison with what it was 2 years or 5 years ago, so far as the price of staples and necessities are concerned. There is the taxation. And the moment you try to raise your taxes today, it is the average man and the woman who will pay the bill, whether their name is on the income-tax roll or not. They not only pay taxes directly, but also in the increased cost of what they buy. It is a terrible situation that we face, and it is due in very large measure to the extravagance of the present administration. Let us put the blame where it belongs. Unless more economy is shown in the next 3 years than has been shown in the past, what do we face at the end of this administration?

There has been absolutely no economy so far, as is shown in the following table of expenditures under the present administration:

<i>Federal expenditures, 1933-38</i>	
1933-----	\$5,143,000,000
1934-----	7,105,000,000
1935-----	7,376,000,000
1936-----	8,880,000,000
1937 (Budget estimate)-----	8,481,000,000
1938 (Budget estimate)-----	7,695,000,000

¹ Does not include items not included in Budget.

I could go on indefinitely referring to the present financial condition of the country, but everyone is familiar with the situation. I am glad to find that even some of the officials of the Government are at last becoming "Budget conscious." The people long since have become "tax conscious", and if those in authority in the country today will become Budget conscious it may in the end result in a reduction of governmental expenditures in such a bill as we are considering here this afternoon.

I think in all fairness it can well be said that the members of the subcommittee that is handling this bill today, the able chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. McMILLAN, and his associate on the minority side, Mr. BACON, are doing their utmost conscientiously to reduce the expenses of Government so far as this bill is concerned, and I wish the example that the gentleman from South Carolina is setting his party associates would be followed. Unfortunately it has not been. Instead of the Budget being balanced downward, as it should be, if it is balanced at all, it will have to be balanced upward by levying more and more taxes on the everyday men and women of the country. I, for one, believe in economy in government, and it is certainly time that that economy is not only preached but practiced by those in authority.

Mr. Chairman, in his radio "fireside chat" a short time ago the President said that he had a great ambition.

I, too, have a great ambition, Mr. Chairman. I want to live to see the day when the President carries out his solemn promise, made over 4 years ago and which he has since repeated many times, that he would balance the Budget—now. And when it is balanced I want to see it done, not by increasing taxes on the masses, who cannot afford to pay them, but by reducing expenditures through the elimination of waste and extravagance.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana [Mrs. JENCKES].

Mrs. JENCKES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I appeal to this House of Representatives and to the Congress to keep faith with American mothers, American parents, and American womanhood. I am appealing to this House of Representatives and the Congress to prevent heartaches of unnamed parents whose children will be kidnaped and murdered in days to come. I am making this appeal on behalf of the Department of Justice appropriation, particularly that appropriation dealing with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which is conducted under the most able and efficient direction of J. Edgar Hoover and his marvelous G-men and every member of the staff and every member of that great organization.

American women and especially mothers are demanding that this Congress give Attorney General Cummings and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover all the money and all of the men that they deem necessary in order to stamp out, for all

times to come, kidnaping, white slavery, extortion, bank robbery, and other crimes, which have created so much suffering in recent years. If this House of Representatives refuses to appropriate the amount of money which Mr. J. Edgar Hoover originally requested and which he deems necessary and required for the efficient operation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, then this House of Representatives and the Congress must stand responsible for any increase in kidnaping, white slavery, extortion, and other crimes.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation only has 630 G-men to cover the 48 States, serving 130,000,000 people. Just think of that, my dear colleagues. Over 7,000 unassigned cases are awaiting investigation on account of the lack of personnel. In the year 1936 the Federal Bureau of Investigation secured convictions in 94 percent of all the cases investigated. The Federal Bureau of Investigation saved the Government in fines over \$7 for every dollar spent by the taxpayers in the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The Federal Bureau of Investigation investigated over 80 kidnaping cases, and every one has been solved with the exception of the Mattson case at Tacoma, Wash., which I am sure will be solved if this Congress does not hamper the Federal Bureau of Investigation by refusing to give that most efficient organization the money which it requires.

J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation have requested, and need and must have, not less than \$337,160 for additional field special agents. The special committee of this House of Representatives and the Budget committee refuse to allow this amount. This amount is needed for salaries and expenses. This Congress has appropriated billions of dollars, none of which is as important as the \$337,160 which is needed for G-men to protect your homes and my home and the children of America from kidnaping and millions of young girls and women from the horrors of white slavery. Do we want the Nation to accuse this Congress of being penny-wise and pound-foolish? Let us give the Federal Bureau of Investigation this money and let them put on duty the G-men they think are necessary, not the number of men the Budget Bureau thinks are necessary.

After the famous Lindbergh kidnaping case Americans felt that kidnapers would never attempt their nefarious efforts again. We were mistaken. The heart-broken fathers and mothers, parents of kidnaped children, are mute testimony to this fact.

As a mother and as a Member of Congress, I appeal to you, my colleagues, to make available to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the full amount of money he needs. I speak in the name of American womanhood, who are demanding that kidnaping and white slavery be stamped out. It will be stamped out if the Congress will furnish the financial support J. Edgar Hoover and his organization needs. But if this House of Representatives adopts a penny-wise and pound-foolish procedure, and skimps and curtails the funds of this most important Bureau in Federal service, we will be indirectly helping kidnapers and white slavers who fear the properly financed activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I am sure that your constituents, parents, women, churches, women's organizations, and business organizations, will applaud and praise you if you will heed my plea and place back in the appropriation the full amount requested by Mr. Hoover.

This Congress has appropriated billions of dollars for many purposes, and I do not know of any purpose where a few hundred thousand dollars could be spent to a better advantage, which would provide more peace of mind to the parents and general citizenship, than by giving these few extra hundreds of thousands of dollars which Mr. J. Edgar Hoover has stated he needs and which the Budget officials have, in the name of economy, and which I brand as false economy, removed. Let us not break faith with the mothers and fathers of America. Kidnaping and white slavery must be abolished.

Your favorable vote today for the extra money needed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation will mark the first steps,

and I appeal to you for your active interest and vigorous support. [Applause.]

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, billions of dollars have been expended in recent years to bring about better conditions in the agricultural industry. Curiously enough, nothing has been done in behalf of the poultry raisers, whose plight has been just as serious as other branches of agriculture assisted, and who in numbers rank second. Indeed, it can be truthfully stated the poultry industry has actually been penalized by the legislation enacted and the efforts of the administration to aid other classes.

The men and women engaged in the poultry industry are sympathetic with the needs of the producers of corn and grains. It is realized if these growers are prosperous the entire country is benefited. They do maintain, however, that no administration has a right by legislation to bring ruin and disaster to one large group of our people in an effort to aid another group. By all means help the producer of grain, but not at the cost of ruin to the larger poultry group. Surely there must be some other way to aid the grain producers than that which has brought so much misery to the poultry industry in the last 2 years.

There is no dispute over the facts. A division of the Department of Agriculture said last November:

The relation of chicken and egg prices to feed prices on November 15 this year (1936) is the most unfavorable to poultry producers since 1917.

That is the report from the Department of Agriculture, and one would think, knowing the acuteness of the situation, something definite would be done for the poultry industry.

Unfortunately there is only inactivity and sympathetic words, which fail to pay the feed bills. Think of it! The worst conditions since 1917, and nothing being done about it. No wonder the millions of poultry raisers are now adopting a more militant mood. They must be militant, otherwise they will continue to be the forgotten men and women engaged in agriculture.

The records of the average farmer confirm the report of the Federal bureau. A farmer in my district sends some interesting data. On April 4, 1936, he bought corn at \$1.60 per 100 pounds, and he sold his eggs at 25 cents a dozen. On September 22, 1936, he paid \$2.63 for his hundred pounds of corn and sold his eggs at 37 cents a dozen. On March 5, 1937, he was paying \$2.37 for his corn, and large eggs brought 25 cents a dozen and medium eggs 21 cents.

To put it a little more concretely, he is now getting a little less for his eggs than he received a year ago and his grain costs are 40 percent higher.

Unless there is a radical change in conditions the second largest agricultural group has a long road to go before it is permitted to share in any prosperity that may be hereabouts.

The poultry raisers are fully aware what has brought about their financial woes. It is the administration policy which curtails the production of corn and grain, creating an artificial price for the grain and leaving the poultry producer to struggle along with the same price for his product.

And the pity of it all has been the high grain prices have gone chiefly to the Argentine producer. For months the American poultry producer has been obliged to pay tribute to the corn grower in the Argentine. Ruin for thousands of American farmers so that there may be a larger trade with a neighbor. If there is any sense in this it is so well concealed it is difficult to discern.

This is no new problem. It has frequently commanded the attention of other countries in the past. England has constantly grappled with it. From the time of the corn laws in England industrial nations have found it necessary to foster and protect their agriculture by such means as would not materially increase the cost of living of their industrial workers.

The producers of poultry, dairy products, and livestock understand there is a limit to which you can tax the consumer. Jack up the prices too high and you have less consumption, less work, and in the end disaster. The producer does not want to bring about this condition of affairs, but he has no alternative if his Government, by restrictive regulations, forces up his own costs.

Today high grain prices, with the need of importing feed grains from abroad, have created critical conditions among all livestock feeders. Dairymen, poultrymen, and hog raisers provide the three largest agricultural products of the country. Without ample feed grains at reasonable prices meat, milk, egg, and pork prices must rise rapidly if normal production is to continue.

Unless normal production is maintained, even higher prices will result before the damage to our livestock industry is repaired.

Industry cannot go forward safely with high food costs absorbing the workers' wages. Industry cannot afford to allow maladjustments in our agricultural enterprise to limit our increasing prosperity. The millions who are on the relief rolls are cruelly cut when the cost of living is so radically increased by the administration.

If we are to assume the burden of vast expenditures to safeguard our future food supply through Federal action, should we not insist that these sums be so administered as to protect the livestock feeders as well as the grain farmers? Must we not insist that Federal subsidies to agriculture insure an abundance of feed grains rather than a scarcity? Is it not a policy which will bring greater prosperity than the policy of restriction so fondly cherished by the Roosevelt administration?

The animal feeders of America—dairymen, poultrymen, and hog raisers—are today fighting the battle of the consumers for reasonable food prices. They seek the aid of the consumers in the determination of Government policies which shall be for the common good of all.

The cow, the sow, and the little red hen have been and still are the great food producers of the country.

Let us quite playing politics with the great agricultural industry. Let us forget dreams and get down to earth and solve this agriculture problem on merit and without favoritism. Sane spending of the billions given in recent years should have brought us nearer to a solution than we are. The American people are willing to maintain an agriculture industry on an American basis, but they do want more intelligence than when in aiding one person you cripple two. [Applause.]

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I appreciate the courtesy that has been extended in granting me 15 minutes to discuss a subject close to my heart and one that I hope will be of interest to the Members of this House. I do not expect often to take up the time of the House, but during these hours of general debate, custom permits the discussion of subjects that may be of more immediate interest to the individual than the Members as a whole.

A Delegate representing a Territory in Congress has a qualified position as a Member of this House, with the specific obligation of speaking for his Territory when occasion requires and opportunity permits. It is, however, a well-established office having been created by Congress almost simultaneously with the birth of this Nation, and there has been in over 150 years of American history a continuous succession of Territorial Delegates from every one of the present-day States except the Thirteen Original Colonies, Vermont, and Texas. I accept the position with great pride despite its limitations and consider it an honor to be included in the roll of Delegates of this House and a high privilege to speak in that capacity for Hawaii as a Territory.

But because there is some confusion in the minds of the public at large and perhaps in that of some of the Members of this House regarding the status of Hawaii as a part of the United States of America, I feel it incumbent on me to

place before you the historical background of Hawaii's becoming a part of this Nation and what I consider its proper place within the Union.

Because Hawaii is separated from the mainland, and because there are, with the exception of Alaska, no longer any Territories on the mainland, the position of a Territory has become somewhat ill-defined. There is a tendency to confuse it with possessions. It is so convenient to think of the noncontiguous Territories of the United States as insular possessions since so many of them are insular and only Hawaii among these island groups is an incorporated Territory. Without desiring in any way to detract from the position these other parts of the Nation have under the American flag, nor question their claims to recognition, I do want to make the point again that I made the other day, that Hawaii has a unique place in the Union, because it became a part of the United States by annexation.

For nearly three-quarters of a century America had taken a leading part in upholding the Hawaiian government against the turbulence of foreign residents, Americans and others, and the intrigues of local representatives of foreign nations. The birth of the Hawaiian nation followed closely after its discovery to the western world in 1778 by the English navigator Capt. James Cook. The consolidation of the different islands under one rule was accomplished by the great Hawaiian chief, Kamehameha, in the 1790's. For practically 100 years his descendants and an allied family ruled over Hawaii as a kingdom.

