

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 15, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Gracious Lord, Thou who givest freely and largely, impress us that only he who forgets to hoard has learned how to live. Shame the heart that dreams only of blessings past and sees not the cheerful offerings which Nature sings in joy and hope; how manifold are Thy mercies. Garden, field, and hillside are covered with a mantle of green which promise a rich and an abundant harvest. Heavenly Father, how much more wonderful are Thy gifts to the souls of men through Christ. Do Thou possess our hearts and minds that we may resist evil and overcome difficulty. Amid turbulent conditions and mental disquietude, unfold to men everywhere the deep things of the soul. The Lord bless and preserve the ideals of our Republic and establish the work of these Thy servants. In the name of our Saviour who became obedient to Calvary's cross. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 11, 1939, 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, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5269. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS
ON THE BILL H. R. 3835

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will afford a hearing on my bill H. R. 3835, which is intended to afford some measure of cooperation on the part of the Post Office authorities with State taxing authorities, particularly in the matter of the collection of cigarette taxes. There are 21 States directly concerned, and a large number of the Members of the House have indicated to me their interest in the bill. Since I do not have an opportunity to confer with each of them separately, I am giving this notice with the idea that those who are concerned will appear before the committee tomorrow morning and present their views.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders of the day I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a brief article from the Brooklyn Citizen on legislation which I introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ACQUIRING STOCKS OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 572) to provide for the common defense by acquiring stocks of strategic and critical materials essential to the needs of industry for the manufacture of supplies for the armed forces and the civilian population in time of a national emergency, and to encourage, as far as possible, the further development of strategic and critical materials within the United States

for common defense, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAY, THOMASON, FADDIS, CLASON, and MARTIN of Iowa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech delivered by Postmaster General Farley before the trainmen's convention in Cleveland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks, first, by including a radio address delivered by myself last Saturday night over the Columbia Broadcasting System, and, second, by including an article by Arthur J. Ballantine, former Under Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

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

There was no objection.

ARGENTINE BEEF

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

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman mind telling us what he is going to talk about?

Mr. RICH. I want to try to discuss with the gentleman from Colorado, the gentleman from Texas, and the gentlemen from the Western States and get their opinion as to whether they think that South American beef is better than beef from cattle raised in your States.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Just hop to it. You have my consent. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, has the Buy American Act been violated; and if so, by whom? It seems pretty tough on American meat-producing farmers; it is hard on the American meat packers and businessmen and pretty tough on American labor when we have poor business, with low farm prices and 12,000,000 American men and women unemployed, to have our Chief Executive, when writing to Secretary Hull in reply to his letter of April 5 regarding purchasing supplies for the 110,000 naval officers and men, that the President of the United States would advise him to buy beef canned in Argentina, claiming that it is better than American canned beef and because its price of 9.7 cents a pound plus the duty of 6 cents is cheaper than American prices paid of 23.61 cents per pound.

How will we maintain a high price for our American farmers and cattle raisers of Texas and Colorado and Idaho and Montana and other States? How will we keep standards of living high? How will we put the 12,000,000 unemployed back to work by such statements as that coming from men in authority? Where is there any incentive to have the slogan "Buy American" if our trusted officers betray us? How will we put our men back to work if we give foreign countries our business, our money, and our good will?

God forbid that this betrayal of the American trust shall have to be endured much longer or the America of tomorrow would be a sad day for our future generations.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a letter to the Secretary of the Interior and also a letter to Senator THOMAS, of the Committee on Education and Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ARGENTINE BEEF

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD on the importation of Argentine beef.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, for several years we have heard much about the good-neighbor policy of this administration, but it seems to me that President Roosevelt's recent statement that we buy Argentine beef for our Navy, despite provisions of the Buy American Act, should be of concern to every citizen.

The farmers and livestock producers have suffered from large importations of farm products and competitive commodities during recent years and now the President infers that he does not believe the American farmer is entitled to the American market. This recent statement should clear the atmosphere and the American farmer should know that his products and his labor are being used in a game of international politics. The question here is not merely the purchase of so many pounds of Argentine beef; the real question is, Would the President of the United States drive the livestock producers to a state of peonage and peasantry in order to curry favor with a South American republic? When a good-neighbor policy with its many reciprocal features is carried so far as to urge American citizens to buy and use foreign meat products, it is high time for the American livestock producer to protest vigorously. The livestock producers of this country cannot be expected to meet competitive prices of imported meats any more than American labor and industry can compete with cheap foreign labor and manufacturing. I cannot conceive how anyone would suggest that the corn-fed beef of the United States must meet competitive prices of Argentine grass- and alfalfa-fed cattle. Nor can I imagine anyone desiring that the American farmer be forced to pay peon wages to his help or reduce his own living standards to that of some of our competitive nations. Agriculture in the United States is in a demoralized condition, and now is no time to take from the American farmer his own market. When one realizes that those engaged in agriculture comprise about 30 percent of our population and that this great group receives less than 10 percent of our national income, one need not look far for the cause of our economic condition. Six and a half million families in the United States are engaged in agriculture and they should be entitled to some consideration.

I feel I must call the attention of the House to the number of live cattle we are now importing at reduced tariff rates. The tariff on beef or heavy cattle from Canada under the 1932 tariff was 3 cents per pound. Under the 1939 agreement this tariff is reduced to 1½ cents per pound on a quota of 51,720 head of cattle quarterly. For the first quarter of 1939 this quota was completely filled during the first part of February. On April 1 large droves of cattle were waiting at the Canadian border to be driven across the line in order to receive benefit of the second quarter quota. The good-neighbor provisions of the reciprocal trade agreement permits Mexico to bring in a quota of cattle on the same basis. In addition to the number of livestock imported we have always imported great quantities of canned meats from South America. The President's statement that this beef was "better and cheaper" than the American product will no doubt increase the consumption of this product in American homes. In my opinion his statement has gone far toward destroying the effects of the "Buy American" movement.

When this matter is presented to the House for further consideration I sincerely hope the Members will vote to protect our American farmers and livestock producers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech delivered by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PURCHASE OF ARGENTINE BEEF FOR THE NAVY

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE AMERICAN FARMER HIT AGAIN

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, it has been stated on many occasions that the American farmer has been "sold down the river" during the past 6 years. The President has just made public a letter which he has written to Secretary of State Hull, bearing date of April 13, 1939, in which he fully authorized our Navy to purchase 48,000 pounds of canned corned beef from the Argentine Republic, despite the provisions of the Buy American Act.

Mr. Speaker, the reports from the press indicate the chief reason assigned by our President for such an unusual and surprising authorization was "that our American cattle do not make as good corned beef as some of the foreign cattle."

This statement is a very unusual one; and since I represent the Tenth Congressional District of Indiana, and many of our Members represent the great Central, Midwestern, and Western States, where our pasture and grazing lands are the most fertile in the world, and where we observe great and large herds of fine cattle in which our farmers and stock raisers take great pride, we doubt the correctness of the statement made. Our cattle, and especially those raised in my own State, are the finest specimens produced in the world, and they provide the finest and very best beef and meat products known to man, any statement to the contrary notwithstanding.

Our farmers and our stock raisers are our very best American citizens; they have materially aided in the building of this great Nation; they have endeavored to fully comply with every regulation imposed by the Government, yet they have been struggling throughout the past 6 years under the various forms of Government control and regimentation imposed by the national administration now in power; they have been entirely loyal and patriotic. When the President of our Nation boldly asserts that the meats and meat products which are produced in a foreign country are infinitely better than our own, that is certainly a hard slap in the face for every farmer and stock raiser in this Nation.

And, Mr. Speaker, it has become known that the dread and highly dangerous hoof-and-mouth disease is prevalent in many parts of the Argentine Republic; certain regions in that Republic are barred from making shipments of meat into this country because of that terrible disease existing among the cattle. It is further reported in the press that the President said "but the hoof-and-mouth disease cannot be imported in cans of corned beef." That assertion may be true, but pray tell me who would relish meats or meat products for human consumption which came from diseased cattle? And may I especially ask who would desire to eat, as food, meats coming from cattle which might be afflicted with the hoof-and-mouth disease? Yet that is the decree of the President—that Argentine corned beef be purchased for consumption by our naval forces. If our Navy should become involved, our men would subsist upon rations provided by a foreign country which might have come from diseased animals and which might cause sickness and other ill effects among our naval forces.

While we feed and market the finest cattle in the world and our cattle are free from any dangerous and transmissible diseases, yielding the finest beef and meat products known to man, yet this character of American-produced beef is not good enough for our Navy, according to the Chief Executive. He desires that our boys in our Navy eat the meat products purchased from a foreign country which come from that region where a dangerous disease is prevalent. Therefore, is it strange in the light of such philosophy that the American farmer and stock raiser has claimed that they were sold down the river?

While the quality of American beef and the meat products from our cattle is unsurpassed anywhere, yet the canned beef

and meat products from Argentina have been placed on the shelves of the grocery stores in Indiana and elsewhere because of our low tariff wall, all of which is in direct competition with our own producers and citizens. This policy has materially injured our farmers and our own citizens. Our people are now, and have been for the past 5 years, struggling for their existence and to retain their possessions; they have had their own markets largely taken away from them, and this gesture on the part of the President gives to the Argentine a market for her meats and deprives our own producers of that opportunity to dispose of their produce. The policy of "buying foreign" instead of "buying American" is a highly dangerous one.

There can be no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that Argentina is highly elated because an added channel of trade has been developed which will be highly beneficial to her farmers and stock raisers. That country has again taken our market and our own people are again deprived of an opportunity to make progress in their own enterprise and business. Our Navy, which is entirely supported and maintained by our people, will by this procedure consume the food products of a foreign country.

May I say in the light of the Buy American Act, which law was passed in the interest of our farmers and laboring men and women, business and industry—which law has been generally adhered to in our country—I am greatly surprised and highly disturbed when our President violates both the letter and the spirit of that exacting law and directs the purchase of meats and meat products from a foreign country, thereby refusing to recognize our own people by buying American? By that lone act the evidence is conclusive that the American farmer and stock raiser are being sold down the river.

I offer this simple suggestion in the face of the very unbusinesslike attitude which has been taken in this matter: Our Government can aid our laboring men and women, our farmers, business, and industry by complying with the law and by buying American. A good-neighbor policy is not one which materially helps the one and materially hurts the other. That policy, as I have grasped it, is one of equality and of fairness, where due consideration is reasonably extended by each to the other. We have been the paymaster for the past 6 years, and our own people are suffering materially because of it. We have much to do within our own borders to rehabilitate our farmers, labor, business, and industry, and to save our own country.

Our President can materially aid the people of our Nation by observing the existing laws and by permitting our Navy to consume American food—and not the food produced in some foreign land.

Let us be American and let us buy American.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a resolution on behalf of the Indiana American Legion.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a radio address I delivered on the American Forum of the Air on May 7, 1939.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a short editorial on the P. W. A.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the Record and to include therein a brief extract from an article in Fortune magazine on taxes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it will, I believe, be worthwhile for every Member to read carefully the

following passage from Fortune magazine. There are some things in this so-called "area of agreement" with which I would hesitate to agree; but there are many more with which I do agree and the very extent of agreement that was reached on this very controversial matter is indicative of the fact that when people get down to business and really face the issues real progress can be made.

The taxes which we are now paying are in large measure the necessary price of our keeping a system of free economy and certainly they are the price we pay for our failure to adjust our national economic life more speedily to the machine age. I am extremely glad that a measure has been passed by the House providing for reciprocal taxation of salaries of Federal officials by States and localities and the taxation of salaries of local officials by the Federal Government. For there is great necessity for us to learn to take a new and much more constructive and patriotic attitude toward taxes than Americans have generally been accustomed to take.

The Fortune article follows:

[From Fortune Magazine of May 1939]

THE AREA OF AGREEMENT

Here are 15 men: A "conservative" midwestern manufacturer, a "progressive" New England manufacturer, an anti-Roosevelt southern businessman, a pro-Roosevelt labor leader, a couple of men who inherited wealth, a Socialist, several tax experts, also one of Sweden's most distinguished economists and practical Socialists, Gunnar Myrdal, invited to the table for his comments on our American tax system.

On the subject of Federal taxation these men are known to disagree; but after struggling with the complicated issues before them they were able to define an area of agreement and even to concur upon some immediate reforms. With the exceptions and qualifications noted in the text, that area of agreement is as follows:

- I. Taxation should be primarily for revenue.
- II. It is an obligation of citizenship that should fall more heavily on the wealthy than on the poor.
- III. The amount of Federal revenue must be increased.
 1. While apparently the Budget cannot be balanced immediately, a cyclical balance is imperative.
- IV. If we are to maintain the capitalist system, taxes must be imposed so as to place the least hindrance upon economic progress.
- V. The present tax system is inadequate:
 1. Because it cannot raise enough revenue.
 2. Because, bearing too heavily on the poor, it is inequitable.
 3. Because, bearing too heavily on the rich, it holds back investment and therefore employment.
- VI. The Round Table recommends:
 1. Reform of corporation taxes to eliminate double taxation of dividends, the capital-stock tax, and the excess-profits tax; also to permit consolidated returns, reasonable allowances for depreciation, and the carry-over of losses.
 2. Abolition of tax-exempt securities.
 3. Relief of the poor by repeal of all Federal excise and sales taxes (except gasoline, tobacco, and liquor).
 4. An increase of \$700,000,000 in the income tax, to be raised from the middle-income brackets by lowering exemptions and raising present rates.
 5. Establishment of a national tax commission to formulate long-term tax policy, eliminating present uncertainty and complexity.

MAJOR QUESTIONS UNRESOLVED

- I. Do surtaxes on large incomes discourage venture capital?
- II. Is the principle of the undistributed-profits tax sound?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of the legislative program for the day and one other special order heretofore made, I may address the House for 45 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

THE GOVERNORSHIP OF PUERTO RICO

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. IGLESIAS. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States announced last Friday the appointment of a new Governor for Puerto Rico. His appointment of Admiral William D. Leahy will mean the retirement of Maj. Gen. Blanton Winship, who for the past several months has sought to be relieved of his duties as Governor of Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point as part of my remarks a letter which I wrote to the President of the United States under date of May 4 regarding Governor Winship and the high esteem in which he is held by all the people of Puerto Rico and the President's reply.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letters referred to follow:

MAY 4, 1939.

HON. FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States of America,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On May 2 I wrote to you a letter requesting a few minutes of your time to talk to you in view of the various rumors circulating about the possibility that Gov. Blanton Winship might resign and that charges against him are being made in Washington. My most recent conversation with Governor Winship left me with the opinion that there might be some truth in these rumors.

Such a move, Mr. President, is unthinkable to me from the viewpoint of the needs of Puerto Rico. The people of Puerto Rico are now comforted with the thought that they have a strong, capable, and honest Governor.

Never before has any Governor been so highly respected by the people of the whole island. No man could maintain the respect and admiration of all our political leaders, yet every political party would deplore Governor Winship's resignation.

Under his leadership during the last 5 years Puerto Rico has enjoyed a great progress as never before. The island's laborers have won better conditions and legislation which they hardly dared hope to obtain. Governor Winship has been Puerto Rico's greatest Governor, a statement which even his critics in Puerto Rico will confirm.

I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that you will use all your influence to persuade the Governor to remain in Puerto Rico if he should ask your permission to resign.

Respectfully yours,

SANTIAGO IGLESIAS,
Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 12, 1939.

HON. SANTIAGO IGLESIAS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: I have your letter of May 4, in which you speak highly of Gov. Blanton Winship and express the hope that he will continue to serve as Governor of Puerto Rico. I share your feeling about Governor Winship personally. I know that he has served both Puerto Rico and the Government with ability and devotion, but some time ago I determined to make Admiral Leahy Governor of Puerto Rico when he went on the retired list. This will be some time this summer.

I am sure that you will find that Governor-Admiral Leahy will serve the people of Puerto Rico with ability and understanding.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

MR. IGLESIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks at this point an article from the New York Times relating to the appointment by the President of Admiral William D. Leahy as Governor of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

LEAHY TO SUCCEED GOVERNOR WINSHIP—ROOSEVELT TAKES NAVY BY SURPRISE IN DESIGNATING ADMIRAL TO PUERTO RICO POST

WASHINGTON, May 12.—In an announcement that took naval circles by surprise, President Roosevelt said today that he would soon send to the Senate the nomination of Admiral William D. Leahy, Chief of Naval Operations, to be Governor of Puerto Rico, succeeding Gov. Blanton Winship.

The President was uncertain when he would send up the nomination, but said that Admiral Leahy would remain in his present post and not go to Puerto Rico until after Congress had adjourned. Admiral Leahy conferred with the President yesterday, and it was understood that the new post was then offered to him.

The President's intention to place the island under jurisdiction of the Navy instead of under the War Department, where it has been for years, was regarded as official recognition of the increasing strategic importance of the Caribbean area in the Nation's Atlantic defenses.

While President Roosevelt's decision was a complete surprise to the Navy, all naval officers agreed that the President would find it difficult to get a better equipped man for the job.

LEAHY HEADS NAVY PROGRAM

The building of the Navy's maximum strength has largely been directed by Admiral Leahy, and this fact is responsible more than any one other thing for his continuance in his present position until the adjournment of Congress.

Admiral Leahy was 64 years old on Saturday, which is the age limit fixed by law for the retirement of Army, Navy, and marine officers.

The fact that San Juan, P. R., is to be made a major link in the Atlantic defensive chain is also considered a prime reason for the appointment of Admiral Leahy as Governor of Puerto Rico.