While the monarchy was trying desperately to maintain itself against the cupidity of the European nations, sometimes of their agents rather than of the governments themselves, it was America that consistently held out a supporting hand, that took a stand against foreign interference with the affairs of the country; that advised its rulers how to meet the recurring emergencies of French demands, of British arrogance, and of Russian efforts at infiltration. The arrival of the first group of American missionaries in 1820, followed by several later groups, comprised of devoted American men and women from practically every New England State and many of the Middle Atlantic States, set the character of Hawaiian civilization along American lines. Indeed, the cultural foundation of Hawaii today is New England, superimposed on the old Polynesian concepts of the ancient Hawaiians.

The rapid acceptance of Christianity by the Hawaiian people, the high degree of confidence in which the Hawaiian rulers held the early missionaries, gave the latter great power during the formative years of Hawaii's monarchical period. This thoroughly American element in Hawaii not only checkmated the smaller British colony and other foreign groups in their efforts to lead Hawaii away from America but also exercised a strong influence in the United States in favor of Hawaii.

Besides the missionaries themselves, there were other Americans settling in the islands engaged in business and trade. My own New England ancestor came to Hawaii in 1793, nearly 30 years before the missionaries, and was one of the first King's foreign advisers. Although these traders did not always see eye to eye with the missionaries in all things, their jealousy of any other foreign influence added that much more weight to the Americanization of Hawaii that was going on long before the United States had crossed the Mississippi River.

The American Navy was another powerful force to keep Hawaii out of the hands of other nations until the inevitable workings of destiny brought Hawaii under the American flag. Hawaiian history has on its honor roll the names of several famous naval commanders who came to Hawaii's rescue in the many crises that agitated its course as an independent nation. On one occasion, when a British naval officer had hauled down the Hawaiian flag and hoisted the British flag in its stead, and before his superior had arrived to repudiate his action and restore Hawaiian sovereignty, an American commodore—Kearney—protested vigorously, and received members of the Hawaiian royal family with full honors as evidence of his refusal to recognize the British

rule. As early as 1826 the United States Navy, its officers then practically roving ambassadors of their country, were advising the native government, acting as referees in disputes involving foreigners and the government, supporting law and order against those who would have liked to leave the Ten Commandments behind them when they entered the Pacific Ocean. Capt. Thomas ap Catesby Jones and Captain Finch; Commodores Downes, Kennedy, Read, and Kearney, already mentioned; and Commodore Wilkes, whose exploring expedition added so much to the knowledge of the whole Pacific area, are great names in Hawaiian history, as they are honorable names in American history.

I paint this picture as the background of the steps that led up to our annexation; so that the last act was indeed, as President McKinley so truly said in his message to the Senate dated December 6, 1897, transmitting the treaty of annexation:

Under such circumstances, annexation is not a change; it is a consummation.

In addition to the close ties that bound us to America, first cultural and later economic as well, there were many political ties, treaties, and trade agreements, and abortive efforts at complete union of the two countries. As early as 1842, Daniel Webster, as Secretary of State, paved the way for the recognition of Hawaiian independence by declaring it to be—

The sense of the Government of the United States that the Government of the Sandwich Islands ought to be respected; that no power ought to take possession of the islands, either as a conquest or for the purpose of colonization; and that no power ought to seek for any undue control over the existing Government or any exclusive privileges or preferences in matters of commerce.

The same sentiments were expressed in President Tyler's message to Congress of December 30, 1842, and in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations written by John Quincy Adams. This strong stand soon led England and France to jointly declare that they—

Taking into consideration the existence in the Sandwich Islands of a government capable of providing for the regularity of its relations with foreign nations, have thought it right to engage reciprocally to consider the Sandwich Islands as an independent state, and never to take possession, either directly or under the title of a protectorate, or under any other form, of any part of the territory of which they are composed.

The first formal efforts for annexation were made in 1854, when President Pierce instructed Secretary of State Marcy to commission Mr. D. L. Gregg to represent the United States in Hawaii to negotiate a treaty with Kamehameha III for that purpose.

This annexation treaty was to provide for the admission of Hawaii as a State—

Enjoying the same degree of sovereignty as other States and admitted as such * * * to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of a State, on a perfect equality with other States of the Union.

This proposed treaty was not ratified and the admission of Hawaii to the Union was not consummated at this time primarily because of the death of Kamehameha III and the fact that his successor, Kamehameha IV, was not interested in having Hawaii annexed to the United States and also because the representatives of Hawaii insisted upon being admitted as a State. The records show that efforts were made to persuade Hawaiian officials to accept Hawaii's admission to the Union as a Territory, which these officials, and especially King Kamehameha III refused to do. The Hawaiian authorities frankly stated that they looked forward to the time when their country might constitute an integral portion of the great North American Republic and were willing to cede to the United States—

All its territories, to be held by them in full sovereignty, subject to the same constitutional provisions as other States of the American Union.

But were unwilling to forego the—

Rights and privileges of the citizens of the United States in terms of perfect equality in all respects with other American citizens.

As evidence of good faith on the part of the American Government, Secretary Marcy in the first of a series of United States pledges of good faith stated that—

It will be the object of the United States, if clothed with the sovereignty of that country (Hawaii), to promote its growth and prosperity.

Although the matter of annexation lay dormant for the time being, the general attitude of all American Secretaries of State following Secretary Marcy was that the United States had a special interest in Hawaii, and would not permit the Kingdom to go under the control of any other power. In the years following this first treaty the economic relations between the two countries became even closer, America coming to dominate Hawaii's commerce. As industries were developed in the islands the nearest and most logical market for its products was America and the converse was equally true that the source of supply for all the commodities it needed was also America. This led to the signing of a treaty of reciprocity in 1875, effective 1876, which made Hawaii practically a unit of the American economy. It may be of interest to the membership of the House to know that during the discussions that preceded the treaty, the King of Hawaii, Kalakaua, was the guest of Congress at a joint session of the House and Senate, and appeared here on this floor, and exchanged compliments with the Speaker, as recorded in the *RECORD* for the Forty-third Congress, second session, page 144.

Naturally the treaty gave the people of Hawaii a sense of security in their commerce with America, and brought about the further development of its principal industry, the sugar industry. It guaranteed to Hawaii an open market for its products and greatly increased Hawaii's demands for American goods.

In 1893 a local revolution overthrew the Hawaiian monarchy, which had existed for nearly 100 years, and set up a temporary government in its place. The principles of the new government were issued in a proclamation announcing the abrogation of the monarchy and the establishment of a provisional government to exist until terms of union with the United States of America had been negotiated and agreed upon. President Sanford B. Dole of the provisional government of Hawaii dispatched commissioners to Washington with instructions to negotiate a treaty with the United States Government "by the terms of which full and complete political union may be secured between the United States and the Hawaiian Islands."

President Harrison approved of the principles of annexation and designated Secretary of State John W. Foster to act on behalf of the United States in negotiating an annexation treaty. In the conferences held with Secretary Foster, the commissioners from Hawaii insisted that Hawaii be admitted to the Union as a State. Secretary Foster replied to their demands that "bringing Hawaii into the Union" was the main object in view, that while not averse to statehood, a treaty providing therefor would occasion debate and delay, and that Hawaii, by asking for annexation had demonstrated her confidence in the United States and could be assured that if annexed, that confidence would be justified. The Hawaiian commissioners were evidently convinced of the sincerity of Secretary Foster, because they made formal written request for "full and complete political union" of Hawaii with the United States "as a Territory of the United States." Upon receipt of this formal request, Secretary Foster suggested omitting the provision concerning territorial government on the ground that details involved therein might cause delay, and suggested in place thereof that the treaty contain a provision that Hawaii should "be incorporated into the United States as an integral part thereof." The Hawaiian commissioners were reluctant to accede to this change, but after consulting the *Century Dictionary* which defined "integral" and cited examples as follows, they accepted the modification:

"Integral"—relating to a whole composed of parts, spatially distinct (as a human body of head, trunk, and limbs) or of distinct units.

"Intrinsic"—belonging as a part to the whole, and not a mere appendage to it.

All the Teutonic states in Britain became first dependencies of the West Saxon King, then integral parts of the Kingdom.

This clarification of the definition of "integral" was considered extremely important by the Hawaiian commissioners, because they did not wish Hawaii to be considered a mere appendage or possession of the United States.

President Harrison was very much pleased with the treaty as drawn. In his message transmitting this treaty to the Senate on February 15, 1893, President Harrison said:

Only two courses are now open, one the establishment of a protectorate by the United States, and the other annexation full and complete. I think the latter course, which has been adopted in the treaty, will be highly promotive of the best interests of the Hawaiian people, and is the only one that will adequately secure the interests of the United States.

No action was taken on the treaty prior to the expiration of President Harrison's term on March 3, 1893. President Cleveland, his successor, declined to consider annexation, withdrew the treaty from the Senate, and made an unsuccessful attempt to restore the Hawaiian monarchy.

The provisional government of Hawaii immediately proceeded to transform itself into the Republic of Hawaii, and on July 4, 1894, formulated a constitution which was adopted by a constitutional convention. Article 33 of this constitution provided for the making of "a treaty of political or commercial union between the Republic of Hawaii and the United States * * *."

It was undoubtedly in the minds of the leaders of the Republic of Hawaii that, despite President Cleveland's opposition to annexation, the argument of events would sooner or later force the issue.

Almost immediately after the inauguration of President McKinley in 1897 a new annexation commission was accredited to Washington by the Republic of Hawaii. President McKinley designated Secretary of State John Sherman to represent the United States in the negotiations. In the conferences with Secretary Sherman the Hawaiian commissioners requested that annexation be expressed in terms of the Harrison treaty, namely, that they be annexed to the United States "as an integral part thereof." This request was agreed to by Secretary Sherman and a treaty was drafted with such provision.

In his message to the Senate, dated December 6, 1897, already referred to, President McKinley said that Hawaii was—

Realizing a purpose held by the Hawaiian people and proclaimed by successive Hawaiian governments through some 70 years of their virtual dependence upon the benevolent protection of the United States. Under such circumstances annexation is not a change; it is a consummation.

He further states that—

If the treaty is confirmed, as every consideration of dignity and honor requires, the wisdom of Congress will see to it that * * * the most just provisions for self-rule in local matters with the largest political liberties as an integral part of our Nation will be accorded the Hawaiians. No less is due to a people who * * * come of their free will to merge their destinies in our body politic.

In the meantime war with Spain was brewing. At the time the United States, as a young nation, was not known to the world in its full lusty strength. There were those who felt America had undertaken a difficult task. We of Hawaii felt no qualms, felt no fears. We were as wild with enthusiasm as any and greeted the transports and naval vessels en route to and from the Orient with every hospitality. Our government disregarded every tenet of international law in putting Hawaii, especially the port of Honolulu, at the disposal of the United States military forces, and laid itself open to any reprisals Spain might wish to make. Our people did this with their eyes open to the possible consequences, but we considered ourselves so much a part of America as to make the war as much our own as though we had by formal treaty allied ourselves with the United States. The Battle of Manila Bay made Hawaii essential to the United States, and today's defense plans make it even more imperative that Hawaii should be under the jurisdiction of the United States.

During these exciting days, which I spent in Honolulu as a boy helping to entertain the Volunteers as they came ashore off transports and to feed them something to vary the embalmed beef of transport fare, the treaty so strongly endorsed by President McKinley languished in the Senate. Annexation was finally consummated by joint resolution of Congress accepting, ratifying, and confirming the "cession" by the Hawaiian Government. This "cession" was the resolution of the Hawaiian Senate containing the full text of the treaty.

The treaty provides that "those islands shall be incorporated into the United States as an integral part thereof," and the ratification of such a treaty by the Hawaiian Senate, as required by the constitution of the Republic of Hawaii, is referred to in the joint resolution of annexation as the cession on the part of Hawaii upon which the joint resolution was based. The joint resolution, therefore, incorporates into itself the said basis of annexation as much as though the resolution itself had contained the above phrase.

On July 7, 1898, the resolution stating that "such cession is accepted, ratified, and confirmed" was finally adopted. The formal transfer of the sovereignty of Hawaii was not effected, however, until August 12, 1898, when Harold M. Sewall, Minister of the United States to Hawaii, presented to President Dole a certified copy of the resolution, and the sovereignty and property of the Republic of Hawaii was transferred to the United States of America.

Mr. Sewall's instructions from Secretary of State W. P. Day, in a letter dated July 8, 1898, were in part as follows:

Herewith a copy of a joint resolution of Congress for annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States.

By the preamble to this resolution it is recited that the Government of the Republic of Hawaii has in due form signified its consent in the manner provided by its constitution "to cede * * *."

These recitals, it will be observed, are made in the language of the treaty of annexation, concluded at Washington on the 16th day of June 1897. They, as well as the other terms of the treaty, were advisedly incorporated in the joint resolution, because they embody the terms of cession which have not only been agreed upon by the two Governments but which have also been ratified by the Government of the Republic of Hawaii. The joint resolution, therefore, accepts, ratifies, and confirms on the part of the United States the cession formally agreed to and approved by the Republic of Hawaii.