The Navy has been authorized by Congress to spend \$9,000,000 to build an air and submarine base on Isla Grande in San Juan Harbor while shore improvements, principally for air operations, will be undertaken by the Army and will cost millions of dollars.

In other words, it was said at the Navy Department today that Puerto Rico might be destined to be the Pearl Harbor of the Atlantic. Pearl Harbor is the key outpost of the Pacific defense. Admiral Leahy made no comment today on the President's statement. The opinion is general, however, that he will accept the appointment.

Governor Winship and Secretary Ickes have been at odds for some time, their differences having been widened recently when Mr. Ickes was said to blame the Governor for the long-continued conflict in the Puerto Rican Department of Education, which resulted in a demand by the Commissioner, Jose M. Gallardo, for the resignation of his assistant, Noster Vincent.

Representative MARCANTONIO, of New York, not long ago called at the White House to demand Governor Winship's removal on the ground that he had failed to cooperate with a movement in the Puerto Rican Legislature for an investigation of the auditor's office. It was said at the White House that this demand had not necessarily influenced the President in his apparent decision to allow Governor Winship to retire to private life.

WINSHIP TWICE FIRED UPON

WASHINGTON, May 12.—Since Governor Winship was inducted in San Juan in 1934, two attempts have been made to assassinate him by members of the island's Nacionalista Party.

The last attempt occurred at Ponce last summer, when assailants fired on a reviewing stand, missed General Winship, but killed several Puerto Rican officials who shielded the Governor with their bodies. General Winship said a year ago that he wanted to resign and enjoy life on his Army general's retirement pay.

"But," he added, "I'm an old soldier and I don't quit under fire."

The last time Governor Winship was in the Capital he told friends he was thinking of buying a trailer to tour the country and "enjoy the fishing and hunting."

WINSHIP PRAISES LEAHY

SAN JUAN, P. R., May 12.—No better man could be chosen to be Governor of Puerto Rico than Admiral Leahy and the island is to be congratulated on the President's designation; this was Gov. Blanton Winship's first reaction this afternoon to the information in news dispatches from Washington that the President had announced the selection of Admiral Leahy to head the island government when he retires as Chief of Naval Operations.

Governor Winship said that he would remain on the job, to suit the President's convenience. In a recent Washington conference with Mr. Roosevelt, it is understood, Governor Winship discussed his retirement after 5½ years as Governor. This afternoon the Governor said that he thought it his duty to stay until he had accomplished certain things and not to leave until the appropriate time.

Mr. Winship had only praise for his successor and the President and Puerto Rico. He said that the island could call on him at any time for anything. Mr. Winship did reiterate that he had suggested to the President that he wanted to continue here until "the appropriate time" to get out.

WINSHIP TELLS OF PLANS

Mr. Winship said that he had spent less than a month with his family in more than 5 years and that, besides his family, there were lots of places that he wanted to visit. Many of these are merely places where he has served in the last 40 years.

Admiral Leahy's assignment at the close of an active Navy career is not unlike that of Governor Winship, who was sent to Puerto Rico on his retirement from the Army at the age of 64, after attaining the rank of major general and serving as Judge Advocate General. Governor Winship said that Admiral Leahy's selection was most appropriate in view of the naval development in the Caribbean, centering at San Juan base.

He alluded also to the creation of an Army military department of Puerto Rico, with Brig. Gen. E. J. Daley in command. So far as a hurried reference to the island's history revealed, Admiral Leahy may be the first Navy officer to govern Puerto Rico in more than four centuries. Spain almost invariably sent Army field marshals to administer the island. After the change in sovereignty in 1898 the United States governed through Army officers for 3 years. From 1901 until General Winship's designation in February 1934, all island Governors were from civil life.

WAGE-HOUR LEGISLATION

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

MR. COX. Mr. Speaker, the chairwoman of the Committee on Labor gave notice several days ago that she would today ask the Speaker to recognize her to move to suspend the

rules and pass the bill recently reported by the Committee on Labor amending the Wage-Hour Act. I understand the chairwoman of the Committee on Labor has stated that in the event the motion to suspend is voted down she will pocket the resolution and that the House would have no opportunity of taking action on the measure this session.

I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is within the right of the Committee on Rules on its own motion to grant a rule for the consideration of any bill reported to the House. If the motion of the gentlewoman from New Jersey is voted down and a resolution is offered by any Member of the House, the probabilities are that the Rules Committee would grant a rule on the bill which would provide for full consideration and the offering of amendments to the measure. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

ARGENTINE BEEF

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we have heard considerable about canned beef from Argentina. Many of us believe that American beef has no superior in the world. I have, therefore, offered a resolution asking that the Speaker appoint five Members of Congress to constitute a committee to inquire into the circumstances and facts in regard to American beef and also in regard to the Buy American Act.

Last Saturday the public press carried the story that the President of the United States at a press conference in the White House last Friday made public a letter he wrote to the Secretary of State April 13, 1939, authorizing the Navy Department to purchase 48,000 pounds of Argentine canned corned beef, notwithstanding the provisions of the said so-called Buy American Act of March 3, 1933.

It was stated that the President declared that—

The Argentine product was infinitely superior in quality to the American product; * * * that the enlisted men of the Navy should have the best beef.

Many of us believe that American beef has no superior. Therefore I am introducing today a resolution providing for a select committee of five, to be appointed by the Speaker, whose duty will be to make a thorough investigation of all the facts and circumstances concerning contracts to supply the United States Navy, to determine the reason for the statement that Argentine beef is infinitely superior to American beef.

I ask unanimous consent to include said resolution at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution referred to follows:

Whereas the Navy Department invited bids to supply the Navy with canned corned beef; and

Whereas the lowest bidder appears to have been the Argentine Meat Producers Cooperative, an alleged institution of the Government of Argentina; and

Whereas section 2, title 3, of the act of March 3, 1933, commonly known as the Buy American Act, requires the purchase for public use of supplies only produced or manufactured in the United States with certain exceptions; and

Whereas the bill (H. R. 6149) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year 1940, passed by the House of Representatives May 8, 1939, now pending in the Senate, contains a provision that no part of the appropriation, or any other appropriation for subsistence of Navy personnel, shall be available for the procurement of any article of food not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, with certain exceptions; and

Whereas it was stated in the public press of Saturday, May 13, 1939, that the President of the United States at a press conference in the White House on Friday, May 12, 1939, made public a letter he wrote to the Secretary of State, dated April 13, 1939, authorizing the Navy Department to purchase 48,000 pounds of Argentine canned corned beef, notwithstanding the provisions of the said so-called Buy American Act; and

Whereas it was further stated that the President of the United States in his said letter to the Secretary of State declared that "the Argentine product was infinitely superior in quality to the American product," which statement, it is said, the President reiterated with emphasis at the said press conference: Therefore

Resolved, That a select committee of five Members of the House of Representatives be appointed by the Speaker, whose duty it shall be to make a thorough investigation of all the circumstances and facts concerning bids and contracts to supply the United States Navy with canned corned beef; also whether or not the Argentine Meat Producers Cooperative, an alleged institution of the Government of Argentina, was awarded the contract to furnish to the United States 48,000 pounds, more or less, of canned corned beef; also, whether or not, if a contract was so awarded, such action was in violation of the provisions of the so-called Buy American Act (title III, sec. 2, act of March 3, 1933); also whether or not the President of the United States did, on April 13, 1939, address a letter to the Secretary of State, said to have been written at the latter's request, in which, as alleged, the President is said to have authorized and directed the Navy Department to purchase 48,000 pounds, more or less, of canned corned beef produced in Argentina; also whether or not it is true that the President of the United States, in said alleged letter to the Secretary of State stated in language or in effect that "the Argentine product was infinitely superior in quality to the American product," and whether or not he repeated and reiterated the said statement at a press conference to the effect that Argentine canned beef is better in quality than the American product, and at the same time, as alleged, recommended trial of both products so as to demonstrate the superior quality of the Argentine product.

Said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby empowered to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths to witnesses, to incur such expenses as may be necessary for the employment of clerical and stenographic services, to have such printing and binding done as the committee may require, and to sit during the sessions of the House. Said committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations as it shall deem necessary, to the House of Representatives at the earliest possible moment during the present session of Congress.

Pending the investigation herein authorized the Secretary of the Navy is hereby requested to suspend the awarding, and, if already awarded, the execution of the contract alleged to have been authorized with the Argentine Meat Producers Cooperative or with any other Argentine producer of canned corned beef for the use of its product by the United States Navy.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, we have heard a lot this week end about last Friday's order by President Roosevelt authorizing the United States Navy to purchase Argentine beef in preference to American beef. There seems to be some question as to whether this action violates the letter and spirit of the Buy American Act; however, I would not want to go so far as to say that the President's order was a direct violation of this act, but it does very definitely and directly point to the necessity of having a new law enacted by this body which will prevent a recurrence of discrimination against American producers. So long as we have a President who is so internationalistic that he chooses to feed the fighting forces of America with foreign foodstuffs instead of supplying them with food raised by American farmers on American farms, it is imperative that we have adequate legislation preventing such favoritism to foreign producers.

A "BLACK FRIDAY" FOR AMERICAN FARMERS

Therefore, I introduced at the beginning of today's session a bill to be known as the "Buy American Farm Products In America Act," which would make it mandatory for all Government purchases of foodstuffs to be made from products which are raised in America, insofar as they are available in this country. I sincerely hope that the Members on both sides of the aisle will join with me in support of this bill. Unless we can pass it and prevent a repetition of Friday's fiasco, last Friday will go down into history as a "black Friday" for American farmers because that date will mark the time when the President of this country officially put our Government in the business of pounding down prices on American farm products through the vicious expedient of using public tax money to stimulate foreign production of competitive farm products. The huge farm imports resulting from the New Deal reciprocal trade pacts have already brought American farmers to the brink of ruin and stimulated foreign agriculture to the point where it will now be a permanent threat to any future American farm prosperity.

I have been considering some such legislation as I have today introduced for some time, but President Roosevelt's

order to the Navy last Friday to buy Argentine beef because it was both "cheaper and infinitely better" proved the New Deal straw that broke the farmer's economic back and caused me to introduce this bill in the first House session following the President's declaration. When the New Deal leader announces this policy of using tax money taken in due proportion from the American farmers to force down the prices of their own products through making Government food purchases from their chief foreign competitors, it is time for Congress to forget playing politics and to begin practicing patriotism toward American agriculture.

NEW DEAL EVADES ITS OWN LAWS

My colleagues, I wonder whether you have thought through the President's unique and unhappy statement to ascertain where it leads in its final implications? Remember, he ordered the Navy to buy this beef because it was both "cheaper and better." We can quickly dispose of the "better" part of this statement because every one of you knows that the Navy can buy beef of as choice a grade as it desires or as the world affords right here in this country—it is quite true that for the specified price stipulated in the bids in question the Argentine beef may have been of a better grade on a competitive price basis, and there is a clear-as-day reason for that.

The New Deal administration has passed wage and hour legislation which requires American packers to pay their workers a specified wage scale; such legislation very naturally must reflect itself, at least in part, either upon the price which the packers must charge for their products or in the price they can pay the farmer who raises the beef. In all probability it results in both a little higher price for the consumer and a little lower price for the producer. However, I am making no quarrel against such legislation if it is necessary to give decent wages to American workingmen, because I am one of those who insist on the right of a worker to receive an honest day's pay for an honest day's work. But I do have a very definite quarrel with the President when, after sponsoring such legislation, he deliberately proceeds to penalize the farmer, the worker, and the packer in America by ordering the Navy, of which he is the directing officer, to buy its foodstuffs from foreign countries because they can thus get them cheaper.

WILL ROOSEVELTIAN INCONSISTENCY NEVER CEASE?

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, will the miracles of Rooseveltian inconsistency never cease? When, oh when, will we settle down to trying to give equitable opportunity to American workers and farmers and cease trying to play Santa Claus to all the world? Unless my "Buy American Farm Products in America Act" is passed, the President has demonstrated by his word and action that after establishing price and labor standards in this country he now openly orders the Government to spend the taxpayers' funds in buying foreign foodstuffs which neither employ American laborers to any extent nor give them so much as an hour's work at the attractive wage and hour standards which he insists they should enjoy. Good friends, continued unemployment for American labor is just as devastating at one wage and hour standard as at another. If Uncle Sam himself seeks to evade the wage and hour standards by making his purchases from the low production-cost countries of America on the basis that his own legislation makes American products cost too much, what chance is there to employ American labor, reduce unemployment, give purchasing power to American farmers, and end this Roosevelt era of debts and depression? And if our Government chisels and cheats to evade the price effects of fair labor standards, what can we expect of private citizens?

The time has come to apply the test of reason to the acts of Government, and I urge the members of the majority party of this House, who must be charged with the bill's defeat if they kill it in committee, to report out my "Buy American Farm Products in America Act" and give American workers and farmers, as well as American businessmen, the guaranty that at least insofar as Uncle Sam is able he will not only strive to provide decent working standards but

he will also strive to provide work upon which these standards can become operative in providing income for the people of this country. I shall now add a copy of my bill to the conclusion of these remarks, as it is very short, although I believe it is very significant, and I want each of you to read it, because I invite you all to join me in this program to help restore honest prices and sincere Government cooperation to the laborers, farmers, and businessmen of the United States.

The bill referred to is as follows:

A bill to give the American market to the American farmer on all Government purchases of food products raised in the United States

Whereas the American farmer, engaged as he is in the basic industry of this country, is not now receiving a fair price for the products which he raises; and

Whereas the restoration of prosperity to the American farmer is the first and fundamental step which must be taken in a sound recovery program for this country; and

Whereas the American farmer is now suffering from unfair competition from low-cost farm products imported from abroad and put into American markets in direct competition with the products he raises on expensive high tax-paying and high production-cost land; and

Whereas money spent on American-raised farm products remains in this country and develops many times its original value in contributing additional labor, business, and national wealth, while money spent for foreign farm products serves only to develop increased competition for American producers; and

Whereas the American farmer is entitled to the American market for all food products which he can raise in this country and since it is the duty of the Government to take the lead in providing an equitable opportunity for the farmers of America: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That beginning with the passage of this act which is to be known as the "Buy American Farm Products in America Act" it shall be the duty of all Government departments, bureaus, boards, and all other Government agencies buying food supplies from money provided through the United States Treasury, to buy all of these food supplies from farmers and other producers of the United States, provided these supplies are raised in the United States and provided sufficient American products are available to supply the demands of the Government.

Violation of this act shall be deemed good and sufficient reason for the impeachment of the authorities responsible for its violation.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I arise for the purpose of assuring the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] that I shall enthusiastically support the resolution which he has introduced and to which he has just referred.

This resolution sets up a committee of the House to make investigation as to the facts upon which the President based his recent statement to the press concerning the purchase by our Government of Argentine beef to be used by the Navy.

The press advises us that "President Roosevelt has directed the Navy to accept a bid on Argentine beef in place of American beef, because," he said, "the foreign product was found to be cheaper and superior in quality." The press also says that "the President expressed himself with considerable feeling on the subject."

It is stated the President further strengthened his position, in recommending the selection of foreign-produced beef by the Navy in preference to American beef, by adding that "it was a question of feeding the Navy men with the best quality of food." And pursuing his excuse further, the President said, "A careful examination of all samples furnished with the bids showed the Argentine beef was far superior in quality."

It appears that the President concluded his statement by advising that he had written a letter to the Secretary of State approving the purchase of the Argentine beef and asserting "that in doing so he felt certain that the intent of buy American products had not been violated."

The country should be especially interested in this position taken by the Chief Executive, because his statements do, and should, carry weight throughout the world. If it is true that Argentine beef is cheaper and superior to our American beef, and that the United States Government is buying Argentine beef to feed to our own Navy because it is better for their health, the American beef producers should know about it.

I am advised that this statement by the President has been given world-wide publicity. I heard a radio commentator make the statement that the President had written the best possible advertisement and publicity for Argentine beef to be used in every country in the world where the United States and Argentine beef are sold on a competitive market. This commentator stated further that in some of the countries of Europe advantage was already being taken of the President's recommendation to buy the "cheapest and the best" beef in the Argentine.

I am wondering what the cattle producers of the country will think of such an attitude on the part of the President. The district which I represent in the Congress is a large beef-feeding district. We purchase the steers from the western range in the fall, feed up the corn and alfalfa raised on our farms, and furnish to the market in the spring the best corn-fed beef cattle in the world—that is, we have always believed that this was the best quality of beef. Therefore we are naturally vitally interested in ascertaining the truth. If it is true that the quality of our beef is inferior to such an extent that our President does not want to feed the beef to our Navy and our soldiers, then the producers of this beef have a right to know about it.

The Allen resolution will create a forum where the truth can be ascertained. If the President is correct, he will have no difficulty in bringing in his experts and those who are advising him. In view of the seriousness of this matter I can hardly see how the House leadership and the administration can object to this resolution. All we want is the truth and the facts. The natural presumption is that the President has stated the truth and the facts about the quality of our beef. However, I challenge the truth of any such statement. Therefore, in fairness to the President and to the American farmer and beef producer, speedy action should be had on the resolution.

Of course, if the President interprets that "buy American products" refers to the Western Hemisphere, that is one thing. That may be, and probably is, the basis of his treaty-making and good-neighbor policy. I am sure, however, that the people of the United States interpret this phrase to mean to buy in our own country.