At the ceremony in Honolulu, when presenting the certified copy of the joint resolution of annexation to President Dole, Minister Sewall said:

This joint resolution ratifies and confirms the cession formally consented to and approved by the Republic of Hawaii.

President Dole, in reply, said:

A treaty of political union having been made, and the cession formally consented to by the Republic of Hawaii having been accepted by the United States of America, I now, in the interest of the Hawaiian body politic, and with full confidence in the honor, justice, and friendship of the American people, yield up to you as representative of the United States the sovereignty and public property of the Hawaiian Islands.

After the salute to the Hawaiian flag and its lowering, Mr. Sewall said:

Mr. President, in the name of the United States I accept the transfer of the sovereignty and property of the Hawaiian Government.

The American flag was then hoisted and saluted. The Minister then congratulated "his fellow countrymen" on the consummation of the national policies of the two countries. By act of April 30, 1900, Hawaii was organized into a Territory of the United States.

Congress followed a precedent in admitting Hawaii to the Union. The Republic of Texas was admitted to the Union as a State by joint resolution of Congress, it likewise being a free and sovereign nation at the time of annexation. It is undeniable that in annexing Hawaii by joint resolution the Congress did not have the power to alter the terms agreed upon in the preceding treaty of negotiations. The congressional joint resolution specifically "accepts, ratifies, and confirms on the part of the United States the cession formerly agreed to and approved by the Republic of Hawaii." If the nature of the agreement had been changed by the Congress, both parties would have had to signify their acceptance of the new conditions.

This is the story in brief of the American background of Hawaii for many years preceding annexation, of the successive steps that led to its annexation by joint resolution, and of its present status as an incorporated Territory of the United States, and an integral part of the Nation. I was present in the palace grounds when the Hawaiian flag was hauled down, never again to be the banner of an independent nation, but continued in use as our "state" flag. I saw the American flag hoisted in its stead, and sensed, even though but a boy, the feeling of pride, and relief, and security that that ceremony brought to our people. As a Territory we follow the precedents of American history. As a Territory we accept all the responsibilities and obligations of American citizenship, both individually and as a community. As a Territory we share with all other Americans the full benefits of American citizenship, of American economic and political institutions. As a Territory we accept no lesser place under the flag than even a sovereign State except in those specific limitations applicable to our political status. As a Territory we have fulfilled every possible test that can be applied to us. And, finally, as a Territory, we have the right by the fundamental principles of American democracy to aspire to statehood. [Applause.]

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD].

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, there are two important items in this appropriation bill that I desire to bring to the attention of the Committee. One of them pertains to aviation and the other to the training of apprentices.

Referring to aviation, that industry has come forcibly to public attention during the past year because of a few unfortunate mishaps. On the whole, I believe American aviation is by far the best and safest on earth, and that its trained personnel cannot be equaled in any other country interested in the promotion of aviation. But, as a result of these mishaps, congressional committees have been appointed to delve into the subject of air safety.

A committee headed by the senior Senator from New York [Senator COPELAND], known as the Copeland committee, has made its report. It is very interesting, and every Member of the House should read its suggestions. That committee proposes an authorization of \$12,414,000 at once to advance aviation in America. It points out that this \$12,000,000 plus is necessary. In its break-down of the figures it would spend \$10,000,000 for new ground aids throughout the country, \$2,364,000 for more adequate weather-investigation facilities, and \$50,000 to study pilot fatigue, as a means to determining how many hours pilots should be kept on duty. All of these recommendations are noteworthy and meritorious.

The Air Transport Association of America recommends a sum approximating that recommended by the Copeland committee. I have a letter from the president of that association. In it he offers a list of improvements that are needed in my own State.

By unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, I ask that this letter may be made a part of my own remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter and list are as follows:

This list has been compiled from the experience of our member companies who are daily flying the airways to, from, and through your State. Naturally, the items in this list have been submitted to the appropriate Government departments, with the hope that some day Congress may make possible the installation of these aids. They are not only desirable from the viewpoint of peacetime flying but are also essential if, in case of emergency, we hope to avoid the possibility of our military air force being in the wrong place at a crucial moment, should atmospheric conditions be adverse.

STATE AND FACILITY NEEDED—NEW YORK

Albany: Light chains, beacon lights to Westport, relocate radio.

Brooks Grove: Radio, teletype.

Buffalo: Light chains, airplane meteorograph, relocate radio.

Columbiaville: Modernize radio.
Dunkirk: Modernize radio.
Elmira: Relocate radio, teletype.
Floyd Bennett: Light chains, radio.
New Hackensack: Improve radio.
Rochester: Radio.
Rouses Point: Beacon light, radio.
Utica: Teletype, radio.
Westport: Beacon light, radio.
White Plains: Radio marker.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Commerce has made recommendations to the Appropriations Committee, and the committee in the main has agreed to those recommendations. The Commerce Department requests flexibility in the expending of the appropriations. I understand there is such flexibility within the bureaus, up to 10 percent.

They have also requested that some of this money become available at once, so that it might be made useful in installing aids to air navigation. This expenditure would be prudent and wisely consummated. It might result in saving human life. But that recommendation has not yet been agreed upon. I trust it will be agreed upon tomorrow when we go into Committee of the Whole.

The committee allows \$2,000,000 to be made available beginning with the first of the fiscal year 1938. They authorize the expenditure of three additional millions for the future recommendations of the department.

I think the committee acted wisely in making the appropriation far less than has been recommended either by the Transport Association or by the Copeland committee. Both of those recommendations for a higher amount are meritorious, but the money can be more wisely expended after time for investigation, after time for experimentation, and after time for the development of scientific apparatus as useful aids to navigation. It is futile to attempt to spend all of that money right now because in this scientific, romantic industry changes occur with great rapidity. Study should be made before the entire appropriation recommended by the investigating committees is made available. In other words, it is just as necessary to spend a dollar in experimentation as it is to spend a dollar in installation. So the appropriation of \$15,000,000 as a 3-year plan, to be carried out by 1940, would put aviation at its highest degree of safety and efficiency.

American aviation, as I said a moment ago, leads the world by comparison in every field and in every means of measurement.

The trouble with aviation in America and the cause of some of these conditions and disasters perhaps can be traced to the futile wave of economy that came into being in the last 2 years of the administration of President Hoover and carried on for a year or two after the advent of the present administration. Appropriations were reduced to the bone as they applied to this activity of Government. Experimental work and development were almost entirely eliminated; equipment became obsolete, disintegrated; and we paid dearly for that unwise and costly economy.

My recommendation, after years of study, after investigating this industry, would be to leave aviation, insofar as originating new lines, regulating schedules on existing lines, advertising for contracts for new service, regulating the collection, delivery, and dispatch of the mails are concerned, entirely with the Post Office Department. We have a number of bills pending in either one House or the other that would transfer the entire activity to the Interstate Commerce Commission. This would be a mistake. The Post Office Department pioneered this industry. Without the Department aviation would not be what it is today; it would not be in the advanced stage in which we find it. It is the Post Office Department, too, that pays the bill. I say to you, therefore, to leave as much of this industry in the Post Office Department as is possible. Leave with the Commerce Department the promotional work, the licensing of pilots, registry of ships, and all work of that nature which naturally goes with that great Department of Government. Leave with the Interstate Commerce Commission the regulation of rate, and give it, if you wish, the supervision of the

inspection service. The Interstate Commerce Commission now inspects safety appliances and locomotives and boilers on our railroads and has charge of the enforcement of the 16-hour law, as well as of the 8-hour law. It might be well, therefore, to give that particular activity to the Interstate Commerce Commission, which would leave with that Commission the regulation of the rate structure and the supervision of the safety of air lines in operation.

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

Mr. MEAD. Not until I complete the formal part of my statement; then I shall be pleased to yield.

Then the suggestion is made which I think is worthy and meritorious and one that should be put into operation by law, and that is that the pilots flying the air lines should become members of the Military Reserve Force. They should be put into a military training school every year and given 2 months of intensive military training. We would, as a result of such training, have the best pilot personnel for national defense of any country in the world. We would be doing more for our own national defense than we would be by appropriating millions of dollars for warships. We would improve the efficiency of the pilots in commercial aviation, because in this intensive training school they would be skilled in the use of modern, up-to-date, last-minute methods—and they are changing very rapidly. They would be schooled in the use of new instruments, new apparatus, new radio control, and all the rest of the improvements that are so constantly, continuously, and everlastingly going on in the aviation industry.

There should be also, as the result of law if necessary, regular, frequent, and open conferences on safety and on the promotion of aviation. These conferences should be held by the Commerce Department, and in them pilots, operators, and all those interested in aviation, as well as those in positions of authority in the Government touching this activity, should participate. These conferences should be continued year in and year out in order to keep pace with the times.

So I really believe that we are making excellent strides in aviation in this country; that we are overcoming the futile savings that resulted from the wave of economy that struck this House a few years ago; that we are bringing our industry up to date with the new Air Mail Act, the increase in air-mail volume, and the rapid rise in passenger and express revenue. These all indicate that aviation is here to stay, that it has made good, and that its safety is now at the very highest peak in all its history. Tomorrow American ships, clipper ships with their intrepid pilots, comparable to the captains who sailed the clipper ships of years ago, will fly over every ocean, bringing America closer to every other nation of the world, increasing the good will, and building up the commerce of this country.

Mr. Chairman, there is another matter I would leave with the Members. Years ago, when I was a boy, I was an apprentice learning the machinist trade in a railroad shop. I spent years of my early life working on the railroads. I sympathize with the boys who go into railroad shops, who have to crawl up into the boiler of a locomotive and there and in other equally hazardous places learn a trade, become skilled mechanics, and serve the Nation in this important vocation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MEAD. I recognize the fact that skilled mechanics are no longer as numerous as they were in the old days. The march of efficient machine methods, the coming of the assembly line and all those new and uncanny electrical devices, including the conveyors, have robbed men of an opportunity to create that which mankind utilizes and has placed the apprentice of today in the category of the forgotten man. Here is our opportunity to develop and train mechanics and skilled workers, to rescue that occupation, to give protection, care, and the interest of Government to the boys of America who seek thus to become the skilled workers of tomorrow.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. STACK. While the gentleman has made a wonderful talk regarding aviation, he has failed to bring out what part the Government should play in building the airplanes.

Mr. MEAD. I am very glad the gentleman brought that out. I may say to him that by reason of the fact that we subsidize the air-mail industry to a limited degree by paying to them more than we receive in revenues, we encourage the building of ships. The Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps organizations in the development of their ships have their engineering corps investigating all of the work done in connection with the formation and the building of military ships. We also have a National Advisory Board for Aviation that is continually investigating developments in this particular field. All we have to do is to continue adequate appropriations for the air mail and to provide sufficient appropriations for the Department of Commerce and the other agencies of the Government interested in the well-being and upbuilding of aviation. In that manner we will be doing our share.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Committee on Apprentice Training was created by the Secretary of Labor under authority granted by Executive Order No. 6750-C, June 27, 1934. The purpose of the order was to permit genuine apprentice training under National Recovery Administration codes, and at the same time prevent the exploitation of apprentices and the break-down of labor standards, insure an adequate training program on the job and prevent the overcrowding or shortage of labor in skilled trades. The committee, established to carry out the purposes of the order, was composed of representatives of the United States Department of Labor, the United States Office of Education, the National Recovery Administration, employers, and employees.

After the National Industrial Recovery Act was declared unconstitutional, the Federal committee was continued under the National Youth Administration, since in creating the National Youth Administration the President listed the promotion of apprenticeship as one of its chief functions. A representative of the National Youth Administration replaced the National Recovery Administration member of the committee, succeeding the representative of the N. R. A.

Following a letter from the President to the Secretary of Labor, dated September 19, 1936, requesting the transfer of the Federal Committee on Apprentice Training to the Department of Labor and suggesting that a request for an appropriation to cover this activity be included in the Department's budget, the Federal committee unanimously voted to approve such transfer and budget. The Department of Labor included an item for the continuance of this work in its appropriation request and the Budget Bureau recommended to Congress an appropriation of \$56,900 for this work during the coming fiscal year.

The President's letter was prompted by the work which had been done by the Federal Committee on Apprentice Training working in cooperation with State apprenticeship committees. The activities of the Federal and State committees have brought about a widespread and enthusiastic interest in apprentice training and an understanding of the importance of apprenticeship as a sound employment policy. Evidence of this may be seen in the resolution passed at the 1936 convention of the American Federation of Labor commending the work of the committee and urging its continuance, and in a letter from Mr. Green, president of the American Federation of Labor to the President dated October 30, 1936, requesting an appropriation for the committee under the Department of Labor. Employers as well as labor support the work which has been done by the Federal Committee on Apprentice Training. National associations of employers, such as the National Association of Master Plumbers, the International Society of Master Plumbers and Decorators, the National Founders Association, the Associated General Contractors are working with the committee and have endorsed its program. Under the leadership of the committee, national trade associations and labor organizations in two industries have formulated sound

programs of apprentice training acceptable to both groups and in other industries plans for doing this are under way.

The increased interest and recent success in the promotion of apprenticeship are largely due to the recognition that there are two distinct groups of responsibilities in the promotion and operation of plans for apprentice training. One group deals with the apprentice as an employed worker—the conditions under which he works, his hours of work, his rates of pay, the length of his learning period, and the ratio of apprentices to journeymen so that overcrowding or shortage of skilled workers in the trades may be avoided in large part. The second group deals with the apprentice as a student—the related technical and supplemental instruction needed to make him a proficient worker and the supervision and coordination of this instruction with his job experience. The Department of Labor has jurisdiction over the first group of responsibilities; the Office of Education over the second.

In accordance with the suggestion of the President and in line with the thought of all parties interested in apprenticeship—including the United States Office of Education—the Department of Labor presented in its budget an item of \$56,900 to carry on the work of the Federal Committee on Apprentice Training. A joint statement was submitted to the Appropriations Committee by the Secretary of Labor and the assistant commissioner in charge of vocational education setting forth the advisability of the separation of functions in connection with apprenticeship and the continuance of the present plan of operation. A copy of the memorandum is attached as exhibit C.

Notwithstanding the proved value of the activities under consideration and complete agreement as to the proper division of functions between the Department of Labor and the Office of Education in the promotion of apprenticeship, the Appropriations Committee has stricken from the bill language proposed in the appropriation request of the Department of Labor and has deleted this item. The committee stated that this action was primarily prompted by a consideration of the policy involved. The committee apparently felt that the proposal to continue the work of the Federal Committee on Apprentice Training under the Department of Labor, through the medium of an appropriation, was contrary to policy, and that such activity should have special consideration by the legislative committees of Congress. The Appropriations Committee further reported that some doubt exists as to whether the Office of Education in the Department of the Interior is not only authorized but equipped to handle a program of apprentice training along the projected lines.

There appears in the hearing records of the Appropriations Committee a statement by the Department of Labor showing that the proposed participation in an apprenticeship program was precisely within the province of the Department of Labor as set forth in the creative act of 1913 (37 Stat. 736, U. S. C., title 5, sec. 611). This act states:

The purpose of the Department of Labor shall be to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment.

In addition, the act of February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 932, U. S. C., title 20, sec. 17), as changed by Executive order dated June 10, 1933, transferring the functions of the Federal Board for Vocational Education to the Department of the Interior, which authorized studies, investigations, and reports with reference to apprenticeship also expressly provided that—

When the Interior Department deems it advisable . . . such studies, investigations, and reports concerning trades and industries for the purposes of trade and industrial education may be made in cooperation with or through the Department of Labor.

This shows that when Federal funds were first appropriated for vocational education it was with the understanding that a close relationship should exist between the Federal office administering funds for trade and vocational education and the United States Department of Labor. It was intended by Congress that the primary interests of labor would be safeguarded through the Department of Labor.

This is essential, inasmuch as the Office of Education has no authority to function in the field of labor standards and employment conditions.

It appears now that the Department of Labor is estopped from proceeding with an activity of vital interest to labor and directly concerned with the safeguarding of labor standards and the promotion of employment opportunities upon a purely technical construction by the Appropriations Committee. It is apparent that the Appropriations Committee need exercise no legislative function whatsoever in approving the request for funds for promotion of apprenticeship under the Department of Labor. It is also apparent that there is no need for legislation to enable the Department of Labor to carry out an activity directly in line with the purpose for which it was created.

The Appropriations Committee apparently did not find that there was any duplication of work. The Budget Director previously approved the requested item, so that it is evident that he found no duplication. Unless funds are made available to the Department of Labor under its requested appropriation, one important phase of the apprenticeship program must be abandoned, and the excellent progress made in apprenticeship within the last 2½ years will be lost.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert certain excerpts from the letters to which I just referred.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to make the request to insert excerpts in the House.

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

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of our Subcommittee on Appropriations has gone into this bill so thoroughly and has so covered every phase of it that it is not my purpose to discuss the bill in detail. I do, however, want to touch one or two of the more important items and make some comments upon them.

As stated in the debate today, there is nothing political or partisan in this bill, and my remarks will not be either political or partisan.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] has referred to an item that authorizes apprentice training, which came to us from the Budget. Your committee went into that question with a great deal of care. We had quite full hearings on it, and all through the discussion the question of whether an item such as this was permissible in an appropriation bill was paramount. I hope that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] will give me his attention, because I want to discuss the very point he has just raised.

Your committee examined the precedents as to whether or not this item was subject to a point of order on the ground it is legislation in an appropriation bill. Without going into the merits of the apprentice-training item or whether you are for it or against it, it seems to your committee it was clearly a piece of legislation in an appropriation bill; therefore your committee, acting in good faith to the House, determined that they could not include this item in the bill.

I may say parenthetically that I believe this is a worthy project and I think this should eventually be included in the Labor Department appropriation bill; but I am convinced it requires legislation from the proper committee of the House before we of the Appropriation Committee may consider it here.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Is there any legislation in this appropriation bill?

Mr. BACON. The report shows there are two minor pieces of legislation in the bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. If that had not been the gentleman's answer, it would be novel, because I have yet to see an appropriation bill that did not have some legislation in it; therefore, if the only reason for striking out this item is because it is new legislation, it is not very appropriate in the consideration of an appropriation bill.

Mr. BACON. The legislative provisions in this bill are in order, we think, as they are limitations and come within the

Holman Rule; otherwise I do not think there is any legislation in the bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Then this is a rare bill, because most appropriation bills do have legislation in them.

Mr. BACON. This question of apprentice training is a brand new activity that has never been considered by the Congress of the United States or by any legislative committee. I want to refer to some decisions that are directly in point, sustaining the contention that this item is legislation on an appropriation bill and therefore subject to a point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, volume 7, and I refer to page 316. I refer to paragraphs 1264 and 1265, as follows:

The general statement of purpose for which a department is established, as set forth in the organic act creating it, is not to be construed as authorization for appropriations not specifically provided for in succeeding sections of the act providing for bureaus designated to carry out the declaration of purpose.

An appropriation to enable the Secretary of Labor to advance opportunities for profitable employment of wage earners was held not to be in order on an appropriation bill.

This point came up on February 28, 1919, when a Department of Labor appropriation bill was pending before the Congress. Mr. Gallivan, of Massachusetts, offered the following amendment as a new section to the bill:

To enable the Secretary of Labor to advance the opportunities for profitable employment of the wage earners of the United States there is hereby appropriated out of available money in the Treasury \$10,033,808.10.

Mr. Blanton, of Texas, and Mr. Gould, of New York, raised the point of order on the amendment that it was legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. JAMES F. BYRNES, of South Carolina, the present Senator from South Carolina, argued in favor of the point of order.

After extended debate, the Chairman ruled:

The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment to insert a new section, as follows:

"To enable the Secretary of Labor to advance the opportunities for profitable employment of the wage earners of the United States there is hereby appropriated out of available moneys in the Treasury \$10,023,000"—

And so forth.

To that amendment the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from New York make the point of order. Arguing the point of order, gentlemen who have discussed it cited certain language in the organic act which created the Department of Labor. That language is:

"The duties of the Department of Labor shall be to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment."

That language is relied upon, as the Chair understands, to make this amendment in order. The House has always been extremely careful in conferring the legislative power upon committees; at least, it has been so for 50 years. It has withheld from the Committee on Appropriations any power of legislation, and, naturally, having withheld that power, it has provided that no amendment to an appropriation bill if it carried legislation should be in order if offered on the floor of the House. This is very peculiar language as contained in this organic act. If the Committee on Appropriations could have rightfully brought in a proposition such as is contained in the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and, of course, if it could not, an amendment from the floor of the House would be subject to the point of order. The Chair is unable to see where the limit on the Committee on Appropriations would end. If this—like the whereas of a resolution—should be held to authorize appropriations by the Committee on Appropriations, there is absolutely no limitation that you could put upon your Committee on Appropriations.

And, of course, if the Appropriations Committee could bring in a proposition, any amendment from the floor would be in order. The Chair thinks this amendment that is offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts makes new legislation, not authorized by any existing law, and that therefore it is obnoxious to the rule of the House. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

I want to call attention to the fact the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union at that time was Mr. John N. Garner, of Texas, one of the ablest parliamentarians the House has ever had.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to include at this point certain excerpts from Mr. Garner's decision, without repeating them here and taking up the time of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. That request will have to be made in the House.

Mr. BACON. I will not take the time of the Committee to read them, then, but will ask consent in the House to insert them in my remarks.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there for a brief question?

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. First of all may I make my position clear? I realize the members of the committee were prompted by high and ethical reasons in the stand they have taken. They went into the matter very deeply, and they are to be congratulated. I think they have one of the very best chairmen in the House, as well as one of the very best ranking Members.

I merely want to have their help, assistance, and cooperation in making this appropriation a reality under proper conditions.

Mr. BACON. As far as I am concerned, I shall be very pleased to assist the gentleman in obtaining legislation from the Committee on Labor, in order that we may consider this proposal and include it in an orderly fashion in the appropriation bill.

Mr. MEAD. That is, providing it is not ruled out of order.

Mr. BACON. Of course, if it is authorized by a legislative committee, it is obviously in order in an appropriation bill.

Mr. MEAD. What I have in mind is, if it were declared out of order during the consideration of the bill tomorrow, we would then have to obtain legislation from the Committee on Labor?

Mr. BACON. When I get through reading this decision I think the gentleman will agree it would be considered not in order.

Later on, when the same bill was under consideration, the decision of Mr. Garner, Chairman of the Committee, was reaffirmed by another able parliamentarian, Mr. Finis J. Garrett, of Tennessee.

Two years later a similar point of order was sustained by Mr. Joseph Walsh, of Massachusetts, who was another very able parliamentarian. In Mr. Walsh's decision it was decided that—

Statements of purpose embodied in the organic act creating the Department of Labor were held not to authorize appropriations for establishment of an employment service.

The question of apprentice training is a new proposal. It has seemed to the subcommittee it would not be fair to the House to let it slip by in an appropriation bill without a complete and full discussion by the proper committee of the House having jurisdiction thereon. The proposal is very far reaching. I do not believe there were any members of the subcommittee who opposed the matter in principle, but we felt that any new activity created by an Executive order under the emergency powers given the President ought to have a full hearing before the proper committee of the House before it became permanent law. There is a very, very broad question of principle involved, and the members of the Committee on Appropriations felt they would not be keeping faith with the rules of the House and with the rules under which the Committee on Appropriations acts if they did not call this to the attention of the appropriate committee, in order that the matter may be thoroughly threshed out and brought up in a regular way. As a result of the decisions I have cited, the question of an employment service in the Department of Labor was presented to the Committee on Labor, a bill was passed, and we now carry an appropriation for an employment service in this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

We should follow the same procedure and pass enabling legislation for apprentice training.

If it is, I, for one, will gladly support a proposal to include the necessary amount to carry out the project in the Department of Labor appropriation bill.

I want to touch for a few minutes on one or two other important bureaus mentioned in this bill; first of all, the Department of State.

The normal functions of the Department of State cost the Government the net sum of approximately \$10,400,000 a year. This is all the great "Department of Peace" costs the Treasury of the United States, the net sum of \$10,400,000 a year. There are other items in the appropriation bill over which the State Department has little or no control, in which the Department merely acts as trustee; but the Foreign Service and the State Department proper cost under \$10,500,000 net to the people of the United States per year.

I think the committee should feel this is a very moderate amount. I personally believe we will in future years have to increase this amount. There are a number of matters in the State Department proper that need attention, but your committee did not feel inclined to give them any increase because of the Budget limitations.

The Foreign Service itself is undermanned. There are 691 Foreign Service officers at the present time, and in 1931 there were 775. The Budget allowed and we have given 20 additional Foreign Service officers, but Mr. Secretary Hull asked for a great many more. I believe eventually, owing to the disturbed condition of the world, we will have to strengthen the Foreign Service of the United States and strengthen the hands of Mr. Hull.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts rose.

Mr. BACON. The State Department is the first line of defense, because the State Department is charged with keeping us out of war. It is poor economy to economize on the State Department. In these troublesome times in the world the State Department, being the great "Department of Peace", ought to have sufficient sums of money, and Secretary Hull's hands ought not to be tied.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has any provision been made for any increases of salary in recognition of foreign service, such as that performed by Mr. Engert in Ethiopia and Mr. Wendelin in Spain, both of whom showed great courage in staying at their posts?