The Army and the Navy are maintained by the tax dollar, much of which is taken from the pockets of the farmer and the livestock producer. As a result, every time our Government buys beef or other supplies for our Army and Navy from foreign countries it heaps insult upon injury so far as our taxpayers are concerned. It is pretty tough to ask our farmers to pay the taxes they do and then have this money used to purchase foreign products, the effect of which is to put out of business, or at least cripple, these very taxpayers.

When the people understand just what the President has said, and just what the effect will be, there will be a justifiable protest from every quarter section of land in the Nation. This whole thing just does not make sense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to make any comment on the appointment of a new Governor for Puerto Rico, nor was it my intention to comment on the removal of Blanton Winship as Governor of Puerto Rico. My reason for not making comment, as well as for my not publishing the charges I had made against him with the President, is that it is not my policy to kick a man when he is down. However, since the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico has just stated that Mr. Winship had "intended to resign," thereby conveying the impression that Mr. Winship quit of his own volition, I call the attention of the House to the fact that Mr. Winship was requested to resign by the Secretary of the Interior. Instead of resigning, he saw the President on May 4. Upon arriving in Puerto Rico, he bragged that he had defeated Mr. Ickes and conveyed the

impression that he had satisfactorily disposed of my charges against him. In fact, before leaving Washington, in the presence of newspapermen, he invited people to visit him during the summer in Puerto Rico. On May 12, at a press conference, the President announced that Admiral Leahy would succeed Mr. Winship as Governor of Puerto Rico. Up to then and never before this announcement had Mr. Winship resigned. The conclusion, therefore, is inescapable. Winship was removed. Notification of one's successor without one's resignation constitutes removal.

I am not surprised to see the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. IGLESIAS] apologize for Mr. Winship and try to convey the impression that Mr. Winship left of his own free will. The role of official apologist for removed Governor of Puerto Rico on the part of the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. IGLESIAS] is not new for him. When Mr. Gore, Mr. Winship's predecessor, was forced out the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. IGLESIAS] played the same identical role for him, that of official apologist.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the entire membership of the House, I believe, is very much shocked at the President's recommendation with reference to Argentine beef. One can readily see that as goes the Argentine beef so goes the rest of our trade. I hope the Members of the House will most earnestly protest against the taking over by the State Department of the commercial and agricultural attachés, the people who are supposed to sell our agricultural and commercial products in other countries. The President has proposed such a transfer under the reorganization plan. I voted against the reorganization bill because I felt just such a thing would happen.

In view of the President's statement about Argentine beef, may I ask what chance in the world has our trade in other countries? We will buy from other countries, but we will sell nothing. It was bad enough to suggest that the beef be purchased from Argentina, but it was adding insult to injury to say that our beef was inferior.

I am informed by reliable sources that because the reciprocal-trade agreements are handled by the diplomats, many of the consuls are doing only minor jobs, instead of trying to sell our goods to foreign countries. It makes a farce of the program for the farmers. Millions are appropriated to assist them, and then the foreign trade is taken away from them. It stands to reason that the commercial attachés and trade commissioners can go much further in assisting industry and agriculture in exploiting its products abroad than can the diplomats, who are told by the administration they must be very careful not to interfere with the reciprocal-trade agreements program. Reciprocal trade is fine, but is very harmful at the cost of our own trade. The President's statement certainly indicates we are well on the road to free trade. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to propound some inquiries of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, since the Republicans have now finished eating up all the Argentine beef, may I take the time of the House to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] some questions about the parliamentary procedure?

The gentleman from Georgia made certain statements a while ago which I should like to have clarified. As I understand, when a bill is taken up under suspension of the rules there has to be a second from somebody.

Mr. COX. Not necessarily, unless someone moves for a second.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that. If the motion for a second is voted down, the bill cannot be taken up under suspension of the rules. I understood the gentleman from Georgia to say that if such took place the Rules Committee would give us a rule which would enable the Members to offer amendments to the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. COX. I made the statement that in the event a motion to suspend the rules is voted down the Rules Committee—and I think I speak advisedly—would grant a rule upon an application coming either from the chairwoman of the Labor Committee or any member of that committee or any Member of the House, and that that rule would provide for full debate and the right of Members to impress their influence upon this type of legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. Would that give individual Members the right to offer amendments?

Mr. COX. Of course.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I have the attention of the majority leader for a moment? There is a general demand throughout the country for a tax revision which will help business and enable the American people to get back to work at American wages. There have been conflicting reports. First we hear there will not be any general tax revision; then we hear there will be. May I ask the majority leader if he can give us any assurance as to the possibility of real tax revision at this session of Congress?

Mr. RAYBURN. I may say to the gentleman that I cannot speak for the Ways and Means Committee or for the Treasury or for the executive department headed by the President. There will be a tax bill. The so-called nuisance taxes must be reenacted or else we shall lose a billion dollars. Many of the corporation taxes expire on December 31 this year. They must be reenacted or else some other kind of corporation tax bill must be enacted to raise \$250,000,000 that the Treasury needs very much. A bill therefore will be reported renewing these nuisance taxes and rearranging or reenacting the corporation taxes. Just what revision of corporation taxes will be reported by the Ways and Means Committee I am not in position to say at this time.

In all probability, however, when the bill relating to corporation taxes comes up for consideration it may be subject to amendment and, if that be the case, Members will have the opportunity of offering amendments to anything they believe may be called a deterrent tax. And may I say to the gentleman and to the House that some one coined the phrase "deterrent tax" in speaking of "repealing deterrent taxes." If all deterrent taxes were repealed, no taxes would be left on the statute books because there is not a tax on the statute books, local, State, or Federal, that is not to that extent a deterrent, because it takes money from capital.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas desire additional time?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute, and I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of course, the gentleman understands this is a very acute problem. The gentleman can, I hope, give us assurance when the tax bill does come up in the House it will not be under a gag rule but will be subject to amendment. Furthermore, I hope, the gentleman believes we should stay in session until some remedial tax legislation is considered by the House?

Mr. RAYBURN. I may say to the gentleman that I said the measure may come up so amendments could be offered to

it, and I suppose—and I believe this is a very definite thing—that we will remain in session until laws continuing expiring taxes are enacted or something is adopted in their stead.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I want it known that I highly resent the statement made and the action taken by the President of the United States in reference to the purchase of Argentine beef. There is plenty of resentment on this side of the aisle and plenty of resentment throughout the western livestock-producing States.

I want to say that the American livestock producer cannot afford to pay the price necessary to appease Argentina. I can see in this appeasement gesture to Argentina the implication to influence the Senate to ratify the Argentine sanitary pact, which would permit the importation of fresh and chilled beef from Argentina. We now prohibit the importation of chilled and fresh meats from any country where foot-and-mouth disease is prevalent. Should this sanitary pact be ratified, it would permit the importation of meats from those Provinces in Argentina that are free from foot-and-mouth disease. This, however, would be a serious threat to the livestock industry in this country, not only because of increased competing imports of meat but because it would expose this country again to a possible outbreak of the dread foot-and-mouth disease, which is so devastating to livestock. The United States is one of the few countries in the world that is free of this disease. Let us keep it that way.

The American cattle producers cannot and should not be asked to compete with Argentine prices in supplying the requirements of the United States Navy. The high labor standards maintained in the livestock industry make it impossible to compete with the peon labor in Argentina. The cost of freight, processing, and distribution is much higher in this country. The ocean freight from Argentine ports to the eastern seaboard of the United States on canned meats is \$7 a long ton, and the freight rate from the Missouri River to the eastern seaboard is approximately double that. Incidentally the ocean freight rate on canned meats from New York to the River Plate ports is approximately three times as much as it is from River Plate points to New York.

The American livestock producers are entitled to the American market, and any effort to encourage increased importations of Argentine beef into this country will meet with strenuous opposition. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, in his press conference of the 12th the President went out of his way to take a shot at the beef industry of this country, saying that canned Argentine beef is vastly, infinitely superior to the United States product. And when pressed as to why, he said he "guessed the Argentine cow was just naturally better than the United States cow."

There are no cattle on the face of the earth that can approach in quality the good old range bred, Corn Belt fed cattle of this country.

If, as the President says, the Argentine canned meat is superior to United States canned meat, then it must be that choicer cuts are canned in Argentine. But in that connection, let us inquire as to the kind of cattle from which these choice cuts may come.

Perhaps Mr. John McKenzie, of the Matador Land & Cattle Co., who spent 11 years in the cattle business in South America, and who still has vast interests there, can tell us. I quote from his address before the Wyoming cattlemen's convention in June of 1937 in which he discussed rinderpest, commonly called foot-and-mouth disease. He states that

during his entire stay and connection with his South American properties that there never was a time when everyone of their ranches was free of foot-and-mouth disease.

My experience in South America was practically all in Brazil. However, I visited in the Argentine and I know that the conditions existing in the Argentine are practically the same as in Brazil. For instance, in Brazil we have no sanitary regulations; none whatsoever. When we would see cattle taking the foot-and-mouth disease we immediately shipped them to the packing house. There was no rule or anything against it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have ever spoken on this floor. I can complete my statement in about a minute, and I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object.

Mr. HORTON. If I am out of order, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a statement that appeared in the Kiplinger Washington letter of February 18, 1939, on the question of the foot-and-mouth disease and the sanitary pact with Argentine; release No. 5 under date of April 4, 1939, from the American National Livestock Association; and my own release under date of last Friday.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. The foot-and-mouth disease of which Mr. McKenzie speaks is the most loathsome and disgusting disease known to cattle. They run a high fever, slobber and drool at the mouth; the nose, teats, and udder are covered with lesions and blisters; they have lesions and open, bloody sores between the cloven hoofs; the mouth is covered with blisters and sores and if you were to put your hand in the mouth and take hold of the tongue, the mucous membrane would peel off like the skin of a rattler in August.

As Mr. Roosevelt says, "You cannot ship foot-and-mouth disease in cans." Right, but it is possible to can meat from foot-and-mouth diseased cattle and that does not sound so attractive. True, such meat may not kill a man, but a calf sucking its diseased mother will be dead within 2 days' time.

Follow the President's advice. Buy a can or two of this Argentine beef the next time you and your children go on a picnic and find out for yourself whether his statement is true. But while you are at it, ask yourself whether you want our great fighting Navy boys, the best in the world, to be protected by good old United States of America meat inspection laws or whether they are to be fed the mess which Mr. McKenzie describes and which possibly is being purchased for them by Mr. Roosevelt. [Applause.]

The Kiplinger Washington letter, February 18, 1939:

Argentine beef: State Department is quietly searching for a method of lifting the embargo on Argentine beef, because there is no chance of Senate ratification of the long-pending Sanitary Convention.

Here's Hull's tentative plan: Get House Ways and Means Committee, on which livestock is not strongly represented, to approve a resolution repealing provisions of the tariff act which keeps out Argentine beef.

If this scheme is adopted, it might be forced through this year because all administration forces would be rallied behind it.

The whole plan is aimed at short-circuiting livestock forces.

AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVE STOCK ASSOCIATION,
Denver, Colo., April 4, 1939.

AMERICAN BEEF SUPERIOR

Emphatically it is not the competitive feature of beef importation from Argentina that is the reason stockmen insist on maintenance of the embargo against that country, declared F. E. Mollin, secretary of the American National Live Stock Association, in a letter to the New York Herald Tribune, made public today. The reason is that Argentina, along with many other barred countries, has foot-and-mouth disease, he said.

Mollin's statements were made in reply to a Tribune editorial entitled "Good Beef Makes Bad Neighbors."

"There has been a lot of amusing publicity recently as to the superior beef which Argentina produces," said Mollin. "Apparently an attempt is being made to create the impression that the United States is afraid of the competition of this beef from a quality standpoint, and that this is the main reason why the livestock industry in this country insists on the maintenance of the embargo provision of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act.

"Nothing is further from the truth. It so happens that only last Saturday I talked to a prominent Texas cattleman who has recently been in the Argentine, and I asked him how the quality of the beef served in first-class restaurants and hotels in Buenos Aires compared with the quality of our best beef in this country. He replied that it was about the same quality as good Kansas grass beef. This is plenty good, but it is not of the same quality as the thousands of tons of prime and choice corn-fed beef which is marketed annually in this country. We are interested in the maintenance of the embargo provision because we feel that only in that way can we safeguard the health of our herds and flocks. Foot-and-mouth disease exists in some sixty-odd countries in the world. The embargo applies to all alike. There is no discrimination against Argentina. If you break down the embargo in order to permit importations from some certain sections of Argentina, you establish a precedent which eventually would mean the complete breaking down of the embargo and the infestation of our herds and flocks with disease. We have had many costly experiments with it; our fears are not imaginary. During the past 2 years almost every country in Europe has had severe outbreaks. We can produce in this country all the meat that we need, and hence, fortunately, unlike many European countries, we do not need to take the risk involved in such importations with the dire consequences that so frequently follow.

"There is an interesting contrast in the attitude of the Argentine Government in this matter and that of Brazil. They are in exactly the same position, yet Brazil has the good sense to recognize our situation and to make the best of it. She long ago executed a trade agreement with the United States and has recently concluded a new economic agreement which will lead to increased trade between the two countries. Argentina, on the other hand, has made an issue of the admission of dressed meats, placing severe restrictions on American imports and doing everything possible to stir up trouble in attempting to force a relaxation of the embargo against foot-and-mouth disease. The livestock industry is determinedly opposed to any change in the present situation until such time as any country of the ones against which the embargo applies cleans its herds and flocks of foot-and-mouth disease. When they do that, the embargo is automatically lifted. The reason for Argentina's attitude is very plain. Under the terms of the Ottawa agreement, Great Britain has steadily reduced its import quotas for Argentine beef and lamb, giving preference to the British dominions. It would be very accommodating of the United States to take up the slack, but the reasons cited above are entirely sufficient for our refusing to do so."

Representative FRANK O. HORTON (Republican), of Wyoming, today issued the following statement with reference to President Roosevelt's remarks at a press conference directing the purchase by the Navy Department of foreign beef:

"I am amazed at the statement attributed today by the press to the President of the United States lauding the superior quality and cheaper price of foreign-produced beef over that of the American product. Why a President of the United States should use his influential office as a sounding board to boost foreign products is inconceivable to me.

"The President's statement that he had directed the Secretary of the Navy to award a contract for some 48,000 pounds of canned beef to the Argentine Meat Producers' Cooperative is the more surprising because of action taken only this week by the House of Representatives in connection with the Navy Department appropriation bill.

"In that bill the House provided that no part of \$773,000,000 thus appropriated shall be used for the purchase of 'any article of food not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, except articles of food not so grown or produced or which cannot be procured in sufficient quantities as and when needed.' Mr. Roosevelt certainly would not contend that this country is unable to produce beef in sufficient quantities for the Navy.

"Mr. Roosevelt bases his preference for foreign canned beef on the contention that it is cheaper and superior to our American product. Naturally the price for American beef is higher because our producers and processors pay a wage that permits a decent standard of living. To insist upon an Argentine price is to demand Argentine wage levels and living standards for the people of this country. The price is higher here also because of the increased costs of production brought about in large part by New Deal legislation, such as the Social Security Act, the Wages and Hours Act, the National Labor Relations Act, and the Federal tax laws of the last 4 or 5 years, not to mention the New Deal's farm scarcity program.

"I am not objecting in this place to those enactments, but it does seem illogical to me for Mr. Roosevelt, after sponsoring such price-raising legislation, to turn around and insist that a Government department must purchase canned beef from a foreign country because it is cheaper.

"Indeed I am amazed at the inconsistency of the President. Again and again he has professed that his aim in regard to agriculture was to raise the prices of farm products. I distinctly remember that in July 1933 Mr. Roosevelt asserted that 'for many years the two great barriers to a normal prosperity have been low farm prices and the creeping paralysis of unemployment.' Yet by ordering the Navy Department to buy Argentine canned beef the President is making a contribution to depressing American beef prices and preventing reemployment of Americans who process that product. Has Mr. Roosevelt abandoned his professed desire to raise farm prices?

"Certainly the American taxpayer, and that means every American, who shortly will be called on to provide the seven hundred and seventy-three millions appropriated for the Navy, has a right to demand, and does demand, that those millions appropriated be spent in this country for the benefit of American labor, farmers, and industrialists, and not for the benefit of foreign countries.

"I am making a vigorous protest, and I am also urging Senators O'MAHONEY and SCHWARTZ to uphold the action taken by the House of Representatives."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and include therein an article by Westbrook Pegler appearing in this morning's Washington Post.

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

There was no objection.

The article referred to is as follows:

FAIR ENOUGH
(By Westbrook Pegler)
AN OPEN LETTER

MR. HENRY MORGENTHAU,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

DEAR HENRY: I have just received your form letter in which you express a desire to borrow some money from me on your United States savings bonds. The proposition sounds interesting, but, as you know, the Government has laws nowadays where promoters and business firms are required to meet certain conditions and conform to certain standards, and I assume that you are willing to set private business a good example.

In the sad days after the great boom we learned that some business houses squandered investors' money on frivolous expenditures and that they pyramided issues until they were selling people bonds to pay the interest on previous issues.

They aren't allowed to do that now. In fact, only this morning there was a piece in the paper saying that the Securities and Exchange Commission was demanding information from a gas and electric company as to the services performed by a Mr. Ben Gray in return for a salary of \$55,000 a year. A good idea, too, and if a company goes to the public for money the Government should see to it that the pay rolls are not loaded with relatives and fraternity brothers of the management at high salaries or even at medium salaries, because medium salaries mount up, too.

GOVERNMENT ALSO NEEDS INVESTIGATING

A big shot who owed somebody \$50,000 could make a deal to put that creditor on the company's pay roll a couple of years at \$25,000 a year and make the investors pay off his private debt.