Mr. BACON. We hope that through lapses which will come about because of certain eliminations in the Foreign Service due to resignation and otherwise there will be a sufficient sum of money to make certain promotions in the Foreign Service. It is obviously unwise to add 20 men at the bottom unless a flow of promotions for meritorious service can be started toward the top. I believe we will be able to make some promotions, though no specific sum is provided in this bill to do so.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the fine work of these gentlemen deserves such increases.

Mr. BACON. May I commend the chairman of my subcommittee for the excellent report he made on the underpaid clerks, particularly the foreign clerks in our service. They are of utmost importance. I know in one case the chief of our mission is paying money out of his own pocket to provide the translators necessary for his office. This situation occurs in Japan, where obviously translators are extremely important and necessary. The increase we have allowed will be less than one-half what is necessary to make small increases in salaries to those receiving under \$960 a year. It is, however, a beginning, and your committee hopes the Bureau of the Budget will remedy the situation in the bill next year.

I come now to the Bureau of Air Commerce in the Department of Commerce.

Your committee has made no cut in the amount granted by the Budget for new aids to navigation. It is absolutely essential that the air routes be marked by radio beams. The radio beam marks the channel through the air as the buoys mark the channel through the water in entering a harbor. It will require at least the \$5,000,000 we have in this bill to complete the gap in the air routes of the United States. I believe it will take a great deal more money to really complete the job. This is one item the Congress has got to look forward to, and we will be obliged to make a further appropriation in the future. We must make the air-

ways as safe as we possibly can. The private companies are not allowed to do it, even if they had the money to do it. We are appropriating \$5,000,000 in this bill to make the aids to navigation more efficient, as well as to put in the additional aids that are so necessary. The air lines themselves are spending \$11,000,000 this year to increase the safety of their own planes, twice as much money as the Government is spending to make the air routes safe; and Colonel Gorrill, who testified before your committee, stated that the air lines intended to spend \$15,000,000 additional during the next year to improve the safety of the planes that carry mails and passengers. The Government must keep pace in making the aids as safe and as up to date as the planes that fly the passengers and the mails. The private companies are way ahead of the Government so far as safe navigation in the air is concerned. I shall submit a table in the extension of my remarks showing how the Government has been falling behind, not through the fault of the committee but because of the general economy program, in keeping up with the improvements in air navigation. I do not intend to take up any further time of the Committee to discuss the various items of the bill. I should like to discuss the Bureau of Prisons, the Bureau of Fisheries, and the Bureau of Steamboat Inspection and Navigation, because I think they present very important problems for the Department, as well as your committee, but the time is late. My chairman has covered the bill very thoroughly and in the extension of my remarks, which I shall ask when we go back into the House, I shall include some of the comments I had intended to make on the bill now, or else I will take time under the 5-minute rule. [Applause.]

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, my attention has just been called to a copy of one of the local newspapers of Shreveport, La., bearing date of March 16, 1937, containing 30 legal advertisements of foreclosures being made by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in the parish of Caddo, La. This list does not include the foreclosures which may have been brought and which may be advertised in other newspapers at the present time. Neither does this list include advertisements of other foreclosures being run by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in the same paper at the present time.

Under the laws of the State of Louisiana, the foreclosing mortgagor is required to run a judicial advertisement in a daily newspaper announcing the foreclosure and the date and place of the sale. This advertisement must be run four times in a daily newspaper over a period of four consecutive weeks before the sale can be held.

I have been watching from time to time the list of foreclosures being made by the Shreveport office of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation with grave concern. Ordinarily, when a home owner knows that he is unable to carry on with his home, and knows the futility of attempting to do so, he informs the owner of the mortgage of this fact and by agreement the property is deeded from the mortgage debtor to the mortgage owner. In this manner, no doubt, the Shreveport office of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation disposes of cases of many borrowers who are unable to meet the monthly payments. It is the unusual case that requires foreclosures.

In speaking of this fact, I find that 30 homes are being advertised in one single issue of one of the local newspapers. This means in effect that within the next month 30 families will lose their homes in this city and will have to look for some other place of abode. I am informed that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation since its establishment in Shreveport, La., has made the sum of 2,350 loans. Therefore, we find in this issue of the newspaper that 1½ percent of all the property upon which the Home Owners' Loan Corporation holds a mortgage is being advertised under legal foreclosure in Shreveport proceedings.

Since January 1, 87 foreclosure suits have been filed against home owners in Caddo Parish, La., and since October 1 the Shreveport office of the Home Owners' Loan

Corporation has foreclosed against 135 home owners in this locality. I am informed that the usual old-line insurance companies which loan money on homes rarely exceed in repossession of homes for all purposes 6 percent of the total number of loans made. Yet we find in this city that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in less than 6 months' time has foreclosed upon approximately the same percent of people and taken their homes from them as the old-line companies do during the entire period of 8 or 10 years in the collection of their loans.

But to make the situation worse, I wish to say that lending agencies lend money on homes when times are fairly prosperous and, therefore, must accept the value upon the home as of the date of the application. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation made the loans in the depth of the depression when property had very little value. Since then, property values have been rising in every section of the United States. In Shreveport real-estate values have more than doubled during the last 3 years. Due to the improvement in business conditions and especially due to the oil development which continues apace in this oil section of the mid-continent area, a real house shortage exists in Shreveport, La. Because of this situation, I say, and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation will not deny, that the properties upon which they own mortgages have doubled in value since the mortgages were obtained.

There is something wrong with the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in the fourth congressional district. They tell me that the defendants in these foreclosure suits are, to some extent, 20 months or better in arrears on the payment of these mortgages. It may be that there is a faulty system of collection. It is true that the United States is not in the position of a good-natured philanthropist but rather it is in the position of a strict businessman who insists and has a right to the return of all money loaned. This does not explain the conditions existing at the present time in the fourth congressional district, however.

We have in Shreveport just as honest and conscientious citizenry as exists in any other part of the United States. We have people who understand the meaning of an obligation and where they are able to do so, intend to and do accordingly, carry out their contracts. These home owners constitute the backbone of my congressional district as well as the bulwark of the Nation. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation should grant every possible consideration to these heads of families who are struggling with a heavy burden in an effort to retain their homes for themselves and their children. I say that if, in the list of foreclosures, there exists one single family who unnecessarily loses its home, some one is at fault in the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

When the crash came in 1930-31 in Shreveport, we found the banks closing and the financial institutions refusing to aid even the most worthy persons who because of the economic crisis were unable to carry on with their obligations. Values disappeared and refinancing was impossible. In such a situation came the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and it said to the people of Shreveport, in effect, here is a haven of refuge; you will be permitted to liquidate the indebtedness on your home in an orderly manner.

Several years have passed since then, and values and confidence have been to a large extent restored. And now the people of this city of northwest Louisiana find that they have jumped from the frying pan into the fire. They have been permitted to hold on for a little longer and to "cherish the fond delusion of hope" for a short time only to find their homes taken from them in spite of their every effort, every struggle, and every sacrifice.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation in Louisiana has been and is thoroughly politicalized. Mr. Paul B. Habans, State manager, of New Orleans, La., is a political appointment. He has politicalized the entire set-up. In the Shreveport office, up until last week, a close relative of the leader of the opposing faction, Mr. A. M. Leary, has been in active management of the office. Last week he retired to make a place for another political appointment, a Mr. Parker, of Monroe, La., whose chief claim to competency are his political views and activity.

I have analyzed the situation existing in Shreveport very carefully and I am of the opinion that this office should be thoroughly investigated from top to bottom. Unquestionably loans have been made which should have never been considered by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation of Shreveport, La. In the making of these loans certain institutions have been favored and individuals have been discriminated against. The Shreveport office of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation has accepted from some local financial institutions practically every bad loan on their books and has permitted these institutions to retain the loans in whose liquidating value they have full confidence.

I charge that the difficulty now that this office is having is in concealing the facts that have existed there for some time and should require immediate investigation.

As I have said before, irregularities exist in the Shreveport office which should require investigations. The large number of recurring foreclosures likewise should require investigation. I have discussed this matter with Mr. John W. Childress, assistant to the chairman, who promises his aid; but a more general investigation with a wider scope is needed. We are entitled to know here in Congress why certain irregularities have existed. We are also entitled to know why it is necessary that 6 percent of the loans out of this office be foreclosed within the last 6 months and where this folly of rushing into legal proceedings is going to lead.

I do not have the figures upon the number of homes which have been voluntarily returned by home owners who acknowledge their inability to pay. These figures are in the possession of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. I merely have what is shown by the public records and should be sufficient to warrant an immediate investigation of the affairs in Shreveport, La.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, there is an old saying, "Of what should a man be proud if he is not proud of his friends?" and my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] this afternoon took occasion to refer to the Governor of our State as "the hired man."

I am happy to refer to Frank Murphy as a soldier, a district attorney, a mayor of Detroit, a Governor General of the Philippines, the first High Commissioner of the Philippines, a municipal judge and, now, the Governor of the State of Michigan. If there is one thing that Frank Murphy would be proud to be called, it would be the hired man of the underprivileged. [Applause.] Frank Murphy has been known throughout his entire public career as the champion of the underprivileged. Frank Murphy has been famous for his leniency and his charitable thought of the underprivileged. Frank Murphy has a heart bigger than the man himself, and with it all it is tempered with the greatest sense of justice. Frank Murphy lists among his friends both the rich and the poor, but by far would he prefer to be in Abe Lincoln's class, as the champion of the underprivileged.

I wish that the Committee would give me permission now to read from an editorial in the Detroit Free Press. I ask unanimous consent that I may read this editorial.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. I think I know what is in the editorial and I agree with the Governor's statement about the enforcement of the law and the duty as well. He is entitled to the highest praise for his words, but did he himself follow the advice that he gave to others? Did he follow his words with action?

Mr. RABAUT. Let us see what the editorial says.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this editorial is from the Detroit Free Press, under date of March 19. The Detroit Free Press most vigorously opposed the election of Frank Murphy as Governor of the State of Michigan. I quote it because so much has been said here about the sit-down

strike and Governor Murphy's connection with it that I feel it proper for the House to know what the Republican press has to say about the statement of the great Democratic red-headed Governor of Michigan. The editorial is as follows:

[From the Detroit Free Press of Mar. 19, 1937]

THE GOVERNOR'S STATEMENT

The law-and-order statement by Governor Murphy merits whole-hearted approval and support.

It is a statement the people of Michigan have long been waiting for. It is firm and clear. Already it seems to be having a healthful effect.

Nobody can mistake where the Governor stands with respect to the maintenance of order in Michigan, or can be doubtful about his disposition to do what is necessary for ending the impossible condition existing as a result of the epidemic spread of unlawful sit-down strikes.

Governor Murphy says plainly that the Government of Michigan will not forsake its responsibilities to maintain order and protect citizens in the full exercise of their legal rights. He points out that under their oaths, the Governor and the police officials have no alternative in the matter.

On the strength of what he says, the State will expect effective law enforcement.

At the same time, Governor Murphy makes it clear that he earnestly hopes to avoid any extraordinary action. What he said is a warning, but it is not a threat. He speaks to strikers as to reasonable men and women and fellow citizens.

He has no quarrel with workers because they are trying to obtain redress of grievances or because they are struggling to get relief from hard conditions. He has nothing to say against the use of the lawful strike as an instrument to gain those ends, where necessary.

The Governor sets his face only against the use of illegal and violent methods which tend to destroy law and order and jeopardize the State and the Nation, and which in the end inevitably will defeat the purposes of those who use them.

For as Governor Murphy says, when such things are resorted to, democratic rule is endangered and the way is prepared for the rule of mobs or dictators; at best democratic government is impaired, and social progress impeded.

"And", adds the Governor, "it should not be forgotten that personal liberty (the most precious possession of the common man and woman) will be of little value if the authority and integrity of the courts are not preserved and property rights protected."

That is sound talk. And the Governor might have said, too, that the present conditions in Detroit and Michigan already are injuring seriously the standing and reputation of the State throughout the Nation, and are threatening its business and industry so that any victory won by violent, lawless strike methods will be a very hollow triumph.

Agreements about bargaining and working conditions and rates of pay don't mean much if the jobs that make them valuable are gone.

Governor Murphy is doing his duty to the State. He also is performing a friendly service for labor.

That is the comment of the most bitter paper against the Democratic Party in the State of Michigan and I am happy to congratulate it today upon this candid statement.

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

Mr. RABAUT. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I approve of all that the Governor said there, but was the Governor's statement about the sanctity of the law and the duty of everyone to obey the law and the court order made after or before he prevented the sheriff of Genesee County serving the writ issued by Judge Gadola of Flint?

Mr. RABAUT. This is about the Detroit situation, and was published on the 19th of this month.