I don't think the S. E. C. would let a big corporation doing business on money borrowed from the people maintain one or more company yachts for the pleasure of the executives, even though they pretended to concentrate and work better at sea, away from the telephone and all.

Before I decide whether to lend you some money on these savings bonds, suppose you get yourself inspected according to the same requirements that are applied to private operators. Being of the Government yourself you should be the last one to refuse to meet conditions which are held to be correct and ethical for other borrowers, and even if you hold that the Government, by reason of its authority to tax, is in a better position to extend itself, you can't honestly say that a government has any more right than a private concern to toss investors' money around to its personal and political friends.

ANY NEPOTISM, MR. MORGENTHAU?

Well, what about the pay rolls of your concern? Are there any employees on the rolls there in Washington and in bureaus around the country who were taken on merely because they were related to somebody or worked for somebody's election or wrote flattering pieces about the administration? Have you gone over the pay rolls lately and checked each man and woman to determine what duties they were performing and whether such duties are necessary? It's my money you want to be paying them, you know.

What about your position at the time of proposing this loan? Are you running in the red; and if so, to what extent, and how long have you been running behind, and about when would you say you will be able to turn the corner, and what makes you think so? You know the S. E. C. wouldn't let a private concern borrow money from the public indefinitely just to pay the interest on past issues and thus make a deceptive appearance of soundness.

What about private yachts for the executives? Have Ickes and Hopkins been vacationing off the coast of Florida lately? I don't want to lend you my money to be spent for yachting parties.

THE ANSWER IS NO, IF FOR FLORIDA CANAL

And what about that Florida canal? Here you boys are talking about saving \$20,000,000 by tightening up a few bureaus, but you still insist on this canal thing at \$200,000,000, although the southern half of Florida is afraid it will destroy the fresh-water supply, and the ditch, when dug, would save only a couple of hours sailing time from the Atlantic to the Gulf. Do you think the S. E. C. would let a private company borrow from the people for a comparable folly?

Your note to me just said these bonds were the most widely heralded security in America, which may be true, but I notice that

you didn't say what you intended to do with the money. A lender always likes to know that and a borrower usually is willing to tell. If you are intending to spend any money of mine building that ditch for \$200,000,000, the answer is no.

Let me hear from you on this, will you, Henry?

Sincerely,

GEORGE SPELVIN, *Average American.*

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of the recent recommendation of the President that the Navy purchase Argentine beef.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Inasmuch as the President has frequently expressed his solicitude for the welfare of the American farmer, his recent statement in substance and to the effect that canned beef produced in Argentina was cheaper and better than American-grown beef and that the Navy should purchase this foreign product, rather than the product of our own farmers, for whose advancement the vast Agriculture Department is maintained and for whose benefit we have appropriated billions of dollars, it is not only pertinent but imperative that we inquire as to the President's acts not matching his words; whether he was really sincere in this recommendation or whether he was—to express it in the language of the street—just "shooting the bull."

If he was not, it might not be amiss to assert that rather than accept this Argentina canned beef we "can the President."

The President has on many occasions previous to this shown his utter disregard of the welfare of our own people as a whole. His Department of Agriculture is putting the Michigan sugar-beet growers out of business. His Department of Labor, with the assistance of his man Murphy, John L. Lewis, the C. I. O. and its communistic allies, through the sit-down strikes, put the brakes on recovery, which was being brought back to Michigan by the motor industry.

This past week the administration has signified its intention, by supporting John L. Lewis in his demand that no one shall dig coal until he becomes a member of the C. I. O., to deprive the American worker of his right to earn a livelihood except under conditions imposed by John L. Lewis.

Hence we should not be surprised that the President should act as the advertising manager and sales agent for a foreign product. His head is so high in the clouds, his thoughts are so engrossed by world affairs, that he fails to see and have at heart the interests of his own people.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in order to save time I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on Argentine beef at this point in the RECORD. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of beef.

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in deference to my friend from Colorado, I think all Members can speak for themselves, and therefore I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1940

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill (H. R. 6260) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. POWERS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies, and the Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. POWERS moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with amendments reducing the total amount of the bill \$50,000,000.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the motion to recommit undertakes to do indirectly what cannot be done directly.

The amount carried in this bill, with these amendments, totals \$305,000,000. Part of it is for the Panama Canal, part for cemetery expense, part for the Signal Corps and Alaskan Communications Commission, part for rivers and harbors, part for flood control, and part for the United States Soldiers' Home. Of the amount of \$305,000,000, \$277,000,000 is for rivers and harbors and flood control, leaving only \$28,000,000 for all of these other governmental activities. A reduction of \$50,000,000 would take away a large part of the money carried in the two amendments voted in the House last Wednesday. A motion to recommit to do this cannot be done. This motion to recommit attempts to do indirectly what cannot be done directly. It proposes a second vote on the same propositions that were voted on last Wednesday; therefore is subject to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may state, in connection with the point of order made by the gentleman from Mississippi, that the Chair understands the purpose of the motion to recommit, one motion to recommit always being in order after the third reading, is to give to those Members opposed to the bill an opportunity to have an expression of opinion by the House upon their proposition. It is true that under the precedents it is not in order by way of a motion to recommit to propose an amendment to an amendment previously adopted by the House, but the motion now pending does not specifically propose to instruct the Committee on Appropriations to do that. The Chair is inclined to the opinion that the motion to recommit in the form here presented is not subject to a point of order.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHORT. According to the language of the motion to recommit, the \$50,000,000 could be taken from either rivers and harbors or flood control, or at any other place in the bill.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

Mr. RANKIN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to ask whether or not, if this motion is sustained, they could cut these old soldiers out and take the funds away from them? That is what I want to find out. I want to know what we are voting on.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the motion is simply to reduce the bill \$50,000,000.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the rule to be that the House can adopt a motion to recommit with instructions to reduce the amount of the appropriation by \$50,000,000, but the committee, if this motion should be adopted, could not report the bill back to the House with an amendment proposing a change in the amendments adopted by the House.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POWERS) there were—ayes 95, noes 201.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 127, nays 255, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—127

Allen, Ill.	Cluett	Fish	Hall
Allen, Pa.	Coffee, Nebr.	Flannery	Halleck
Andrews	Cole, N. Y.	Fulmer	Hancock
Arends	Crawford	Gamble	Harness
Barton	Crosser	Gifford	Harter, N. Y.
Blackney	Crowther	Gilchrist	Hartley
Bolles	Darrow	Gillie	Hawks
Bolton	Dirksen	Gore	Heinke
Bradley, Mich.	Ditter	Gossett	Hoffman
Brown, Ohio	Dondero	Graham	Hope
Case, S. Dak.	Dowell	Grant, Ind.	Horton
Chipperfield	Dworschak	Griswold	Houston
Church	Eaton, N. J.	Gross	Hull
Clevenger	Engel	Gwynne	Jarrett

Jenks, N. H.
 Johns
 Johnson, Ill.
 Johnson, Ind.
 Jones, Ohio
 Kean
 Keefe
 Kinzer
 Knutson
 Kunkel
 Landis
 Lanham
 Larrabee
 LeCompte
 Luce
 Ludlow
 McLean
 McLeod

Maas
 Mapes
 Martin, Iowa
 Martin, Mass.
 Mason
 Michener
 Moser
 Murray
 O'Day
 O'Neal
 Pace
 Powers
 Rabaut
 Reece, Tenn.
 Reed, Ill.
 Reed, N. Y.
 Rich
 Risk

Robertson
 Robison, Ky.
 Rockefeller
 Rodgers, Pa.
 Rogers, Mass.
 Routzohn
 Rutherford
 Ryan
 Sandager
 Schafer, Wis.
 Schiffer
 Simpson
 Smith, Ohio
 Springer
 Sumner, Ill.
 Sweeney
 Taber
 Talle

Taylor, Tenn.
 Thill
 Thomas, N. J.
 Tinkham
 Van Zandt
 Vorys, Ohio
 Vreeland
 Wadsworth
 Wheat
 White, Ohio
 Wigglesworth
 Williams, Del.
 Wolcott
 Wolfenden, Pa.
 Woodruff, Mich.
 Woodrum, Va.
 Youngdahl

NAYS—255

Alexander
 Allen, La.
 Andersen, H. Carl
 Anderson, Calif.
 Andresen, A. H.
 Angell
 Arnold
 Austin
 Ball
 Barden
 Barnes
 Barry
 Bates, Ky.
 Beam
 Beckworth
 Bender
 Bland
 Bloom
 Boehne
 Boland
 Boren
 Boykin
 Bradley, Pa.
 Brewster
 Brooks
 Brown, Ga.
 Bryson
 Buck
 Bulwinkle
 Burch
 Burdick
 Burgin
 Byrne, N. Y.
 Byrns, Tenn.
 Caldwell
 Cannon, Mo.
 Carlson
 Cartwright
 Celler
 Chandler
 Clark
 Clason
 Claypool
 Cochran
 Coffee, Wash.
 Cole, Md.
 Collins
 Colmer
 Connery
 Cooley
 Cooper
 Corbett
 Costello
 Cox
 Creal
 Crowe
 Cullin
 Cullen
 Cummings
 Curtis
 D'Alesandro
 Darden
 Delaney
 DeRouen

Dickstein
 Dies
 Dingell
 Disney
 Doughton
 Doxey
 Drewry
 Duncan
 Dunn
 Durham
 Eaton, Calif.
 Eberharter
 Edmiston
 Elliott
 Ellis
 Elston
 Englebright
 Fay
 Fenton
 Ferguson
 Fitzpatrick
 Flaherty
 Flannagan
 Folger
 Ford, Miss.
 Ford, Thomas F.
 Fries
 Garrett
 Gathings
 Gavagan
 Gearhart
 Gehrman
 Gerlach
 Geyer, Calif.
 Gibbs
 Grant, Ala.
 Green
 Gregory
 Griffith
 Guyer, Kans.
 Hare
 Harrington
 Hart
 Harter, Ohio
 Healey
 Hendricks
 Hennings
 Hess
 Hill
 Hinshaw
 Hobbs
 Hook
 Hunter
 Izac
 Jacobsen
 Jarman
 Jenkins, Ohio
 Johnson, Luther A.
 Johnson, Lyndon
 Johnson, Okla.
 Johnson, W. Va.
 Jones, Tex.
 Kee
 Keller

Kelly
 Kennedy, Martin
 Kennedy, Md.
 Kennedy, Michael
 Keogh
 Kerr
 Kilday
 Kirwan
 Kitchens
 Kieberg
 Kocalkowski
 Lea
 Leavy
 Lemke
 Lesinski
 Lewis, Colo.
 Lewis, Ohio
 Lord
 McAndrews
 McArdle
 McCormack
 McKeough
 McLaughlin
 McMillan, John L.
 Maciejewski
 Mahon
 Mansfield
 Marcantonio
 Marshall
 Martin, Colo.
 Martin, Ill.
 Massingale
 May
 Merritt
 Miller
 Mills, Ark.
 Mills, La.
 Mitchell
 Monkiewicz
 Monroney
 Mott
 Mouton
 Mundt
 Murdock, Ariz.
 Murdock, Utah
 Myers
 Nelson
 Nichols
 Norrell
 Norton
 O'Connor
 O'Leary
 Oliver
 O'Toole
 Owen
 Parsons
 Patman
 Patrick
 Patton
 Pearson
 Peterson, Fla.
 Peterson, Ga.
 Pfeifer
 Pierce, Oreg.

Pittenger
 Poage
 Polk
 Ramspeck
 Randolph
 Rankin
 Rayburn
 Richards
 Robinson, Utah
 Rogers, Okla.
 Sabbath
 Sacks
 Sasser
 Satterfield
 Schaefer, Ill.
 Schuetz
 Schulte
 Seccombe
 Secrest
 Seger
 Shannon
 Sheppard
 Short
 Sirovich
 Smith, Conn.
 Smith, Maine
 Smith, Va.
 Smith, Wash.
 Smith, W. Va.
 Snyder
 Somers, N. Y.
 South
 Sparkman
 Spence
 Steagall
 Stearns, N. H.
 Stefan
 Sullivan
 Sutphin
 Tarver
 Taylor, Colo.
 Tenerowicz
 Terry
 Thomas, Tex.
 Thomason
 Thorkelson
 Tibbott
 Tolan
 Treadway
 Vincent, Ky.
 Vinson, Ga.
 Voorhis, Calif.
 Wallgren
 Walter
 Warren
 Weaver
 Welch
 West
 Wheelchel
 Whittington
 Williams, Mo.
 Wolverton, N. J.
 Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—48

Anderson, Mo.
 Ashbrook
 Bates, Mass.
 Bell
 Buckler, Minn.
 Buckley, N. Y.
 Byron
 Cannon, Fla.
 Carter
 Casey, Mass.
 Chapman
 Curley

Dempsey
 Douglas
 Evans
 Faddis
 Fernandez
 Ford, Leland M.
 Gartner
 Havenner
 Holmes
 Jeffries
 Jensen
 Kramer

Lambertson
 McDowell
 McGehee
 McGranery
 McMillan, Thos. S.
 McReynolds
 Magnuson
 Maloney
 O'Brien
 Osmer
 Pierce, N. Y.
 Plumley

Rees, Kans.
 Romjue
 Schwert
 Scrugham
 Shafer, Mich.
 Shanley
 Smith, Ill.
 Starnes, Ala.
 Summers, Tex.
 White, Idaho
 Winter
 Wood

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. O'Brien (for) with Mr. Dempsey (against).
 Mr. Jensen (for) with Mr. Maloney (against).

Mr. Pierce of New York (for) with Mr. Havenner (against).
 Mr. Douglas (for) with Mr. Gartner (against).
 Mr. Osmer (for) with Mr. Wood (against).
 Mr. Holmes (for) with Mr. McGranery (against).
 Mr. Jeffries (for) with Mr. Fernandez (against).

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. McReynolds with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Plumley.
 Mr. McGehee with Mr. Lambertson.
 Mr. Summers of Texas with Mr. Winter.
 Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Shafer of Michigan.
 Mr. Thomas S. McMillan with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
 Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Evans with Mr. McDowell.
 Mr. Chapman with Mr. Rees of Kansas.
 Mr. Bell with Mr. Romjue.
 Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
 Mr. Faddis with Mr. Schwert.
 Mr. Anderson of Missouri with Mr. Byron.
 Mr. Shanley with Mr. Ashbrook.
 Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. White of Idaho.
 Mr. Kramer with Mr. Curley.

Mr. GEARHART and Mr. DREWRY changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion to recommit was rejected was laid on the table.

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

The question was taken, and the bill was passed; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS TO WAGE AND HOUR LAW

Mrs. NORTON rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentlewoman from New Jersey rise?

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, because of the evident misunderstanding and extraordinary misstatements issued of certain provisions of H. R. 5435 which have arisen over the week end, due to the vicious and unreliable propaganda spread by those who in the first place were opposed to the law, and who now would repeal it if they dared to do so, it has been decided not to call the bill up at this time under suspension of the rules.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from New Jersey has expired.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day, and the Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN VESSELS FOR COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 138) to authorize the construction of certain vessels for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDING REIMBURSABLE FEATURES OF TITLE II, SECTION 208, OF ACT APPROVED JUNE 16, 1933

The clerk called the bill (H. R. 4679) to amend title II, section 208, of the act approved June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 205-206), to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust or cancel reimbursable features of said act insofar as they apply to Indians, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin, Mr. WOLCOTT, and Mr. THILL objected.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT DELTA POINT, LA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3224) creating the Louisiana-Vicksburg Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to purchase,

maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Delta Point, La., and Vicksburg, Miss.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5030) to amend section 4 of the act of June 29, 1906, entitled "An act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization and to provide for a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF GRAIN ELEVATORS

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 156, authorizing and directing the Comptroller General of the United States to certify for payment certain claims of grain elevators and grain firms to cover insurance and interest on wheat during the years 1919 and 1920 as per a certain contract authorized by the President.

Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. RICH, and Mr. TABER objected.

PROVIDING LOSS OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP IN CERTAIN CASES
 The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5188) to provide for the loss of United States citizenship in certain cases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to ask what the bill does.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think the gentleman knows what it does.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is this the bill that provides against aliens in this country going back and participating in elections?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It applies to American citizens who go back to foreign lands and vote in elections in those lands.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, and Mr. LEWIS of Colorado objected.

NATIONAL ANIMAL THEFT ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4372, to provide for the punishment of persons transporting stolen animals in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 90, an identical bill, be substituted.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That this act shall be cited as the National Animal Theft Act.

Sec. 2. When used in this act—

(a) The term "animal" shall include any cattle, hog, sheep, horse, or mule.

(b) The term "interstate or foreign commerce" shall include transportation from one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to another State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or to a foreign country, or from a foreign country to any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia.

Sec. 3. Whoever shall transport or cause to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce any animal, or the carcass or hide or any part of the carcass or hide of any animal, knowing the same to have been stolen, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or by imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both.

Sec. 4. Whoever shall receive, conceal, store, barter, buy, sell, or dispose of any such animal, or the carcass or hide or any part of the carcass or hide thereof, moving in or constituting a part of interstate or foreign commerce, knowing the same to have been stolen, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or by imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both.

Sec. 5. Any person violating section 3 of this act may be prosecuted in any district from, into, or through which such animal, or the carcass or hide or any part of the carcass or hide thereof, has been transported or removed.

Sec. 6. Nothing herein shall be construed to repeal, modify, or amend any part of the National Stolen Property Act.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 4372) was laid on the table.

QUAPAW INDIANS, OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3796, to extend the period of restrictions on lands of the Quapaw Indians, Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PARK FIELD MILITARY RESERVATION, TENN.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3364, to transfer the control and jurisdiction of the Park Field Military Reservation, Shelby County, Tenn., from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the lands embracing the Park Field Military Reservation, Shelby County, Tenn., together with all improvements and equipment thereon, be, and they are hereby, transferred from the control and jurisdiction of the War Department to the control and jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture of the United States is authorized to supervise, control, and direct the development and administration of the said lands, improvements, and equipment pursuant to the powers, functions, and duties heretofore vested in him by Executive Order No. 7530 of December 31, 1936, as amended by Executive Order No. 7557 of February 19, 1937.

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

SAN CARLOS APACHE INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 18, authorizing payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians for the lands ceded by them in the agreement of February 25, 1896, ratified by the act of June 10, 1896, and reopening such lands to mineral entry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Bureau of the Budget said that these Indians are entitled to \$33,725. The bill calls for \$277,966.37. As far as I am concerned, if the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] wants to accept the figures of the Bureau of the Budget and will accept an amendment which I will offer, I will not object to the passage of the bill. Otherwise I will object to the passage of the bill.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The Department favored the bill as reported by the committee. The Indian Affairs Committee carefully considered this bill and by a unanimous vote favorably reported it. I am somewhat surprised to find the gentleman from Missouri objecting to this meritorious bill which the Department of the Interior favors and which was unanimously approved by the Indian Affairs Committee after thorough investigation.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say that I have objected to this bill for several years, and I have tried to get those interested to accept the figures of the Bureau of the Budget. Now let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, whenever you are going to follow the Department of the Interior or its Bureau of Indian Affairs in connection with Indian legislation, then the doors of the Treasury are wide open.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. We do not rubber stamp the Bureau of the Budget. We consider bills on their merits. The committee considered this bill and unanimously reported it out. If the gentleman wants to object, we cannot stop him.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman from Arizona accept my amendment?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I will accept it with this understanding: This is an involved case. The amount in this bill to be paid was \$1.25 per acre, which would amount to \$277,966.37. The \$33,725 indicated by the gentleman from Missouri will merely buy part of it at \$1.25 per acre, but it is understood that this bill, with or without this amendment, will return to public domain and open up the entire area for mineral entry, except what has become private property. With that understanding I will accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am not going to agree to any such suggestion as that. I am only accepting what the Bureau of the Budget says. The Bureau of the Budget says this:

The Budget recommends payment for such lands at \$1.25 per acre which would amount to the sum \$33,725.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. In accepting this proposed amendment to the bill as it stands, it will simply mean that the Indians will be paid less than \$1.25 an acre, which I am reluctant to agree to, but I do want this matter in dispute for so many years to be cleared up.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Arizona is in a very embarrassing position. I do not think the Bureau of the Budget, under the Constitution, has legislative power. In order to protect the gentleman and the committee reporting the bill, I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill.

WAPATO SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 54, YAKIMA COUNTY, WASH.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3824, to provide funds for cooperation with Wapato School District No. 54, Yakima County, Wash., for extension of public-school buildings to be available for Indian children of the Yakima Reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MARKETING AGREEMENTS UNDER AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4539, to extend the time during which orders and marketing agreements under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, may be applicable to hops.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

TO AMEND SECTION 344 (H) OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5911, to amend subsection (h) of section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, although this bill is about to be passed over without prejudice, I nevertheless desire to make some comment upon the effect which this legislation would have should it be enacted into law. I feel that the Members should understand more fully what this bill proposes to do before allowing the bill to pass without some discussion.

The bill H. R. 5911 further amends subsection (h) of section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide that payments to any producer would be made upon the basis of his original allotment even though he released a portion of his allotment to another producer under the so-called "frozen" acreage amendment to section 344 (h). In other words, it is proposed that the original allottee would receive the same consideration with respect to parity and agricultural conservation payments as if he had not transferred any portion of his allotment. This amendment also provides "that the recipient of the portion of the allotment transferred shall receive such acres with the understanding that he will not receive conservation or parity payments upon them." The latter provision is not specifically included in that part of S. 2052 concerning this subject.

The Price Adjustment Act of 1938 provides that payments thereunder shall be made upon the normal yield of the farm and the acreage allotment, and shall be made with respect to a farm only in the event that the acreage planted for harvest on the farm is not in excess of the farm acreage allotment established for the commodity. By the expression "the farm-acreage allotment established for the commodity under the 1939 agricultural conservation program" it is believed that the Congress meant the final acreage allotment established for the farm. It has been considered by the Department, therefore, that a producer who received an original allotment of 100 acres by signifying his intention to release, under the provisions of section 344 (h), 50 acres of such allotment actually receives a final allotment of only 50 acres for cotton for the applicable year.

The amendment would necessitate the establishment of two cotton acreage allotments for each farm involved in a transfer of acreage allotment in accordance with the "frozen" acreage amendment. One of the cotton acreage allotments would be used as a basis for payment under the agricultural conservation program and the price adjustment payment program. It should be noted that if such acreage allotment is exceeded no payment could be made in accordance with the Price Adjustment Act of 1938. The other cotton acreage allotment would be used for the purposes of planting, marketing quotas, and deductions under the agricultural conservation program.

Some of the more important difficulties which would result if this amendment is enacted are as follows:

First. It would be necessary to explain to producers releasing cotton acreage why their cotton acreage allotment may be knowingly overplanted or why there may be deductions from their conservation payments for planting an acreage less than the acreage upon which the conservation payment is based. Under the present program payments and deductions are based upon only one acreage allotment figure.

Second. It would be necessary to explain to producers who receive additional allotments why they would not be entitled to an additional payment. The division of payments to interested producers on the farm is based upon each interested person's proportionate share of the planted acreage. The question would likely arise with respect to which producer on the farm planted the additional acreage allotment upon which no payment would be made.

Third. When producers release all or a portion of their cotton acreage allotment many request an increase in their general crop acreage allotment so that their farm operations may be kept in balance. Since some of the "frozen" acreage will be released in the commercial grain and feed crop area, there would be a duplication of payments if the producer

should be paid on the "frozen" cotton acreage released and at the same time should receive payment for planting the same acreage in general crops.

Fourth. The necessity of computing two cotton acreage allotments on each cotton farm and revising the general crop acreage allotments for such farms may cause considerable difficulty on the part of both county and State offices in determining that the sum of the allotments for all farms does not exceed the maximum allotment to the county for the purposes of (1) the 1939 agricultural conservation program, (2) the 1939 marketing quota, (3) the 1939 general crop acreage allotment, and (4) the 1939 total soil-depleting acreage allotment.

Fifth. The determination of two cotton acreage allotments for each farm involved in a transfer of allotments would result in widespread confusion among the operators of the farms involved and would increase the expenses in administering the program.

NONSUBSIDIZED VESSEL CONSTRUCTION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5756, to amend section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. RICH objected.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentlemen withhold their objections in order that I may make a statement?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withhold my objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is simply to place persons who desire to secure money for the construction of ships to operate in domestic and foreign commerce, and who do not ask for a subsidy, in identically the same position as the law has already placed those who apply for the construction of ships and ask for a subsidy. In other words, the sole purpose of this bill is to reduce the cash payment in accordance with exactly the same provisions that have been made for others asking for subsidies.

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

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Does this bill provide that the Government shall pay a subsidy to these people who went ahead themselves and did not arrange for the subsidy to start with?

Mr. BLAND. Not at all. This covers the case of persons who desire to get money to aid in the building of their ships on the premise of a cash-down payment and 20 years' amortization. We have already provided this in the case of those who ask for a subsidy that substantially the same cash payment shall be made. By this bill we would extend to those who do not ask for a subsidy the benefit we have already given those who do.

To provide an example, I may state that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] has constituents who are ready to go ahead and make their contracts. They do not intend to ask for a subsidy. Should national-defense features be incorporated in the ships, of course, they would be paid for by the Government, as in any other case; but the parties in question are asking for neither operating differential nor construction differential. I ask the gentleman from Alabama if this is not correct.

Mr. BOYKIN. That is absolutely correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SIMPSON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (52 Stat. 959; U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. IV, title 46, sec. 1159), is amended as follows:

(1) By amending the second sentence thereof to read as follows: "If such application is approved by the Commission, the vessel may be constructed under the terms and conditions of this title, but no construction-differential subsidy shall be allowed."; and
(2) By amending so much of the fourth sentence thereof as precedes the first semicolon therein to read as follows: "In case the vessel is designed to be of not less than 3,000 gross tons and to be

capable of a sustained speed of not less than 14 knots, the applicant shall be required to pay the Commission not less than 12½ percent of the cost of such vessel, and in the case of any other vessel the applicant shall be required to pay the Commission not less than 25 percent of the cost of such vessel (excluding from such cost, in either case, the cost of national-defense features);".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, at the end of line 3 and the beginning of line 4, strike out the words "three thousand" and insert in lieu thereof the words "thirty-five hundred."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. Were not three objections made to this bill?

The SPEAKER. The record shows three objections were made to the bill, but the gentleman from Virginia asked the gentlemen objecting to withhold their objections to permit him to make a statement with reference to the bill. Thereupon the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RUTHERFORD] withheld his objection and the gentleman from Virginia made his statement. The Chair then asked if there were objections. One objection was heard. Three objections are required to stop consideration of the bill.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

PACIFIC NORTHWEST BOXED APPLES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1096, to amend section 8c of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, to make its provisions applicable to Pacific Northwest boxed apples.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection to permit me to make a statement? I am sure if the gentleman understands the bill he will not object.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Speaker, I withhold my objection to permit the gentleman to make a statement.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, this bill applies only to the three specific Northwest States—Washington, Oregon, and Idaho—in reference to apple production. The growers of every other agricultural commodity are permitted to enter into agreements, but the growers of apples are prohibited to do so. Our growers feel that if they were allowed to enter into such agreements as growers of other agricultural products are they could save what is to them a bad situation in the undercutting of prices between the individual growers. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection. It affects merely the three Northwest States.

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

Mr. LEAVY. I yield.

Mr. RICH. May I ask the gentleman what effect the Sherman Antitrust Act will have on such agreements?

Mr. LEAVY. I understand these agreements are entirely outside the Sherman antitrust law.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman being a lawyer and a judge, and knowing the laws, I wondered why he would want such a bill, and what would be the difference between such a bill and one permitting manufacturers to establish contracts to maintain prices.

Mr. LEAVY. If time permitted, I could answer the gentleman I think in a manner that would satisfy him.

I trust the gentleman from Wisconsin will withdraw his objection.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin withdraw his objection?

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Speaker, I renew my objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman renews his objection. The Clerk will call the next bill.

MINIMUM NATIONAL ALLOTMENTS FOR COTTON

The Clerk called the next resolution, House Joint Resolution 247, to provide minimum national allotments for cotton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

MINIMUM NATIONAL ALLOTMENTS FOR WHEAT

The Clerk called the next resolution, House Joint Resolution 248, to provide minimum national allotments for wheat.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 344 OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5498, to make applicable to the years after 1939 the special provisions relating to cotton baleage and acreage allotments which apply for 1939.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WARREN). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

INCLUSION OF MATERIAL PORTIONS OF EVIDENCE IN RECORDS CERTIFIED TO SUPREME COURT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2567, to provide that records certified by the Court of Claims to the Supreme Court, in response to writs of certiorari, may include material portions of the evidence, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill, S. 198, for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3, subsection b, of the act of February 13, 1925 (43 Stat. 936, 939, c. 229; U. S. Code, title 28, sec. 288 b), be amended so as to read as follows:

"(b) In any case in the Court of Claims, including those begun under section 180 of the Judicial Code, it shall be competent for the Supreme Court, upon the petition of either party, whether Government or claimant, to require, by certiorari, that the cause be certified to it for review and determination of all errors assigned, with the same power and authority, and with like effect, as if the cause had been brought there by appeal. In such event, the Court of Claims shall include in the papers certified by it the findings of fact, the conclusions of law, and the judgment or decree, as well as such other parts of the record as are material to the errors assigned, to be settled by the court.

"The Court of Claims shall promulgate rules to govern the preparation of such record in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"In such cases the Supreme Court shall have authority to review, in addition to other questions of law, errors assigned to the effect that there is a lack of substantial evidence to sustain a finding of fact; that an ultimate finding or findings are not sustained by the findings of evidentiary or primary facts; or that there is a failure to make any finding of fact on a material issue."

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

A House bill (H. R. 2567) was laid on the table.

SALE OF CARSON CITY (NEV.) MINT SITE AND BUILDING

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5328, authorizing sale of old Carson City (Nev.) Mint site and building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill, S. 2050, for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the old Carson City (Nev.) Mint site and building may be sold under the provisions of the act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 800; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 345b), or the act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 885; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 304a), notwithstanding Joint Resolution No. 18 of February 23, 1865 (13 Stat. 569), providing that said site shall be reserved from public sale and shall remain the property of the United States.

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

A House bill (H. R. 5328) was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY TO ACCEPT REAL ESTATE DEVISED BY THE LATE LIZZIE BECK, OF MENA, ARK.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5836, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to accept real estate devised to the United States by the late Lizzie Beck, of Mena, Ark., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill, S. 2244, for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to accept on behalf of the United States the real estate devised to the United States by the late Lizzie Beck, of Mena, Ark., and to deal with the same in the manner provided by the act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 885; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 304a), or the act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 800; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 345b).

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

A House bill (H. R. 5836) was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRESIDENT TO RENDER CLOSER AND MORE EFFECTIVE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AMERICAN REPUBLICS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5835, to authorize the President to render closer and more effective the relationship between the American republics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire whether this bill proposes a raid of \$500,000 on the American Treasury so that South American dictator countries will be able to sell more canned bully beef in America?

Mr. BLOOM. This has nothing to do with that.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Does this bill provide a half million dollar handout from the Federal Treasury to the South American countries?

Mr. BLOOM. No. It has nothing to do with that at all. I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin it is an entirely different thing. It is absolutely divorced from any other legislation that we have along this line.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. What is the purpose of this bill?

Mr. BLOOM. If the gentleman will read the report, he will see it provides for closer relationship between the South American countries and the United States. That is all there is to it. There is no appropriation of any kind involved. If the gentleman will read this paragraph of the report, he will find this sentence:

All that is contemplated at this time is a general advisory committee, and in addition, special advisory committees on exchange of students, professors, books, library translations, and educational films.

That is all.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman states "at this time." What does it provide for some other time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I object.

COOS BAY WAGON ROAD GRANT LANDS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2317, relating to the disposition of funds derived from the Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an identical Senate bill, S. 242, may be considered in lieu of the House bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask if the Senate bill conforms to the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. COSTELLO. The language of the Senate bill is identical with that of the House bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then I have no objection.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That beginning with the fiscal year next following the date of the passage of this act, not to exceed 75 percent of the receipts derived in any one year from the Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands in Oregon and deposited in the special fund in the Treasury created by the act of February 26, 1919 (40 Stat. 1179), and designated "The Coos Bay Wagon Road grant fund" shall be paid annually, in lieu of taxes, by the Secretary of the Treasury, upon certification by the Secretary of the Interior, to the treasurers of Coos and Douglas Counties according to the ratio that the total assessed valuation of the reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, belonging to the United States, in each of said counties bears to the total assessed valuation of all said lands in those counties, to be used for the purposes mentioned in said act: *Provided*, That until such time as the general fund of the Treasury of the United States shall have been fully reimbursed by Douglas County for expenditures which were made charges against the Coos Bay Wagon Road grant fund by section 5 of the act of February 26, 1919, said Douglas County shall be entitled to receive only 50 percent of the amount to which it would otherwise be entitled under this act: *Provided further*, That prior to making any payment under this authorization an appraisal of the land and timber thereon shall be made, within 6 months after the passage of this act, by a committee to consist of a representative of the Secretary of the Interior, one representative for the two counties interested, and a third person satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior and the county officials, but who shall not be an employee of the United States nor a resident of, nor a property owner in, either Coos or Douglas County. Upon appraisal thereof, the land and timber thereon shall be assessed as are other similar properties within the respective counties, and payments hereunder in lieu of taxes shall be computed by applying the same rates of taxation as are applied to privately owned property of similar character in such counties.

SEC. 2. Appraisals of the land and timber thereon shall be made, in the manner prescribed in section 1 hereof, not less frequently than once in each 10-year period, and the amounts due hereunder in any year shall be computed as specified in section 1 of this act upon the basis of the last appraisal. The expenses of making the appraisements provided for in this act shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury upon certification by the Secretary of the Interior, from that portion of the receipts derived from such lands and timber payable to the counties and shall be deducted from any amount due said counties.

SEC. 3. If, during any one year, 75 percent of the receipts are insufficient fully to meet the payments due the counties hereunder, the Secretary of the Treasury, upon certification by the Secretary of the Interior, may pay an additional sum from any surplus of 75 percent of prior year receipts: *Provided, however*, That in no event shall the aggregate of payments during any 10-year period commencing with the period beginning July 1, 1940, exceed 75 percent of the receipts deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the Coos Bay Wagon Road grant fund for such period: *Provided further*, That at the end of each 10-year period, any balance of the 75 percent not required for payments to the counties shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 4. Not to exceed 25 percent of the annual receipts shall be available, in such amounts as the Congress shall from time to time appropriate for the administration of the act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874), insofar as it applies to the Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands. Any balance not used for administrative purposes shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 5. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

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

A House bill (H. R. 2317) was laid on the table.