Mr. HOFFMAN. After the Governor had prevented the officer at Flint from executing the process of the court?

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to call to the attention of the Appropriations Committee the desperate situation in which employees of the United States district courts and the employees of the United States marshals' offices throughout the Nation find themselves. I make specific reference to the pay scale of these employees. The bailiffs in the district courts receive \$4.50 a day for only such time as they actually put in. This makes the annual average scale below that which is necessary for the average

self-respecting citizen. The deputy United States marshals, I would say, are in even worse condition because for most part they are younger men and have greater obligations.

In comparison to wages paid by first-class municipalities and salaries paid to deputy sheriffs, these Federal employees are unjustly treated.

The service rendered by deputy marshals in serving subpoenas and certain court papers require extensive travel within the jurisdiction of the local court, and the mileage allowances, it is universally agreed, are insufficient to pay the cost on the deputies' investment and provide for the gasoline used in the conveyance, with the result that the meager salaries, which run from \$115 to perhaps \$135 per month, must be drawn upon to make up the losses incurred through the use of their automobiles.

The policy of the Department heretofore has been so short-sighted as to force some of these men to use streetcars, thus limiting the number of services on the part of a deputy in any working day, and this practice is not profitable for either the employee or the Department.

The only reason that these conditions exist is because the deputy marshals and bailiffs are not members of any association or trade union. Therefore, they have no one to speak for them. They are not in a position to force their demands upon the Government.

Under date of January 21, 1937, I brought these matters to the attention of the Attorney General, and I received a reply from him under date of February 8. For the benefit of the committee I insert copies of these letters to show that the Attorney General agrees with my deductions:

HOMER S. CUMMINGS,

Attorney General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CUMMINGS: I was privileged to write you in behalf of the employees connected with the United States marshal's office. As we go along we learn of additional injustices.

It has been brought to my attention that the bailiffs in the United States district courts receive pay at the rate of \$4.50 per day and payable only when the court is in session.

It appears to me that the entire plan of the Justice Department as it applies to its employees, for want of a better term, may be called "scabby." Whoever may be responsible for this condition, certain I am it is not you up to and until this date, but from this time on you and I must share the responsibility for its continuance. When the bailiffs in the State courts of Michigan receive \$3,300 per year and the deputy sheriffs, with no particular experience, receive from \$1,800 to \$2,100, it is a crying shame to pay Federal bailiffs \$4.50 per day and trusted employees serving as deputy United States marshals at a ridiculously low rate.

Of course, I understand your position. You have recommended an increase. Somehow your ideas and mine seem to collide with the Budget Director, and the Appropriations Committee is always willing to accommodate the Budget Director. But, personally, I am of the opinion that it is a matter of obligation on the part of this administration to see that this iniquitous condition is changed.

I sincerely hope that in making your recommendations that you will again recommend a reasonable increase for the United States marshals' deputies and likewise, after careful analysis, recommend some reasonable basis for compensation for the court bailiffs.

I will be more than willing to cooperate with you in remedying this situation.

Cordially and sincerely yours,

JOHN D. DINGELL.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Your letter of January 21, 1937, in reference to the pay of bailiffs in United States district courts is acknowledged herewith.

I agree with you that something should be done about the underpayment of bailiffs and deputy marshals, and we have requested additional funds to alleviate this situation as far as possible. The fundamental basis of correction, however, is through legislation, and please be assured that the Department is giving every consideration possible to this matter.

I appreciate your interest and cooperation very much.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

HOMER S. CUMMINGS,
Attorney General.

Unfortunately, these employees are faced with almost insurmountable obstacles. First, the Judiciary Committee must authorize an increase after the Attorney General's office approves it. Then after an appropriation is authorized the Appropriations Committee must allow the necessary money to meet any increase in pay scales. The Appropriations

Committee is governed by the recommendation of the Budget Director, and it seems that the Budget Director as well as the authorized legislative committees fail to act because these employees have no spokesman and certainly are not in a position to force the issue.

In my letter to the Attorney General I referred to the shabby treatment of these Department of Justice employees. For want of a more forceful or descriptive term, I called it "scabby", and on that point there is no discounting the phrase.

Mr. Chairman, I would have introduced a bill of my own, but after discussing the matter with several members of the Committee on the Judiciary I am assured that the committee has before it a bill which will take care of the situation and which will provide a scale of wages and allowances for mileage commensurate with the service rendered.

I sincerely hope that if and when the Judiciary Committee passes favorably upon the needs of these employees that the Appropriations Committee, without any regard whatsoever for a contrary opinion from the Budget Director, will discharge its duty and make the necessary appropriation.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I was glad this afternoon to hear the question brought up and also the promise of the committee for its support, pertaining to apprentice training. I believe that is one of the most important subjects that will come before this House through the Department of Labor this year. It is doing something for the youth of our country. I base my support on an experience of over 40 years ago. My parents apprenticed me out to learn the trade of foundry worker nearly 40 years ago, for \$1 a day, for 11 hours. I was apprenticed upon the promise to be taught my trade. That was at the beginning of the machine age in my particular business. After working a few months upon one special machine I could produce as much work as a journeyman, receiving at that time possibly seven times as much pay. I rebelled. I had no place to appeal. I quit my job and I went to another town and got a job. Being under contract with the company, I was forced back to their employment to finish my time. Now I know that this is a condition, only it has been exaggerated a thousand times with the boys and girls of our country who are agreed to be apprenticed to a trade, to learn all of the different parts, that they are being exploited on one particular machine. At the end of 4 years' time, at small wages, these boys and girls went out into the world as specialists, and they were not equipped.

The result has been a shortage of skilled mechanics. Today in this country there is a real shortage of skilled mechanics in certain lines. This project is to throw a cloak of protection around these boys and girls in industry in a voluntary plan participated in by the company, the employee, and the Federal Government. It has been organized in 42 States and has been accepted. There are today 117 committees working in this country for the protection of young people in industry and for putting this project across. Three years ago I organized this committee in the State of Connecticut and saw the results. I am very much satisfied with the way it has worked out. If nobody else does, I shall present a bill that will bring this under the Department of Labor as one of its activities in a legal way, and I do hope that the Committee on Appropriations will see fit to help pass this bill.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. BACON. I may say to the gentleman from Connecticut that, so far as I am concerned as one member of the Appropriations Committee, I shall be very glad to join in getting the necessary appropriations, provided we can do it in the Appropriations Committee. I think that the Secretary of Labor has been very negligent in not bringing this subject to the attention of the Committee on Labor in an orderly way before this time.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. McMILLAN. I can only say that the committee will go along with the gentleman's views on this matter if it is properly presented to the legislative committee and authorization is granted by the Congress providing for such a commission. The Appropriations Committee, however, is not a legislative committee, and under the circumstances a point of order will unquestionably be raised against the provision were it undertaken to be inserted in the bill at this time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I promise the chairman of this subcommittee that I shall bring in a bill putting this activity where it belongs—in the Department of Labor—and bringing it properly within the appropriation bill.

MEMORANDUM ON THE WORK OF THE FEDERAL COMMITTEE ON APPRENTICE TRAINING

The Federal Committee on Apprentice Training is a coordinated committee made up of representatives of the United States Office of Education, the Youth Administration, the United States Department of Labor, industry, and organized labor. It was created by Executive Order No. 6750-C (June 27, 1934) for the purpose of permitting genuine apprentice training under the National Recovery Administration codes and, at the same time, prevent the exploitation of apprentices and the break-down of labor standards. After the N. R. A. was declared unconstitutional, the Federal Committee was continued under the National Youth Administration. While apprenticeship solves in part the unemployed youth problem, it is primarily a long-time program covering a period of years and its promotion should be the function of a permanent department of the Government.

The President, in a letter to the Secretary of Labor, dated September 19, 1936, requested the transfer of the Federal Committee on Apprentice Training to the Department of Labor and suggested that a request for an appropriation to cover this activity be included in the Department's budget. The Budget Bureau recommended to Congress an appropriation of \$56,900 for the continuation of this work during the coming fiscal year. This transfer and budget had the unanimous approval of the Federal Committee.

Scope of the program of the Committee

The objectives of the Federal Committee on Apprentice Training are to promote apprenticeship as a sound employment policy and to open up to young people opportunities to obtain training that will equip them for profitable employment. To this end the Committee has been active in:

1. Stimulating training of skilled workers in those trades where shortage is imminent and discouraging training in trades where obsolescence or other factors forecast overcrowding.
2. Bringing national trade associations and labor organizations together in the formulation of a sound program of apprentice training acceptable to both groups.
3. Stimulating the States to set up the necessary machinery for safeguarding and promoting the training of youth for the skilled trades.
4. Serving in an advisory capacity to both employers and employees in the formulation of practical training programs for skilled workers.

It will be seen that the work of the Committee is entirely voluntary and depends upon the acceptance by employers and employees of the services and advice of the Committee. It works through representative State committees that have been set up to establish policies for the administration of the State apprenticeship program. Each of these State committees has drawn up a plan of work which has been approved by the Federal Committee. Such State committees have been set up in 42 States. In addition to these committees, 117 local trade committees have been organized, composed of employers and journeymen in the trade, for the formulation of labor standards and the application of these standards to the training program in the trade.

The activities of the Federal Committee have brought a widespread and enthusiastic interest in apprentice training and an understanding of the importance of apprenticeship as a sound employment policy. One of its outstanding achievements has been its influence in upholding standards of apprenticeship at a time when the normal tendency would have been to put on learners without regard to supply and demand and standards of employment.

Up until the time that the Federal Committee became active there had been no adequate Federal or State machinery developed to promote uniformity and give protection to employment standards of apprenticeship. Because of this lack of machinery, this vital system of training has not kept pace with the needs of industry or with the opportunities for employment in the skilled trades. Labor has repeatedly expressed itself in opposition to any apprenticeship program that does not provide proper safeguards for labor standards. If young workers are to be apprenticed, the trade unions must be assured that the boy's interests will be safeguarded, that labor standards will be upheld, and that the apprentice will not be put on at the expense of the older worker. The Federal Committee on Apprentice Training has the cooperation and support of the trade-union movement and must be kept

functioning if the future demands for skilled labor are to be properly met.

The Department of Labor was created "to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment." Certainly the activities of the Federal Committee on Apprentice Training are in line with these purposes. Its activities encroach in no way upon the work being done by the United States Office of Education but, on the contrary, increase the demands upon the school authorities for related instruction for apprentices. The division of the authority and responsibility between the Department of Labor and the Office of Education is clearly covered in the attached joint memorandum which was submitted to the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Labor.

The American Federation of Labor, at its last convention in Tampa, unanimously approved the work of the Federal Committee and urged that its activities be carried on as a regular function of the Department of Labor. Various State federations of labor have also gone on record in approval of the Committee's work. National programs for apprentice training have been worked out and approved by the National Society of Master Painters and Decorators, and the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers, and by the National Association of Master Plumbers, and the United Association of Journeymen Plumbers and Steamfitters. Other national joint programs of this sort are in the process of formulation. This development is meeting a long-felt need in the building and construction industry.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is entitled to the thanks of the House for placing in the RECORD the editorial from the Detroit Free Press. I have no doubt but that every Member of the House agrees with the sentiments of that editorial, even though it comes from a Republican newspaper.

While the Governor there lays down a course of conduct for all public officials, and which meets with the approval of all, since the 30th day of December 1936, he has failed to follow that course which would permit him to be in line with the advice he gives the others. I mean that, while he has been depicted here as a friend of labor, thousands of men have been deprived of their jobs because the Governor refused or failed, if you prefer that word, to tell those strikers to leave those factories. I am firmly of the opinion, from information that I have of my own and what I have received from Flint and from Detroit, that had the Governor then said to these men in those factories, "You must get out and we will arbitrate this matter", we would have had no further trouble there.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman pays a compliment to the Governor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. As to his words, yes—pardon me—but not as to his actions.

Mr. RABAUT. By inference and implication he gives the Governor credit for being able to do that which the officials could not do; he gives the Governor credit for doing everything that seemed humanly impossible for anybody else to do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Governor Murphy laid down the correct rule, which all must follow if this Nation is to endure as a democracy. When the Governor stated, in substance, that the use of illegal and violent methods which would tend to destroy law and order and jeopardize the State and Nation would in the end defeat the purpose of those who used them, we can all agree with and applaud him.

When he said, in substance, that when such things were resorted to democratic rule was in danger and the way is prepared for the rule of mobs or dictators, he again stated a fundamental truth which we all admit.

When he said, as the gentleman has quoted from this editorial, that—

It should not be forgotten that personal liberty will be of little value if the authority and integrity of the courts are not preserved and property rights protected—

he stated a principle which experience has demonstrated must govern the actions of all.