PORT NIAGARA MILITARY RESERVATION, N. Y.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5436, to authorize the grant of a sewer right-of-way and operation of sewage-treatment plant on the Fort Niagara Military Reservation, N. Y., by the village of Youngstown, N. Y.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to grant to the village of Youngstown, Niagara County, N. Y., a municipal corporation, for a term of 50 years, an easement for right-of-way for a sewer line to be constructed by said village on the Fort Niagara Military Reservation, N. Y., from said village to a sewage-treatment plant to be constructed by the Secretary of War on said reservation, and to contract therein for the operating and maintenance of said plant by the village for the treatment of sewage of said post and the village, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of War deems advisable, the village's share of the cost of operation and maintenance to be \$600 per annum for a population of 1,000 or less and an additional 60 cents per capita per annum over and above said thousand.

Sec. 2. That said easement shall not be granted until the Legislature of the State of New York shall have first provided by appropriate legislation that the granting of the easement shall not impair or invalidate any of the rights, title, or privileges granted to the United States pursuant to the act of the Legislature of New York passed April 21, 1840 (New York Laws, 1840, ch. 155, p. 113).

Sec. 3. That the act of May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 592), to authorize the Secretary of War to lease to the village of Youngstown, N. Y., a portion of the Fort Niagara Military Reservation, N. Y., be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Sec. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$60,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I offer two amendments, which conform to the recommendations of the War Department in a favorable report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. ANDREWS:

Page 1, line 10, strike out the word "therein" and insert in lieu thereof the words "from time to time."

Page 2, line 2, after the word "advisable", change the comma to a period and strike out the balance of section 1.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

WESTERN OR OLD SETTLER CHEROKEES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4498, for the relief of the Western or Old Settler Cherokees, and for other purposes. Mr. COCHRAN and Mr. WOLCOTT objected.

INDIANS ALLOTTED ON THE QUINAIELT RESERVATION, STATE OF WASHINGTON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2654, authorizing the payment of necessary expenses incurred by certain Indians allotted on the Quinaielt Reservation, State of Washington.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like the Record to show there is a great deal of merit to the contention of the attorneys that they should be paid for their services in connection with this matter, but I insist this is not the way they should be paid. Under the terms of this bill the taxpayers of the United States would be required to make the payments. The attorneys can be paid if the Secretary of the Interior will allot the necessary amount of land so it can be sold and the attorneys receive the money, to which I admit they are entitled. The attorneys, I understand, have liens on this property and it never can be sold until the liens are released and the claims satisfied. Therefore, I believe it is the duty of the Department of the Interior, instead of recommending the Congress of the United States take this money out of the Treasury, to sell sufficient land or timber and then settle the attorneys' bill. If it requires additional legislation to enable the Secretary to sell the land or timber, I will support it; but it is wrong to ask us to require the taxpayers to pay the attorneys, regardless of how meritorious their claim is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

DESERTERS FROM THE MILITARY OR NAVAL FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6035, to provide for the exclusion from the United States of persons who have been convicted of desertion from the military or naval forces of the United States while the United States was at war.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this bill should be enacted at an early date, and I object to passing it over.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. I object, Mr. Speaker.

PORTRAIT OF FORMER PRESIDENT HERBERT HOOVER

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 208) authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure an oil portrait of former President Herbert Hoover.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the objector did not stand when objecting to this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ANDERSON] rose and addressed the Chair and objected, in conformity with the rules of the House.

Mr. CHURCH. That is perfectly satisfactory, Mr. Speaker.

RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1827, to allow moving expenses to employees in the Railway Mail Service.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter officers and regular clerks in the Railway Mail Service, when arbitrarily transferred under orders of the Department from one official station to another for permanent duty, may be allowed their actual and necessary transportation expenses for moving their household goods, including packing and drayage, not in excess of 3,500 pounds.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 4, after the word "Service", insert "and the Post Office Inspection Service."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1569, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL PETROLEUM EXPOSITION AT TULSA, OKLA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5447, authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition at Tulsa, Okla., to be held May 18 to May 25, 1940.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized to invite by proclamation, or in such other manner as he may deem proper, the States of the Union and all foreign countries to participate in the proposed International Petroleum Exposition, to be held at Tulsa, Okla., from May 18 to May 25, 1940, inclusive, for the purposes of exhibiting samples of fabricated and raw products of all countries used in the petroleum industry and bringing together buyers and sellers for promotion of trade and commerce in such products.

Sec. 2. All articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Petroleum Exposition or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign buildings or exhibits at the said exposition, upon which articles

there shall be a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted without payment of such tariff, customs duty, fees, or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the said exposition to sell within the area of the exposition any articles provided for herein subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles, when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles, which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law: *Provided further*, That imported articles provided for herein shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States: *Provided further*, That at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the exposition, any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the Government or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such article shall be remitted: *Provided further*, That articles which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law, and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond, and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to and entry for exhibition at the said exposition under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *And provided further*, That the International Petroleum Exposition shall be deemed for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this act, and that the actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisement, release, or custody, together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for, articles imported under the provisions of this act, shall be reimbursed by the International Petroleum Exposition to the Government of the United States, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524, Tariff Act of 1930.

Sec. 3. That the Government of the United States is not by this act obligated to any expense in connection with the holding of such exposition and is not hereafter to be obligated other than for suitable representation thereat.

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

ELEVENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS FOR THE RHEUMATIC DISEASES

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 180) to provide that the United States extend to foreign governments invitations to participate in the Eleventh International Congress for the Rheumatic Diseases, to be held in the United States during the calendar year 1940, and to authorize an appropriation to assist in meeting the expenses of the session.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized and requested to invite foreign governments to participate in the Eleventh International Congress for the Rheumatic Diseases to be held in New York, N. Y., Philadelphia, Pa., and Boston, Mass., probably from May 26 to June 1, inclusive, 1940, under the auspices of the Ligue Internationale contre le Rhumatisme (the International League Against Rheumatism).

Sec. 2. The sum of \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the expenses of organizing, holding, and publishing the proceedings of the Eleventh International Congress for the Rheumatic Diseases, including expenditures for personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, communication services, stenographic and other services by contract if deemed necessary without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); travel expenses, local transportation, hire of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, entertainment, official cards, purchase of newspapers and periodicals, necessary books and documents, stationery, membership badges, such expenses as may be actually and necessarily incurred by the Government of the United States by reason of observance of appropriate courtesies in connection therewith, and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 4, strike out the word "Eleventh" and insert the word "Seventh."

On page 2, line 6, strike out the word "Eleventh" and insert the word "Seventh."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to provide that the United States extend to foreign governments invitations to participate in the Seventh International Congress for the Rheumatic Diseases to be held in the United States during the calendar year 1940, and to authorize an appropriation to assist in meeting the expenses of the session."

APPEALS TO CIRCUIT COURTS OF APPEALS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6071, to permit appeals by the United States to the circuit courts of appeals in certain cases.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved March 2, 1907, entitled "An act providing for writs of error in certain instances in criminal cases" (34 Stat. 1246; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 682), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That an appeal may be taken by and on behalf of the United States from the district courts direct to the Supreme Court of the United States in all criminal cases in the following instances, to wit:

"From a decision or judgment quashing, setting aside, or sustaining a demurrer or plea in abatement to any indictment or information, or any count thereof, where such decision or judgment is based upon the invalidity or construction of the statute upon which the indictment or information is founded.

"From a decision arresting a judgment of conviction for insufficiency of the indictment or information, where such decision is based upon the invalidity or construction of the statute upon which the indictment or information is founded.

"From the decision or judgment sustaining a special plea in bar, when the defendant has not been put in jeopardy.

"An appeal may be taken by and on behalf of the United States from the district courts to a circuit court of appeals or the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, as the case may be, in all criminal cases, in the following instances, to wit:

"From a decision or judgment quashing, setting aside, or sustaining a demurrer or plea in abatement to any indictment or information, or any count thereof except where a direct appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States is provided by this act.

"From a decision arresting a judgment of conviction except where a direct appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States is provided by this act.

"The appeal in all such cases shall be taken within 30 days after the decision or judgment has been rendered and shall be diligently prosecuted.

"Pending the prosecution and determination of the appeal in the foregoing instances, the defendant shall be admitted to bail on his own recognizance: *Provided*, That if an appeal shall be taken pursuant to this act to the Supreme Court of the United States which, in the opinion of that Court, should have been taken to a circuit court of appeals, or the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the Supreme Court of the United States shall remand the cause to the circuit court of appeals or the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, as the case may be, which shall then have jurisdiction to hear and determine the same as if the appeal had been taken to that court in the first instance; and if an appeal shall be taken pursuant to this section to any circuit court of appeals or to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, which, in the opinion of such court, should have been taken directly to the Supreme Court of the United States, such court shall certify the case to the Supreme Court of the United States, which shall thereupon have jurisdiction to hear and determine the cause to the same extent as if an appeal had been taken directly to that Court."

Sec. 2. That section 128 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 225), be, and the same is hereby, further amended by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"(f) The circuit courts of appeals, including the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, are further empowered to review decisions and judgments of the district courts in criminal cases on appeals taken by the United States in cases where such appeals are permitted by law."

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

FACILITIES FOR THE COAST GUARD

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1369, to authorize necessary facilities for the Coast Guard in the interest of national defense and the performance of its maritime police functions.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

COMMISSIONED PERSONNEL OF THE COAST GUARD

The Clerk read the next bill, S. 1876, to readjust the commissioned personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to readjust the commissioned personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1533; U. S. C., title 14, sec. 10), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"The total number of commissioned officers in the Coast Guard is hereby increased by 154 line officers (exclusive of commissioned warrant officers) and 2 district commanders. Such additional line officers shall be distributed in grades in the same proportion as prescribed by the foregoing provisions of this section: *Provided*, That the total number of vacancies created hereby in each of the grades of captain, commander, lieutenant commander, and lieutenant shall be filled at a rate not exceeding, in any 1 year following the enactment hereof, 20 percent of such total number."

Sec. 2. Section 2 of the act entitled "An act to distribute the commissioned line and engineer officers of the Coast Guard in grades, and for other purposes," approved January 12, 1923 (42 Stat. 1130; U. S. C., title 14, sec. 12), is hereby amended by changing the second proviso thereof to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That the engineer in chief, while so serving, shall have the rank of a rear admiral and the pay and allowances of a rear admiral (lower half), and hereafter the engineer in chief shall be selected from the active list of engineer officers not below the grades of commander (engineering)."

Sec. 3. Section 1 of the act entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Revenue Cutter Service," approved April 16, 1908 (35 Stat. 61, as amended; U. S. C., title 14, sec. 11), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"The President is authorized to appoint in the Coast Guard, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one Assistant Commandant who shall serve for a term of 4 years unless sooner relieved by the President. The Assistant Commandant shall be selected from the active list of line officers not below the grade of commander, and such appointment shall not create a vacancy; and the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall make recommendations for the appointment of the Assistant Commandant. The Assistant Commandant shall have the rank of a rear admiral and the pay and allowances of a rear admiral (lower half): *Provided*, That an officer whose terms of service as Assistant Commandant has expired shall take his place on the lineal list in the grade that he would have attained had he not served as Assistant Commandant."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, in line 10, strike out the word "terms" and insert the word "term."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

PAPAGO INDIAN RESERVATION, ARIZ.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5758, to add certain lands to the Papago Indian Reservation in Arizona.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Arizona what this bill does?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. This bill provides something over \$5,000 to buy 320 acres of land adjoining the Papago Indian Reservation in Arizona, as that piece of land has developed water. The Papago Indians are a stock-raising people and they are in a very dry, desert country. They sadly need this additional water supply.

Mr. RICH. As the gentleman knows, we have appropriated \$500,000 in the Interior appropriation bill for the purpose of buying lands for Indians. Why cannot this land be acquired under that act?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. That is a blanket appropriation for Indians all over the country and no doubt has been planned to be spent otherwise. I do not know that the Papago Indians would be entitled to come in or would have a look-in under that act. If I could be assured that the right sum is so earmarked, that would do.

Mr. RICH. It is to buy lands for Indian reservations in every State.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

REPRODUCTION OF OFFICIAL BADGES, ETC.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1281) to prohibit reproductions of official badges, identification cards, and other insignia.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to prohibit the misuse of official insignia," approved on June 29, 1932 (47 Stat. 342; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 76a), be amended to read as follows:

"That hereafter the manufacture, sale, or possession of any badge, identification card, or other insignia, of the design prescribed by the head of any department or independent office of the United States for use by any officer or subordinate thereof, or of any colorable imitation thereof, or the photographing, printing, or in any other manner making or executing any engraving, photograph, print, or impression in the likeness of any such badge, identification card, or other insignia, or of any colorable imitation thereof, is prohibited, except when and as authorized under such regulations as may be prescribed by the head of the department or independent office of which such insignia indicates the wearer is an officer or subordinate."

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

COMPENSATION OF JURORS, ETC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5380) to amend an act approved April 26, 1926, entitled "An act fixing the fees of jurors and witnesses in the United States courts, including the District Court of Hawaii, the District Court of Puerto Rico, and the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia."

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act fixing the fees of jurors and witnesses in the United States courts, including the District Court of Hawaii, the District Court of Puerto Rico, and the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia," approved April 26, 1926, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Employees of the Government of the United States in active service, and otherwise qualified according to law, who are called upon to sit on juries shall not be paid for such jury service but their salary shall not be diminished during their term of service by virtue of such service, nor shall such period of service be deducted from any leave of absence authorized by law."

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

ADDITIONAL LAND FOR MILITARY PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5735) to authorize the acquisition of additional land for military purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, until I receive further information with regard to one item in this bill, I am constrained to object.

LOAD LINES FOR AMERICAN VESSELS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1583) to amend the act of March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1492), entitled "An act to establish load lines for American vessels, and for other purposes."

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1492; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 46, sec. 85), entitled "An act to establish load lines for American vessels, and for other purposes," is amended to read as follows:

"Load lines are hereby established for the following vessels:

"(a) Merchant vessels of 150 gross tons or over, loading at or proceeding to sea from any port or place within the United States or its possessions for a foreign voyage by sea, the Great Lakes excepted.

"(b) Merchant vessels of the United States of 150 gross tons or over, loading at or proceeding to sea from any foreign port or place for a voyage by sea, the Great Lakes excepted."

SEC. 2. That section 8 (c) of the act of March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1494; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 46, sec. 85g (c)), is amended to read as follows:

"If any person shall knowingly permit or cause or attempt to cause any vessel subject to this act and to the regulations established thereunder to depart, or if, being the owner, manager, agent, or master of such vessel, he shall fail to take reasonable care to prevent her from departing from her loading port or place when

loading in violation of section 4, or if any person shall knowingly permit or cause or attempt to cause a foreign vessel exempted pursuant to section 5 to depart, or if, being the owner, manager, agent, or master of such vessel, he shall fail to take reasonable care to prevent her from departing from her loading port or place when loaded more deeply than permitted by the laws and regulations of the country to which she belongs, he shall, in respect of each offense, be liable to the United States in a penalty of \$500. The Secretary of Commerce may, in his discretion, remit or mitigate any penalty imposed under this paragraph."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 6, strike out the word "excepted." and insert the word "excepted."

Page 2, after line 6, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"(c) This act shall not apply to merchant vessels that are being towed and which are carrying neither cargo nor passengers."

The committee amendments were agreed to; and the bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LAND TO STATE OF OREGON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5501) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to convey a certain tract of land to the State of Oregon for use as a public park and recreational site.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of Oregon, subject to the condition and the easement specified in section 2 of this act, the following-described tract of land situated in the State of Oregon and now constituting a part of the Umpqua River Lighthouse Reservation, such tract of land being more specifically described as follows: All of the north half southwest quarter section 13 and that portion of the southeast quarter northwest quarter section 13, township 22 south, range 13 west, Willamette meridian, lying easterly of the meanders of the center line of the creek flowing northerly from Lake Marie, containing approximately 110 acres; the conveyance thereof being subject to the payment of a purchase price to be determined by the Procurement Division, Treasury Department: *Provided*, That the total purchase price shall not be less than 50 percent of the appraised value of the land.

Sec. 2. The tract of land authorized to be conveyed by the first section of this act shall be used by the grantee for the purpose of a public park and recreational site and for similar and related purposes. The conveyance of such tract of land shall contain the express condition that if the grantee shall cease to use such tract of land for such purposes, or shall alienate or attempt to alienate such tract of land, or shall fail to perform any contract entered into with the United States for the purchase of the property, title thereto shall revert to the United States for the use of the Lighthouse Service, Department of Commerce, or other agencies of the United States, or for disposal under the act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 885; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 304a), or under the act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 800; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 345b). Such conveyance shall contain appropriate provisions for the purpose of reserving to the United States such rights of ingress and egress over the land conveyed as may be necessary for the maintenance of the light station and other aids to navigation established upon such reservation and as may be necessary for the performance of other governmental activities on such reservation.

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

CREDITING CERTAIN INDIAN TRIBES WITH CERTAIN SUMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2777) to credit certain Indian tribes with sums heretofore expended from tribal funds on Indian irrigation works.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF PINE RIDGE LOST ALLOTMENT CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5746) to provide for the correction of the list of approved Pine Ridge lost allotment claims, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to correct the list of 979 Pine Ridge Sioux lost allotment claims, approved December 18, 1936, under the act of May 3, 1928 (45 Stat. 484), by eliminating certain names errone-

ously placed thereon and the substitution of others in lieu thereof: *Provided*, That the total number of approved claims shall not exceed 979: *And provided further*, That such part of the appropriation authorized by the act of June 29, 1937 (50 Stat. 441), as would have been used to pay those to be eliminated shall be used to pay those to be substituted.

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

COAST GUARD RESERVE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5966) to establish a Coast Guard Reserve to be composed of owners of motorboats and yachts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, to suggest an amendment to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], on page 3, line 19, to change the word "with" to the word "without."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct, and I accept the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection, and the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Coast Guard Reserve Act of 1939."

Sec. 2. In the interest of (a) safety to life at sea and upon the navigable waters, (b) the promotion of efficiency in the operation of motorboats and yachts, (c) a wider knowledge of, and better compliance with, the laws, rules, and regulations governing the operation and navigation of motorboats and yachts, and (d) facilitating certain operations of the Coast Guard, there is hereby established a United States Coast Guard Reserve (hereinafter referred to as the "Reserve") which shall be composed of citizens of the United States and of its Territories and possessions, except the Philippine Islands, who are owners (sole or part) of motorboats or yachts, and who may be enrolled therein pursuant to regulations prescribed under the authority of this act.

Sec. 3. The Reserve shall be a voluntary organization and shall be administered by the Commandant of the Coast Guard (hereinafter referred to as the "Commandant") under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Commandant shall, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

Sec. 4. The Coast Guard is authorized to utilize in the conduct of duties incident to the saving of life and property and in the patrol of marine parades and regattas any motorboat or yacht temporarily placed at its disposition for any of such purposes by any member of the Reserve: *Provided*, That no such motorboat or yacht shall be assigned to any Coast Guard duty unless it is placed in charge of a commissioned officer, chief warrant officer, warrant officer, or petty officer of the Coast Guard during such assignment: *Provided further*, That appropriations for the Coast Guard shall be available for the payment of actual necessary expenses of operation of any such motorboat or yacht when so utilized, but shall not be available for the payment of compensation for personal services, incident to such operation, to other than the personnel of the regular Coast Guard.

Sec. 5. Any motorboat or yacht, while assigned to Coast Guard duty as herein authorized, shall be deemed to be a public vessel of the United States, and, within the meaning of the act of June 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1514; U. S. C., Supp. IV, title 14, sec. 71), shall be deemed to be a vessel of the United States Coast Guard.

Sec. 6. The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe one or more suitable distinguishing flags to be flown from the motorboats and yachts owned by members of the Reserve, and one or more suitable insignias which may be worn by such members. Such flags and insignias shall be furnished by the Coast Guard to members of the Reserve at actual cost, and the proceeds received therefor shall be credited to the appropriation from which paid. Any person who shall, without proper authority, fly from a motorboat, yacht, or other vessels any flag of the Reserve, or wear any insignia of the Reserve, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding \$100.

Sec. 7. No member of the Reserve, solely by reason of such membership, shall be vested with or exercise any right, privilege, power, or duty vested in or imposed upon the personnel of the Coast Guard.

Sec. 8. The services and facilities of the Coast Guard may be employed in the administration and operation of the Reserve; and the appropriations for the Coast Guard shall be available to effectuate the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 21, before the words "Coast Guard", insert the word "such."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I offer the amendment I suggested.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHURCH: Page 3, line 19, after the word "shall", strike out the word "with" and insert the word "without."

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

RETIREMENT OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL OF COAST GUARD

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 595, to increase further the efficiency of the Coast Guard by authorizing the retirement under certain conditions of enlisted personnel thereof with 20 or more years of service.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commandant of the Coast Guard (hereinafter referred to as the "Commandant") shall assemble annually a Coast Guard Enlisted Personnel Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"), to be composed of not less than three commissioned officers on the active list of the Coast Guard. It shall be the duty of the Board to recommend for retirement such enlisted men of the Coast Guard, who have 20 or more years of service, whom the Board determines, in its discretion, should be retired from active service. The recommendations of the Board shall be transmitted to the Commandant for final action. If the Commandant shall approve the recommendations of the Board, the enlisted man concerned shall be notified thereof in writing, and any enlisted man who, within 30 days after receipt of such notification, files with the Commandant a written protest of the action taken by the Board in his case, shall not be retired involuntarily under this act unless a subsequent annual Board again determines in its discretion, that such enlisted man should be retired and so recommends, in which case such enlisted man may, upon approval by the Commandant, be retired from active service with retired pay as prescribed by section 5 hereof. At the expiration of 30 days after receipt by an enlisted man of notice as aforesaid, in the event that no such protest is filed by him within the period prescribed, such enlisted man may, upon approval by the Commandant, be retired from service with retired pay as prescribed by section 5 hereof. If the Commandant shall disapprove any recommendation of the Board, the enlisted man concerned shall retain his status in the Coast Guard to the same extent as if his case had not been considered.

Sec. 2. An enlisted man of the Coast Guard who has 20 or more years of service may, upon suitable application to and approval by the Commandant, be retired from active service with retired pay as prescribed by section 5 hereof.

Sec. 3. The total number of enlisted men who may be retired in any one fiscal year under sections 1 and 2 of this act shall not exceed the whole number nearest to 1 percent of the total enlisted force of the Coast Guard on the active list as of January 1 of such year, to be divided in such proportion between retirements under sections 1 and 2 of this act as may be determined by the Commandant.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to call any enlisted man who has been retired pursuant to this act into active service for such duty as he may be able to perform. While so employed such enlisted man shall receive full pay, allowances, and benefits authorized by law, shall be eligible for promotion, and shall be entitled to the benefits of continuous service for such rank and for such length of time as he is or has been employed in active service, and when relieved of active service shall retain upon the retired list the rank and service held by him at the time of such relief, with pay and such increases as are prescribed in section 5 of this act.

Sec. 5. The annual rate of pay of any enlisted man retired under this act shall be $2\frac{1}{2}$ percent of the sum of his base pay and all permanent additions thereto at the time of his retirement, multiplied by the number of years of his service: *Provided*, That any enlisted man retired under this act who has been cited for extraordinary heroism in line of duty, or whose average marks in conduct during his service in the Coast Guard shall be not less than $97\frac{1}{2}$ percent of the maximum, shall be entitled to have his retired pay increased by an amount equal to 10 percent of the sum of his base pay and all permanent additions thereto at the time of his retirement: *Provided further*, That the retired pay of any enlisted man retired under this act shall not in any case exceed 75 percent of the sum of his base pay and all permanent additions thereto at the time of his retirement: *And provided further*, That the determination of the Secretary of the Treasury as to what constitutes extraordinary heroism for the purpose of this section shall be final and conclusive.

Sec. 6. (a) The provisions of this act shall be supplementary to, but shall not be construed to limit or supersede, existing laws relating to the retirement of enlisted personnel of the Coast Guard.

(b) The Commandant may prescribe such regulations which shall be subject to approval by the Secretary of the Treasury, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 18, after the word "from", insert the word "active."
Page 3, line 11, after the word "The", strike out "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert "Commandant."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WARREN). At this point the present occupant of the chair will be granted unanimous consent to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my deep appreciation to the House for its action in passing this bill by unanimous consent. Three similar bills were introduced in the House by Mr. BARDEN, of North Carolina; Mr. O'LEARY, of New York; and me. It has had widespread interest on both sides of the House, and especially do I desire to thank for their efforts the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Mr. BLAND, of Virginia; Mr. HART, of New Jersey; Mr. GIFFORD, of Massachusetts; Mr. BREWSTER and Mr. OLIVER, of Maine; Mr. CLARK, of North Carolina; Mr. McMILLAN, of South Carolina; Mr. PACE, of Georgia; and Mr. CALDWELL and Mr. PETERSON, of Florida, as well as others who have shown great interest in this legislation.

In previous sessions of Congress bills seeking the same objective met with the disapproval of the Coast Guard, the Treasury Department, and the Bureau of the Budget. For that reason Mr. BLAND, of Virginia, and I refused to have anything to do with those measures, because we knew it would be futile and we felt that we would be doing the surfmen in the Coast Guard a great disservice by advocating something when there was no chance of it becoming a law. About a year ago we asked the Treasury Department to try to work out a bill that would meet all the objections, and the bill we have just passed is the result of that conference.

There is no finer or nobler service on earth than the Coast Guard. Its long and distinguished record has been filled with brave and heroic acts and it has the respect and admiration of the people of the country. This bill seeks in a small way to give those men who have served as surfmen for as long as 20 years an optional retirement patterned somewhat on the law now in effect concerning the Navy. Its cost for the first 12 years will be nominal, and over a period of 20 years there will actually be a saving over the present system.

I congratulate the surfmen in the Coast Guard over this action of Congress, and, knowing them as I do from a long and close association with them, I know how deeply it is appreciated by them. While the bill does not contain everything that we might desire, it is a forward step and is justly deserved by this fine Service.

CONSENT CALENDAR

BRIDGE OVER MISSOURI RIVER, GARRISON, N. DAK.

The Clerk called the next bill on the Consent Calendar, S. 542, to further extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WARREN). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this a toll bridge or a free bridge? In the absence of an explanation, I will have to object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Yes. I will reserve the objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. That is only an amendment. The bridge was authorized last year. The two cities will have to agree as to what kind of a bridge it is. No one knows what will be done. It is only an authorization. This simply meets

a new location that the engineers recommended over the bill last year. The authorization was granted last year, but this is a new location which they recommend. It is up to the two cities. It is going to be a free bridge if it is built at all.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. Is this bridge going to be a publicly constructed bridge, or are private toll-bridge speculators and racketeers going to get this franchise and make a fortune at the expense of the general public?

Mr. GEHRMANN. No. It will be done by the cities. There is no question about that.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in view of that statement, I will withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River, at or near Garrison, N. Dak., authorized to be built by the State of North Dakota by the act of Congress approved February 10, 1932, and heretofore extended by acts of Congress approved February 14, 1933, June 12, 1934, May 24, 1935, June 5, 1936, and June 16, 1938, are hereby further extended 2 and 4 years, respectively, from June 12, 1938.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

BRIDGE OVER ST. LOUIS RIVER, DULUTH, MINN.—SUPERIOR, WIS.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 965, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Port Authority of Duluth, Minn., and the Harbor Commission of Superior, Wis., to construct a highway bridge across the St. Louis River from Rice's Point in Duluth, Minn., to Superior in Wisconsin," approved June 30, 1938.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Port Authority of Duluth, Minn., and the Harbor Commission of Superior, Wis., to construct a highway bridge across the St. Louis River from Rice's Point in Duluth, Minn., to Superior in Wisconsin," approved June 30, 1938, is amended by striking out "to the vicinity of the lower end of Banks Avenue extended to the shore line in Superior, Wis.," and inserting in lieu thereof "to such point in Superior, Wis., as the Harbor Commission of Superior shall designate."

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

BRIDGE OVER OHIO RIVER NEAR SHAWNEETOWN, ILL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4499, authorizing the county of Gallatin, State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near the city of Shawneetown, Gallatin County, Ill., to a point opposite thereto in the county of Union, State of Kentucky.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, the county of Gallatin, in the State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Ohio River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near the city of Shawneetown, Gallatin County, Ill., to a point opposite thereto in Union County, Ky., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

For like purposes said county of Gallatin, its successors and assigns, are hereby authorized to acquire by purchase any and all ferries operating across the said Ohio River within 10 miles on either side of the said bridge and to maintain and operate the same, or abandon the operation thereof, at the discretion of the said county of Gallatin, its successors and assigns, subject to the limitations contained in this act.

Sec. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the county of Gallatin, in the State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon land and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property in the State of Illinois and the State of Kentucky, including real estate and other property acquired for or devoted to public use or other purposes by the State of Illinois, or the State of Kentucky, or any other governmental or political subdivisions thereof, as may be needed for the location,

construction, maintenance, and operation of such bridge and its approaches, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation of private property for public purpose in said States, respectively.

Sec. 3. The said county of Gallatin, in the State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

Sec. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge and its approaches, including reasonable interest and financing cost, and the cost of the acquisition of any ferries as hereinabove provided, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 40 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

Sec. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 19, after the word "Illinois", strike out the remainder of the line.

Page 2, line 22, strike out "or the State of Kentucky."

Page 3, line 20, strike out the word "forty" and insert the word "twenty."

Page 3, line 23, after the word "of", strike out the balance of the line 23, all of lines 24 and 25, and on page 4, line 1, strike out the words "maintenance, repair," and insert "tolls. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

BRIDGE OVER RED RIVER NEAR THOMPSON, N. DAK., AND CROOKSTON, MINN.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5036, authorizing the State Highway Departments of North Dakota and Minnesota and the counties of Grand Forks of North Dakota and Polk of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Red River near Thompson, N. Dak., and Crookston, Minn.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, the State highway departments of North Dakota and Minnesota and the counties of Grand Forks of North Dakota and Polk of Minnesota, be, and are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Red River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Thompson, N. Dak., and Crookston, Minn., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

Sec. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the State highway departments of North Dakota and Minnesota and the counties of Grand Forks of North Dakota and Polk of Minnesota, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the States in which real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such States, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such States.

Sec. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

BRIDGE OVER ST. CROIX RIVER NEAR OSCEOLA, WIS.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5523, authorizing the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin to construct, maintain,

and operate a free highway bridge across the St. Croix River at or near Osceola, Wis., and Chisago County, Minn.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota be, and are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the St. Croix River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Osceola in accordance with provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

EXCLUSION FROM UNITED STATES OF PERSONS CONVICTED OF DESERTION WHEN UNITED STATES WAS AT WAR

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 156 and I ask for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 6035.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana to return to Calendar No. 156?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the Bergdoll bill?

Mr. HARNESS. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I shall not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill H. R. 6035?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That any person heretofore convicted of desertion from the military or naval forces of the United States, while the United States was at war, and who has heretofore proceeded to any foreign country to escape punishment for such offense, shall be deemed to have voluntarily relinquished and forfeited all rights and privileges of American citizenship as well as the right to become an American citizen, and shall not be readmitted into the United States, either temporarily or permanently, or for any purpose whatsoever.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Wolcott: Page 1, line 11, after the word "permanently", strike out the word "or."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar Nos. 145 and 146. These bills were objected to by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman can make his request as to only one bill at a time.

The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 145. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman from South Dakota assure the House that members of the committee reporting the bill will thoroughly explain it?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe they will. I have talked to the chairman of the committee, and I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Jones] at this time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it the intention, if this bill is enacted, to do something to help all the cotton farmers of the South and prohibit the importation of Indian cotton?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. If the passage of this legislation will result in the sale of more American cotton and wheat and less foreign cotton and wheat, I shall not object.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman is correct in judging the purpose of the bill. The present Farm Act sets up a formula for determining the annual acreage allotments on cotton and wheat. These two bills seek to establish a floor under which cotton and wheat acreages will not be permitted to go. They seek to protect the farmers against an acreage restriction that might destroy many of them.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no particular objection to returning to the bill, but I think, in fairness to the gentleman from South Dakota, I should advise him that I will ask to have the bill passed over without prejudice and not considered on the Consent Calendar because it involves a matter of agricultural policy. I am firmly opposed to the adoption of agricultural policies by unanimous consent. In the next couple of weeks in the ordinary course of events the Committee on Agriculture will have the call on Calendar Wednesday, and I think we should not be put in the position of adopting an agricultural policy by unanimous consent without having some debate on it.

I believe I know the purposes of this act. If I do, I am not so sure but what I am opposed to it. I do not want to prejudice the bill by objecting to it. I do want consideration given to this bill and the next bill under a rule, or under such other circumstances as will afford a hearing to those who might want to discuss it. For this reason I and others have made the same request in respect to all these bills on the calendar today that have to do with agricultural policy—that they be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that these bills would simply continue the provisions that are already effective this year; that is, those minimum limits below which the quota cannot be placed or made effective for 1 year.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think I understand what the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. JONES of Texas. This would make them permanent as a bottom level, that is all. It does not in any way change the basic nature of the Farm Act. I do not see why there should be any objection to continuing that as a policy. If something like this is not passed a condition might be brought about that would run these quotas so low as to cause great hardship.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not agree with the gentleman in that respect. We shall still have control of the situation and to regulate cotton acreage regardless of whether this bill is passed or not. If this be the case, if we are going to be denied any further consideration of this bill other than what can be had in these few minutes, then I will surely object to it to force consideration.

Mr. JONES of Texas. If the gentleman will permit, let me state the reason for having this matter enacted at this session. Congress will probably adjourn sometime this summer. The vote on the cotton program by the farmers is usually had in December, when we are not here. I feel as to both cotton and wheat that it is important that this matter be fixed before we adjourn.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that many of us who have not perhaps paid too much attention to cotton in years gone by have been giving a great deal of thought to it lately. I would like to take the floor some time to express my own thoughts on cotton, and to express what I believe were the fundamental reasons necessitating these allotments. I think it might be interesting to start a discussion and thresh out this whole thing, because we

surely have not determined the fundamental reason why it is necessary to make these allotments, and I think we should give some study to it.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The passage or failure of passage of these bills will not interfere with the gentleman's right to express his opinion either on this or any other issue connected with agriculture.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The mere fact that we may have made one mistake does not obligate us to continue to make them.

Mr. JONES of Texas. May I say to the gentleman that this does not affect the policy he is talking about except perhaps to make it less burdensome, if it may be termed a burden, on those who go along on the soil-conservation program. It simply puts a limit beyond which the policy may not go; in other words, it softens the policy rather than expands it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Texas a question?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman seems to feel that we should not agree to do things for the farmers of the United States.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The gentleman is talking. We want to make it possible for the farmers to have an even break in this country.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me the legislation that it was said was necessary to help the farmers of this country in the past few years has not been forthcoming by an act of Congress. As a matter of fact, we have not helped the farmers.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. How have you helped the cotton farmers when we are permitting the price of cotton to be increased so high we cannot sell it to foreign countries?