But when he gave the people of the State of Michigan and the strikers to understand there would be "no compulsion" he nullified all that he said, and when, by his conduct at

Flint, he refused to permit the sheriff to uphold the authority and protect the integrity of the Circuit Court of Genesee County, then, as he himself said, the personal right of the citizen is of little value.

The Governor's words are all that any honest man can desire. His failure to inform the sit-down strikers at Flint and again at Detroit that the law must and would be enforced, his failure to take any action looking toward that end nullifies all his words and demonstrates once more that men must be judged by their acts rather than by their words. The acts of the Governor have demonstrated that the liberty of the citizen of Michigan, the right of the worker who desires to continue in his job, means nothing to him.

Our President by his silence lends support to these sit-down strikers. For more than 60 days, while this lawlessness has continued, while civil authority has been defied, while armed men have invaded our State, disturbed its peace, kidnaped factories and held them to ransom, the President of the United States has remained silent. Not one word of disapproval has come from the Chief Executive of the Nation.

The Clerk read the bill down to and including line 7, page 1.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BUCK, 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. 5779, the appropriation bill for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year 1938, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and special orders heretofore made, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an excerpt from a speech made by Senator Jones, of Nevada.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon in Committee, and to include therein one or two quotations from decisions of previous Chairmen.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a bill which I introduced today.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FERNANDEZ, for 10 days, on account of official Government business in New Orleans.

To Mr. FORD of California, for 2 weeks by doctor's order, on account of illness.

To Mr. HILDEBRANDT, for 8 days, on account of death in family.

To Mr. HILL of Washington, for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

To Mr. LARRABEE, for 1 week, on account of important official business.

To Mr. McCLELLAN, indefinitely, on account of pressing business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the following titles were taken from the Speakers' table, and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 74. An act for the relief of Melba Kuehl; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 191. An act for the relief of Orson Thomas; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 274. An act for the relief of Joseph N. Wenger, lieutenant, United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 434. An act for the relief of Rufus C. Long; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 435. An act for the relief of B. W. Winward; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 470. An act for the relief of Joseph M. Cacace, Charles M. Cacace, and Mary E. Clibourne; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 544. An act for the relief of M. K. Fisher; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 595. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, approved June 19, 1934, for the purpose of promoting safety of life and property at sea through the use of wire and radio communications, to make more effective the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1929, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 750. An act to grant relief to persons erroneously convicted in courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1470. An act authorizing and empowering the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the old post-office building at Oakland, Calif., and to convey to the city of Oakland portions of the site for street-widening purposes in accordance with the provisions of public act approved August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 800); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 1550. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional circuit judges for the ninth judicial circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1570. An act granting the consent of Congress to compact or agreements between the States of Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota with respect to the Red River of the North; to the Committee on Flood Control.

S. 1634. An act for the relief of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 328. An act for the relief of the estate of Letha F. McCubbin, the estate of Mary B. Hodge, and the estate of Walter H. Mansfield;

H. R. 1231. An act for the relief of John Munroe;

H. R. 3067. An act for the relief of John Edgar White, a minor;

H. R. 3201. An act for the relief of Bertha M. Harris;

H. R. 5487. An act to amend section 4551 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. II, title 46, sec. 643); and

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Greater Texas and Pan American Exposition, Dallas, Tex., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on March 20, 1937, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 217. Joint resolution providing for the construction and maintenance of a National Gallery of Art.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 23, 1937, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Affairs at 10 a. m., Tuesday, March 23, 1937. Business to be considered: Open hearings on House Joint Resolution 234, authorizing an appropriation of \$5,000,000 for New York World's Fair, 1939.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

There will be a hearing before subcommittee no. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary at 10:30 a. m., Saturday, March 27, 1937, on the bill H. R. 2271, to provide for trials and judgments upon the issue of good behavior in the case of certain Federal judges.

There will be a hearing before subcommittee no. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary at 10 a. m., Friday, April 2, 1937, on the bills H. R. 4894, to limit the right of removal to Federal courts in suits against corporations authorized to do business within the State of residence of the plaintiff, and H. R. 4895, to further define the jurisdiction of the district courts in case of suits involving corporations where jurisdiction is based upon diversity of citizenship.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will meet on Wednesday, Mar. 24, 1937, at 10:30 a. m. to consider the following bills: H. R. 3424, for the relief of certain aliens illegally in the United States; H. R. 4291, to extend further time for naturalization to alien veterans of the World War under the act approved May 25, 1932 (47 Stat. 165), to extend the same privileges to certain veterans of countries allied with the United States during the World War, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The subcommittee appointed by the Committee on the District of Columbia to consider H. R. 3291, barber regulations, will meet Tuesday, March 23, 1937, at 10:30 a. m. in room 345, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m. Wednesday, March 24, 1937. Business to be considered: Hearing on natural-gas bills. In view of the hearing which the committee held last year, it is hoped that the hearing this year will be limited to new matter as far as possible.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, March 30, 1937. Business to be considered: Aviation bills (hearing).

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, March 24, 1937. Business to be considered: Hearings on H. R. 3683, conveyance of portion of Oakland, Calif., post-office site for street-widening purposes, and H. R. 3135, for the exchange of land in Hudson Falls, N. Y., for the purpose of the post-office site.

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation at 10:30 a. m., March 23, 1937. Business to be considered: House Joint Resolution 91, to permit a compact or agreement between the States of Idaho and Wyoming respecting the disposition and apportionment of the waters of the Snake River and its tributaries, and for other purposes; H. R. 2512, to authorize an appropriation for the construction of small reservoirs under the Federal reclamation laws; H. R. 1499, to create a commission and

to extend further relief to water users on United States reclamation projects and on Indian irrigation projects.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

458. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to two existing appropriations of the War Department (H. Doc. No. 172); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

459. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to the appropriation for Army transportation, War Department, fiscal year 1937 (H. Doc. No. 171); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

460. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a request for the enactment of an appropriation authorizing an appropriation of \$100,000 to defray the organizing and holding of the Seventh World's Poultry Congress and Exposition in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

461. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a bill to amend section 13 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of February 18, 1929; to the Committee on Agriculture.

462. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a proposed change in the act approved March 26, 1934, Forty-eight Statutes, 467 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 514a) creating the position of Under Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 4194. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination of the Delaware River with a view to the control of its floods; with amendment (Rept. No. 436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 4541. A bill for a survey and examination of the Kickapoo River, Wis., with a view to the control of its floods; with amendment (Rept. No. 437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SECREST: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 4708. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Scioto and Sandusky Rivers and their tributaries in the State of Ohio, with a view to the control of their floods; without amendment (Rept. No. 438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCLELLAN: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 4714. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Illinois Bayou, Pope County, Ark., to determine the feasibility of cleaning out the channel and repairing the banks, constructing dams and reservoirs when needed, and the cost of such improvement, with a view to the controlling of floods; with amendment (Rept. No. 439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCLELLAN: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 4715. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Big Piney Creek in Pope and Johnson Counties, Ark., to determine the feasibility of cleaning out the channel and repairing the banks, constructing dams and reservoirs where needed, and the cost of such improvements, with a view to the controlling of floods; with amendment (Rept. No. 440). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 4896. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Cayuga Creek, N. Y., with a view to the control of its floods; without amendment (Rept. 441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 4956. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination of the White River in South Dakota with a view to flood control; with amendment (Rept. No. 442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 4957. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination of the Keyapaha River in South Dakota with a view to flood control; with amendment (Rept. No. 443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 4958. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination of the Bad River from Philip to Fort Pierre, S. Dak.; with amendment (Rept. No. 444). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GREEN: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 4963. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Estero River, Imperial River, Corkscrew River (Horse Creek), Gordon River, and Rock Creek, all in Florida, with a view to the control of their floods; without amendment (Rept. No. 445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCLELLAN: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 5123. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Palarm Creek, a tributary of the Arkansas River, in Faulkner and Pulaski Counties, Ark., to determine the feasibility of cleaning out the channel and repairing the banks, of constructing dams and reservoirs where needed, and the cost of such improvement, with a view to the control of floods; with amendment (Rept. No. 446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 5128. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Bayou Meto Basin, a tributary of the Arkansas River in the State of Arkansas, with a view to control of floodwaters; without amendment (Rept. No. 447). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCLELLAN: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 5129. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination of Sulphur River in Arkansas with a view to flood control and to determine the cost of such improvement; with amendment (Rept. No. 448). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCLELLAN: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 5130. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination of the Poteau River in Arkansas with a view to flood control and to determine the cost of such improvement; with amendment (Rept. No. 449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALLGREN: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 5180. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination of Nes-tucca River and its tributaries in the State of Oregon with a view to the control of its floods; with amendment (Rept. No. 450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALLGREN: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 5181. A bill to provide a preliminary examination and survey of the Flathead River and tributaries in Flathead County, Mont., with a view to the control of its floodwaters; without amendment (Rept. No. 451). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 226. Joint resolution to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1902, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 452). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DEEN: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 2904. A bill for the relief of officers and soldiers of the Volunteer service of the United States mustered into service for the War with Spain and who were held in service in the Philippine Islands after the ratification of the treaty of peace, April 11, 1899; without amendment (Rept. No. 456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. QUINN: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 4545. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved June 22, 1936; with amendment (Rept. No. 457). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WARREN: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1441. An act to authorize the establishment of a permanent instruction staff at the United States Coast Guard Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 458). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WARREN: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4552. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to dispose of certain portions of Anastasia Island Lighthouse Reservation, Fla., and for other purposes", approved August 27, 1935, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 459). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. DEEN: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 1767. A bill for the relief of the Rowesville Oil Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 453). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DEEN: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 1770. A bill for the relief of the Farmers' Storage & Fertilizer Co., of Aiken, S. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 454). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WOOD: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 2114. A bill for the relief of Ernst Nussbaum; without amendment (Rept. No. 455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WARREN: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 185. Joint resolution to authorize Capt. Harry G. Hamlet, Capt. Edward D. Jones, Lt. Comdr. Louis W. Perkins, Lt. Comdr. Frank T. Kenner, and Lt. Dwight H. Dexter, United States Coast Guard, to accept certain foreign decorations and diplomas; with amendment (Rept. No. 460). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4926) to authorize a payment to Annie Brown Corson in lieu of pension not paid to her father or his widow, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5803) to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more efficient tax-supported free public-school systems; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: A bill (H. R. 5804) to provide for the residence of the United States commissioners appointed for the national parks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5805) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the exercise of sole and exclusive jurisdiction by the United States over the Hawaii National Park in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes", approved April 19, 1930; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5806) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept donations of land, interests in land, buildings, or other property for the extension of national parks, national monuments, battlefield sites, national military parks, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BUCK: A bill (H. R. 5807) to amend the Social Security Act with respect to the meaning of the term "agricultural labor"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEBERG: A bill (H. R. 5808) to amend the act of March 16, 1934, relating to the migratory bird hunting stamp, as amended by the act of June 15, 1935; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DIMOND: A bill (H. R. 5809) authorizing the transfer of canceled cheque to the Governor of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 5810) to provide for the refund of certain interest paid by veterans on loans secured by adjusted-service certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNN: A bill (H. R. 5811) to provide \$30,000,000,000 which shall be expended within a period of 5 years to furnish employment and to end poverty in the United States and its possessions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEBERG: A bill (H. R. 5812) to amend section 243 of the Penal Code of the United States as amended by the act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 378), relating to the marking of packages containing wild animals and birds and parts thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 5813) to authorize the Director of the Census to collect and publish monthly statistics concerning the quantities of soybeans, peanuts, flaxseed, corn germs, copra, sesame seed, hempseed, babassu kernels and nuts, rapeseed, and other oil seeds, nuts and kernels received at oil mills, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. CHANDLER: A bill (H. R. 5814) to authorize and direct the submission to Congress of a comprehensive plan to provide flood protection for the city of Memphis and Shelby County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 5815) providing for the refund of profits realized by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation from the sale of collateral; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HILL of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 5816) to provide that the workmen's compensation law of any State may apply, within such State, to employments in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 5817) to create an Indians Claims Commission, to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CLASON: A bill (H. R. 5818) for the allowance and payment of certain claims for wages for labor performed in excess of 8 hours per day in national armories and arsenals; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5819) to amend the Judicial Code in respect to claims against the United States for just compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAAS: A bill (H. R. 5820) granting compensation for death of Reserve officers and Reserve enlisted men by aviation accidents; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STARNES: A bill (H. R. 5821) to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BOILEAU: A bill (H. R. 5822) to provide for the continuation and expansion of the Federal works program; for the development of a planned, long-range public-works program; for grants and aid by the Federal Government to the several States in relieving hardship and suffering caused by unemployment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DINGELL: A bill (H. R. 5823) to provide funds for acquisition of a site, erection of buildings, and the furnishing thereof for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States, at Warsaw, Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSPECK: A bill (H. R. 5824) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one

hundredth anniversary of the city of Atlanta, Ga., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 5825) authorizing the disposal of boats to the Dawn Patrol, Inc.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 5826) to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Root River, Fillmore and Houston Counties, Minn., with a view to control of floodwaters; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5827) to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Gilmore Creek, Winona County, Minn., with a view to control of floodwaters; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 5828) to provide a preliminary examination of the Fountaine Qui Bouille (Fountain) River and its tributaries, in the State of Colorado, with a view to the control of their floods and the conservation of their waters; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 5829) authorizing the construction of a dam and dike for preventing the flow of tidal waters in the North Slough in Coos County for the purpose of reclaiming land for farming; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DISNEY: A bill (H. R. 5830) to provide for the enlargement, extension, and remodeling of the post-office building at Tulsa, Okla., and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COLLINS: A bill (H. R. 5831) to provide for a survey of the old Jackson Military Road and the establishment of a national parkway along the route thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DIMOND: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 289) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Wrangell Harbor, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

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 Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States favoring the eradication of the noxious weed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting consideration of House Resolution 225 proposing that naval stores laborers be classified as farm laborers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting consideration of their Joint Resolutions No. 49 A, No. 55 A, and No. 58 A; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Resolution No. 28, favoring the Harrison-Black-Fletcher bill providing Federal aid for public education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 16 favoring Senate bill 816; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 18 favoring House bill 4009; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 17 concerning star-route mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Resolution No. 18; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, urging the passage of House bill 5028, by Mr. DEEN, providing for an appropriation of \$125,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1938, and June 30, 1939, for the purpose of increasing employment; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate \$100,000 to the counties of Uintah and Duchesne, located in the former Indian reservation, State of Utah; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 6, requesting passage of Senate bill 1375, which provides punishment for persons stealing cattle moving in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President of the Congress of the United States to consider their House Concurrent Resolution No. 18 and to Amend the O'Mahoney sugar bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 5832) for the relief of John Joseph McMahon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURCH: A bill (H. R. 5833) to provide for a review by the Department of War of the case of the late Capt. Bartlett James; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 5834) for the relief of Mary Louise Oxley; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 5835) to amend certain records of the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DIES: A bill (H. R. 5836) for the relief of Lindsay Linscombe; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 5837) for the relief of Joseph Patrick Twomey; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5838) for the relief of Thomas F. McKee; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 5839) granting a pension to Clara Sill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 5840) for the relief of Purse Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5841) for the relief of William Bockheim; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLIVER: A bill (H. R. 5842) for the relief of John G. Edwards; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POLK: A bill (H. R. 5843) for the relief of Harry E. Conn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICH: A bill (H. R. 5844) granting a pension to Ella V. Bellinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SADOWSKI: A bill (H. R. 5845) authorizing the Secretary of War to award a Distinguished Service Medal to Clarence E. Whitney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMASON of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5846) for the relief of Carolina Maldonado; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH: A bill (H. R. 5847) granting a pension to Katherine Mueller; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1252. By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. C. E. Neptune and Mr. and Mrs. C. W. Neptune, of Roscoe, Ohio, urging that nothing be done to disturb or abridge the

religious rights and privileges of our people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1253. Also, petition of the Democratic Women's Club of Cheshire, Ohio, endorsing the President's Supreme Court proposal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1254. By Mr. BEITER: Petition of the Building Contractors' Association of Indianapolis, urging the continuance of the Public Works Administration and the allocation to it for public construction of a proportionate share of any moneys required to be spent by the Federal Government for national relief of the unemployed and the recovery of industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1255. Also, petition of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, representing 1,500 members, urging enactment of the President's proposals to reform the judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1256. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of the City Council of the Town of Emeryville, Calif., by its mayor and city clerk, favoring the bill (H. R. 4215) to amend the Banking Act of 1935 to authorize the continuance of the payment of interest on deposits of public funds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1257. Also, petition of the southern California legislative committee of the Standard Railroad Labor Organizations, by Frank G. Pellett, chairman, and R. B. Thompson, secretary, Los Angeles, Calif., supporting the program being advanced by the President for the reorganization of the judicial branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1258. Also, petition of the Contra Costa County People's Legislative Conference, by Joseph F. Milcoch, secretary, Martinez, Calif., endorsing the action taken by President Roosevelt on the Federal and Supreme Court matters, and recommending a constitutional amendment to definitely give Congress power to pass laws over the 5-to-4 vote of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1259. Also, petition of 158 lawyers of San Francisco, Calif., received with letter dated March 12 from Matt I. Sullivan, attorney at law, Mills Tower, San Francisco, Calif., opposing the proposal of President Roosevelt in regard to the Supreme Court change; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1260. By Mr. CURLEY: Resolutions of the Alteration Plumbers, Steamfitters, and Helpers Union of New York, endorsing the President's program for reorganization of the Federal Judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1261. Also, resolutions of the Medical Society of the County of New York, composed of 4,500 registered physicians in the city of New York, opposing the enactment of Senate bill 1233 and House bill 4650; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1262. By Mr. COLDEN: Resolution adopted by the southern California legislative committee of the standard railroad labor organizations, March 5, 1937, expressing the approval of the railroad brotherhoods of southern California of the President's program for reform of the judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1263. Also, resolution adopted by the California Mutual Water Companies Association, Upland, Calif., asking that the United States Department of Agriculture, through its proper agencies, be requested to conduct a study of the varying salt constituents of irrigation water, and its possible effects upon soil, plants, and eventually underground percolating waters; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

1264. By Mr. CRAWFORD: Petition of R. A. Carothers and other residents of Stanton, Mich., protesting against any legislation prohibiting the use of the mails for distribution of religious literature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1265. Also, petition of residents of Owosso, Mich., relative to the issuance of currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1266. By Mr. ENGEL: Petition of Mary A. Blankenship and others, of Idlewild, Mich., urging enactment of old-age pension bill (H. R. 2257); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1267. Also, petition of Joshua Lewis and others, of Baldwin, Mich., urging enactment of old-age pension bill (H. R. 2257); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1268. Also, petition of Helena F. Kubecka and others, of Chase, Mich., urging enactment of old-age pension bill (H. R. 2257); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1269. Also, petition of Neely Couch and others, of Lake County, Mich., urging enactment of old-age pension bill (H. R. 2257); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1270. Also, petition of Oscar Blankenship, of Idlewild, Mich., urging enactment of old-age pension bill (H. R. 2257); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1271. Also, petition of Edward Harrison and others, of Baldwin, Mich., urging enactment of old-age pension bill (H. R. 2257); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1272. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Alteration Plumbers, Steamfitters, and Helpers Union, unanimously endorsing President Roosevelt's program for the reorganization of the Federal judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1273. Also, petition of the Eastern and Gulf Sailors' Association, New York Branch, New York, N. Y., endorsing the President's proposal for improving and enlarging the United States Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1274. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of 22 taxpayers and residents of Sullivan County, N. Y., protesting against the President's recommendation of appointing additional Justices to the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1275. By Mr. JARRETT: Resolution of the Mercer County Bar Association, Mercer, Pa., memorializing the Congress of the United States to defeat the measure to provide for supplementary appointment of Justices to the Supreme Court of the United States when incumbents fail to retire at 70 years of age; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1276. Also, petition of Wayde H. McKinley and other residents of Polk, Pa., protesting against revising or weakening the United States Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1277. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of Thomas H. Holden, president, New York Building Congress, New York City, with reference to the enactment of the Beiter bill (H. R. 4594); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1278. By Mr. LAMBETH: Petition of citizens of Lee County, N. C., favoring enactment of House bill 2257, providing for a national and uniform system of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1279. Also, petition of citizens of Union County, N. C., favoring enactment of House bill 2257 providing for a national and uniform system of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1280. By Mr. LEWIS of Colorado: House Joint Resolution No. 10 of the Colorado General Assembly, urging the appointment of a citizen of Colorado to a place on the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

1281. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 6 of the Colorado General Assembly, memorializing the Congress to consider in any treaty or treaties between the United States of America and Mexico the waters of the Colorado River and the Rio Grande River as the subjects of separate and distinct agreements and treaties; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1282. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 5 of the Colorado General Assembly, urging favorable action on Senate Resolution 298 providing for certain measures designed to solve the problem of transient relief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1283. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 4 of the Colorado General Assembly, asking for appropriation of \$1,000,000,000 for the continuation of the Works Progress Administration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1284. Also, House Joint Resolution No. 7 of the Colorado General Assembly, urging assistance to the President in

connection with the reorganization of the Federal judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1285. Also, Senate Joint Memorial No. 5 of the Colorado General Assembly, memorializing the Congress to pass the Wagner-Van Nuys anti-lynching bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1286. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 9 of the Colorado General Assembly, expressing favorable attitude toward House bill 4009 providing for control and eradication of noxious weeds and to protect the agricultural resources of the several States and of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1287. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 10 of the Colorado General Assembly, urging the continuation of a public-works program under the administration of the Public Works Administration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1288. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 7 of the Colorado General Assembly, urging appropriation for the control of grasshoppers, Mormon crickets, and other insect pests similarly subject to interstate migratory movements; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1289. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 8 of the Colorado General Assembly, urging Federal legislation providing for the punishment of persons stealing animals moving in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1290. By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Senate Joint Memorial No. 3 of the General Assembly of Colorado, for the relief of the people of the State of Colorado in respect to narrow-gauge rail abandonments, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1291. By Mr. MOTT: Seven petitions of citizens of the State of Oregon, urging that the Congress pass no law that would disturb or abridge the religious rights and privileges of all our people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1292. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 16 of the Thirty-ninth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, urging the Congress to enact into law Senate bill 816, which amends the Federal Farm Loan Act and Farm Credit Act of 1935, to provide that no deficiency judgment shall be taken in the foreclosure of any first mortgage obtained as security for any loan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1293. Also, 11 petitions of citizens of the State of Oregon, urging that the Congress pass no law that would disturb or abridge the religious rights and privileges of all our people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1294. By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: Petition of citizens of Emanuel County, Chatham County, Bulloch County, and Candler County, Ga., concerning old-age pension bill (H. R. 2257), by Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1295. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the New York Building Congress, Thomas S. Holden, president, New York City, concerning the Beiter bill, H. R. 4594; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1296. By Mr. RICH: Petition of citizens of Bradford, Pa., protesting against the President's plan to reorganize the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1297. By Mr. WARREN: Petition of certain citizens of First Congressional District of North Carolina, favoring House bill 2257, old-age pension bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1298. By Mr. WITHROW: Senate Joint Resolution No. 18, passed by the Wisconsin Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to investigate certain recent charges by a Wisconsin Congressman and a member of the staff of the Wisconsin Relief Administration as to the distribution of relief in Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1299. Also, Joint Resolution No. 58 A, passed by the Wisconsin Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to relieve financial difficulties developing in northern Wisconsin due to Federal purchases of land; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1300. Also, Joint Resolution No. 55 A, passed by the Wisconsin Legislature, relating to memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide relief for farmers in drought-stricken areas in this State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1301. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 28, passed by the Wisconsin Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass the Harrison-Black-Fletcher bill providing Federal aid for public education; to the Committee on Education.

1302. Also, Joint Resolution No. 49 A, passed by the Wisconsin Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to apply available Federal aid to the salvation of the American farmer and the restoration and stabilization of American agriculture as of more vital national concern than the eradication of noxious weeds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1303. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Council of the City of Knoxville, Tenn., favoring the United States Housing Act of 1937; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1304. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Moline, Ill., favoring the United States Housing Act of 1937; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 1937

Rev. W. L. Darby, D. D., executive secretary of the Washington Federation of Churches, of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and loving Lord, we approach Thee in humility and reverence, for Thou art our creator and preserver; Thou alone art worthy of our worship. We come with gratitude for the multitude of Thy mercies upon us as a people through the years of our national life. May we increasingly deserve Thy grace and favor. Cleanse us from selfishness and greed, from envy and covetousness. Forgive our individual and collective sins and help us to seek those great moral and spiritual ideals which alone will assure our stability and permanence.

In these times of stress and strain, when we know not what a day may bring forth, we pray for wisdom to be given the President of the United States, his Cabinet and other advisers, and the members of our courts. In this hour we ask Thy blessing upon the Congress and especially upon this body, the Senate of the United States. Give Thy servants here vision and judgment, so that, devoted to the welfare of their country, they may act for the highest interests of its citizens.

Aid us also to maintain our place helpfully in the family of nations to which we belong. Grant us the spirit of peace and good will, not that of hatred and strife. Let us all labor together for the common good and the coming of Thy kingdom of righteousness and brotherhood.

Today give Thy servants here the consciousness of Thy presence and guidance in all their discussions and actions. This we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, March 22, 1937, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 328. An act for the relief of the estate of Letha F. McCubbin, the estate of Mary B. Hodge, and the estate of Walter H. Mansfield;