Mr. JONES of Texas. We can sell it if we could find somebody that has the money to buy it.

Mr. RICH. But you cannot.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Chair asked, in answer to my unanimous-consent request, if there was objection. I did not hear any objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] objected to the gentleman's request to return to the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTINGER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a memorial of the Florida State Legislature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two brief editorials on the Chamber of Commerce convention.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by the Honorable Louis J. Taber, master of the National Grange.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEYER]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow a subcommittee of the Committee on Claims may have permission to sit during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WARREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WARREN. A few days ago the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] notified the House and gave me personal notice that he was going to speak today for 1 hour on reorganization plan No. II. I am compelled to attend a very important meeting down at the War Department in a few minutes, and for this reason may I say to the gentleman I am very regretful that I will not hear his very fine speech.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is very kind of the gentleman.

Mr. WARREN. But may I add one thing? The last time the gentleman spoke he was accorded the unusual privilege by the House to speak for over the customary hour. He delivered, as he always does, a very entertaining and enlightening address. The first 55 minutes of that hour he used in a very fine analysis of the bill, and I think he had all of the Members of the House believing he was going to support the plan. Then in true justice of the peace fashion, in the last 5 minutes he decided in favor of the plaintiff and voted accordingly. I hope, now that the Senate has already acted, the gentleman will certainly approve of plan No. II.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. II

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, gentlemen of the House, you souls of rare fortitude who do me honor to stay here this afternoon while you might be engaged in far more pleasant and felicitous pursuits, let me say at the outset that I do want to discuss the reorganization plan which was approved by the Senate of the United States in a period of about 6 minutes, as nearly as I could estimate by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is a very clear and patent violation of the rules of the House for anyone to criticize or overtly comment upon the actions of another body. There is, of course, no restriction or inhibition on thinking, so I shall not violate the rules of the House, but I have been doing some thinking since the reorganization plan received approval.

In the course of my remarks I wish to say something this afternoon also on the subject of Argentine beef, because, oddly enough, it figures in very beautifully in connection with reorganization plan No. II.

It is estimated that this plan will save about \$1,250,000, and it applies to an aggregate of \$25,000,000 in salaries or wages. The President assures us there will be no other plan at this session of Congress. I entertain a sense of regret that this plan was passed so quickly. Certainly it could not have been examined by Members of another body in the space from May 9, when the message came to the Congress, until May 12, when the resolution of disaffirmance was acted on in another body. I have been devoting myself to it for the last 3 or 4 days almost exclusively and thought that it was a rather herculean task. So it is rather interesting to pick up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and observe that someone says there, "Of course, everybody is familiar with it." There in the part that is not blocked out as indicated on page 5502

of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 12 is how the reorganization plan went through another body. You go back and read the RECORD. I had to spend an hour to find it in the RECORD. It indicates pretty well what attention was paid to it by the members of another body.

You cannot pass off these reorganization matters so lightly, as a matter of fact, because there is more than usually meets the eye. I see in this last plan lots of good things, I will say to my distinguished friend from Missouri, who is the able chairman of our committee. I see a number of things that are illogical, and then I see one or two things that, in my judgment, are not in the public interest, and to those I shall address the major portion of my remarks this afternoon.

The first thing I want to call to your attention under the reorganization plan is the transfer of the functions of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in the Department of Commerce to the State Department, also the transfer of the functions of the Agricultural Foreign Service to the State Department. It is rather singular that we should concentrate our foreign-trade activities entirely in that department of government which is charged with the diplomatic negotiations for the country; and the one thing that will result, inevitably result, and it is the reason why, in my judgment, the State Department has been making this drive, is to predicate the considerations of foreign trade upon the ground of diplomacy and international politics. The very first evidence that we have of it is the letter the Secretary of State sent to the President advising him to buy this foreign Argentine beef for the Navy.

There are some exhibits that I can take from the current press to indicate that that is the case. First, let me show you a telegram that must have come to almost every Member, signed by Cathrine Curtis, national director of Women Investors in America, Inc., protesting the fact that this consolidation of our Foreign Service should be made in the State Department for the very good reason that it is going to mix diplomacy and foreign trade.

We heard a great deal about "dollar diplomacy" some years ago, and I am wondering whether we are going to see a revival of that kind of philosophy, which, in my judgment, is inimical to the best interests of this country; yet how are you going to escape it when all the functions that have been discharged by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce are now vested in the Department of State? We have been for years—in fact, for 25 years—building up that arm so we could develop foreign trade, foreign contacts, and marketing undertakings in foreign countries everywhere, and almost overnight, by reorganization plan No. II, all that work is undone. I do not say that Harry Hopkins would do a better job than the Secretary of State, but I am of the opinion, as we evaluate the effect of the reciprocal-trade agreements, that the job could not have been a lot worse in the interest of many lines of endeavor in this country and in the interest of American agriculture. But now all the eggs are in one basket and so diplomacy and international politics shall be mixed up with our efforts to revive and rehabilitate some semblance of substantial foreign trade.

I do not share all the confidence that a great many people have in the trade efficacy of the State Department. In the United States Daily, which appeared this morning on the Members' desks, was this little item to show that all the prescience and all the wisdom is not compounded in the State Department. Under "Washington Whispers," which you can read, you will find this statement:

Important officials in the State Department are quietly grumbling over what they described as "sensationalized" reports coming to the White House from at least one of this country's Ambassadors in Europe. The dope is that American diplomats have been making some terribly bad guesses and have been caught badly off guard in recent diplomatic maneuvers.

If they have been caught off guard in some of these maneuvers, what assurance have we that they will not be caught off guard in some of the trade maneuvers that are necessary for this country?

Another thing:

Word is going the inside rounds that American diplomats abroad had a hand in arranging a radio talk by the Duke of Windsor as part of the plan for mobilizing public sentiment against war.

Now, if our State Department officials are out playing with the Duke of Windsor to bring about an international radio speech in the field of international diplomacy, I wonder how safe they will be to be entrusted with all of the foreign trade relations of this country? This question, in my judgment, can be ended with a question mark.

One other item from the United States Daily:

The word "blackmail" is being used by very responsible and excellently informed Government officials to describe the tactics being employed by a few Latin-American nations to tap the United States Treasury for loans. The technique is said to be to suggest that the loan will be needed to be forthcoming or else concessions will be made to Germany and Italy and Japan. This technique is said to be proving very effective even where past borrowings from this country are in default.

Now, we have made it possible for the State Department, without restriction whatsoever, to employ that kind of technique as they go on pursuing foreign trade for this country. The morning papers have been full of it.

Here is a clipping from the morning Post. There was a dinner at the Willard Hotel last night—I believe it was last night—for the Brazilian Ambassador, and one of the speakers at the dinner was Dr. Maurice S. Sheehy, of a local university, and here is what he is quoted as having said:

Approving the President's purchase of Argentine beef for the American Navy, Dr. Maurice S. Sheehy, of Catholic University, last night warned that Senate opposition would lead to retaliatory bans by Argentina and drive that country into closer associations with totalitarian nations.

What more proof do we need to show that now there will be an admixture of foreign trade, of diplomacy, of mysticism, of secrecy, of closeted covenants, and of all the things that have been associated with diplomacy, and on that basis the American trade is to be predicated from here on out, as a result of reorganization plan No. 2, that was approved by the Senate in the space of 5 or 6 minutes. They say they knew what was in the plan.

Much more might be said about this matter, but here comes this little incident of Argentine beef that has already been ventilated on the floor this afternoon.

What was the purpose of buying this 48,000 pounds of beef and announcing to the country it was superior and that it was cheaper? Well, when I read that language, I will tell you what I was thinking. I thought of the first Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1933, and I see my friend ANDRESEN, of the House Committee on Agriculture, smile with his eyes over there. I thought of the first effort that was made to raise the price of farm commodities. I thought of dollar devaluation, taking grains of gold out of the dollar so as to make dollars cheaper in order to make prices higher. I thought of the marketing agreements. I thought of all the efforts that had been made, even including the purchase with relief funds of millions of cattle from the drought-stricken areas of the West. I thought of a sustained and consistent program designed to aid and assist the farmers of this country to build up prices, and then I see the ultimate results thrown into the discard when the President of the United States says that we ought to buy 48,000 pounds of beef from the Argentine to satisfy the delicate stomachs of the gobs, because it is cheaper. I wonder what the reaction of the American farmer will be to this? What difference does it make whether it embraces 48,000 pounds or 6,000 pounds or 48,000,000 pounds? The principle is just the same, and the power is now vested in the diplomatic branch of the Government to carry on its efforts to prevent the totalitarian nations from getting into South America, and so we might be buying more beef, we might be buying more oil, and a peculiar kind of nut they produce in South America out of which oleo oil is extracted.

All of these things are within the realm of possibility. I would not be surprised one of these days if they might not

conceivably say that we ought to take care of our delicate sailors on the high seas by providing Swiss cheese that comes from Switzerland on the ground that it is cheaper and allegedly better.

And while we are about it, we may as well see that the sailors get Canadian cream in their coffee in the morning upon the theory that it is cheaper, and also that we buy butter from Denmark and New Zealand because it is certainly cheaper. There is the logical and ultimate result of the thing that the President has produced for the country and that the Senate has seen fit not to disavow under reorganization plan No. II. Under that reorganization plan, foreign commerce will be directed now, not from the Department of Commerce, not by the Foreign Service Department of the Department of Agriculture, but by the diplomatic branch of the Government; and so we must reconcile ourselves now to an admixture of diplomacy and butter and beans and bacon and wheat and coffee and all the rest of it, which, in my judgment, is not in the interest of business, agriculture, and the labor of the United States of America.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I take this moment—and it is opportune—to congratulate the speaker and to thank him on my own part as a member of the Reorganization Committee, for his willingness and enthusiastic effort, even though it was futile. I wish to ask the gentleman one or two questions. Has the gentleman found out yet who the wise men were who advised the President and suggested those changes embodied in reorganization plan No. II, or even reorganization plan No. I?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think they were the spat-wearing, tea-drinking alumni of Harvard and Yale who man the State Department, as suggested by Paul Mallon. Mr. Mallon further says:

Transfer of the Foreign Commerce Bureau to the State Department was especially disheartening to morale. The State Department is regarded as the post graduate frat house for Harvard and Yale—and only the best frats at that. In the Foreign Commerce Bureau are non-spat-wearing, non-tea-drinking business students interested in commerce. Assistant Commerce Secretary Patterson once called them "shirt-sleeve workers" with an implied comparison that was obvious.

Somebody has been pushing it to identify our trade relations with the diplomatic branch of the Government, and now the interests of the American businessman are liable to be sidetracked and sacrificed if they stand in the way of the foreign policy that this country is going to pursue with respect to South America and other foreign nations. I am rather interested to know what the real pressure was behind it.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am also interested to know that. I can recall how for 15 years or something like that in this House—for several years at least—we fought to have this Commerce Department have businessmen in foreign countries soliciting trade. Now they are to be thrown among the spat-wearing, tea-drinking—oh, I wish I could think of the word that I wish to employ; but it is simply poisonous to try to mix these things. We tried so long and so hard to create a businesslike administration. Who advises the President to do this?

Mr. DIRKSEN. In that connection let me read this other paragraph from Mr. Mellon. He says:

Also businessmen have less confidence in diplomats than in commercial attachés. When the rule requiring them to communicate through the State Department was abandoned in 1937, correspondents picked up 200 percent in the month following.

They got out from under the rule of the State Department with respect to secrecy and closeted negotiations, with the mystery that surrounds it, and as a result, in a single month after that, correspondence on foreign trade and foreign business picked up by 200 percent. The gentleman has his answer, but it is too late to present it now. I add my feeble voice just like Ishmael shouted in the wilderness centuries ago, because the damage has been done. We have conferred upon the gentleman in the White House and the gentlemen who man the Department of State unrestricted authority to tell

the American businessman what is going to happen in the field of foreign commerce.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The State Department, with the President, has exclusive right to negotiate reciprocal-trade agreements, and we will now find, as a result of the beef incident, that that is just a foundation for an agreement with Argentina to further cut the duty on beef and other competitive farm commodities, so that those countries who enjoy the benefit of that reduction can ship things into this country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Precisely. If the Secretary of State believes that best subserves the good-neighbor policy, that is what will be done. There can be no mistake about it in the light of past experience. That is what we are up against.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Another observation: The Department of Commerce in the Bureau of Foreign Commerce has provided Members of Congress and the country with certain statistics and figures on exports and imports into this country.

I assume that particular activity will be turned over to the State Department. What confidence does the gentleman think we might have in these figures after that transfer takes place?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, that is a matter for every gentleman in the House to decide for himself. But let me make this observation before I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts: When they put the skids under George Peek, who was first Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Act—and they put the skids under him, make no mistake about it—he finally wound up as chief adviser on foreign trade to the President of the United States. George Peek is a man of vigor. He is a man of discernment. He was a very outstanding businessman. So he threw himself, heart and soul, into the job of devising authentic figures on foreign trade. He went at it with a vengeance and submitted his report. Do you know what else he submitted along with it? A recommendation, as chief adviser on foreign trade, that foreign trade and diplomacy should be divorced, and kept divorced. As a result there was introduced in the Senate by the late lamented Senator James Hamilton Lewis the bill S. 3464 in August 1935. That bill was designed to create a foreign trade board, and for other purposes. In this bill there is a recital "to provide for separate, unified administration of foreign commercial and financial activities of the United States as distinguished from diplomatic and political activities thereof."

George Peek, after a long and detailed investigation, saw the danger. He recommended it to Senator Lewis. That bill was introduced. Nothing was done. It was sidetracked, and today it is all concentrated now in that branch that carries on the diplomacy and international politics of this country, and our foreign trade must accept a position that is subordinate to diplomacy. What a tragic commentary upon reorganization plan No. II.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not know whether the gentleman was on the floor when I stated yesterday that I had heard from very reliable sources that the trade work that was done by some of the consuls had been taken away from them. Everyone knows that in some places there have been no commercial attachés and in those places our consuls have carried on the trade for this country, trying to sell our goods to foreign countries. That work has been taken away from those consuls and given to the diplomats, the reason being that the diplomats handle the reciprocal-trade agreements. I know the gentleman will agree with me that there is small chance in this reorganization plan, under this administration, of our merchants, our farmers, and our people selling their goods to foreign countries.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How much better it would have been if those activities had been reposed in the Department of Commerce, and they had been given extra authority in order to revive and revitalize our foreign trade. The long-headed

British and the long-headed businessmen even in Germany do not make that mistake. For instance, this came from the newspaper this morning:

Anglo-Nazi talk on trade will ease tension.

The projected talks date back to the March meeting at Dusseldorf between representatives of the faction of British industries and its German equivalent, Reichsgruppe Industrie.

They do not even care if there is a crisis over there. Oh, no. They never lose sight of trade; they never let diplomacy get mixed up with trade. The long-headed British traders, the German businessmen, even when at each other's throats, do not make that mistake. But now we put our foreign trade in the department of diplomacy, in the field of international politics. Perish the thought!

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, if cookie pushing and trade pushing were synonymous, then it would be perfectly proper to transfer the trade activities over to the diplomats. But a man cannot be putting in his time at pushing cookies and passing tea and expect to promote agreements and commerce.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder if the gentleman would not like to have a sentence from Washington's Farewell Address at this point, where he said:

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is in extending our commercial relations, have with them as little political connections as possible."

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to submit this question from the standpoint of practical application of the Argentine beef proposition: If you were running a retail grocery store in some city that was very, very friendly to President Roosevelt and his policies, and where you know that your customers are just as friendly as you are, would you not be inclined to capitalize on this particular incident by glorifying what the President had said, putting advertisements up in the windows and on the counters to the effect that "Argentine beef is the best beef in the world. It is recommended by the President of the United States."

Mr. DIRKSEN. What could be sweeter as an advertisement, I would say.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And therefore not only sell beef to the Navy and the Army, but put it into the homes of the people who are on relief and all such places as that. Why not turn all business over to the foreign countries? What do we want any in this country for?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now, I must get through with this. I will yield later if the gentleman desires.

There are some items here on which I do not have to spend much time. For instance, the transfer of Foreign Service Building Commission to the State Department. Quite all right. It was under the Department of the Secretary of State always. It has to do with keeping in repair our consular and diplomatic properties in foreign countries, and that is all right.

Transferring the Bureau of Lighthouses from Commerce to the Treasury. Rather singular. You know sometimes the President gets a little obscure in his reasoning. For instance, in this report No. II he transferred the Inland Waterways Corporation to the Department of Commerce on the ground that it was an aid to coordination of transportation. To me the Bureau of Lighthouses is certainly an aid to transportation. I ask, therefore, why it should have been transferred to the Treasury Department in the light of that statement? But I do not quarrel about it particularly, nor with the abolition of the Director General of Railroads.

Is it not rather amazing that we are just winding up the Government operation of railroads that was undertaken on the 26th of December 1917? It will soon be 22 years since

Uncle Sam took over the railroads. The War Finance Corporation that we set up to help finance the railroads was the R. F. C. of wartime. We have been all this time seeking to liquidate the claims and settle the disputes. Part of the files are down in the Commerce Department, some are in the General Accounting Office. The personnel files are over in the Civil Service Commission, and other files are down in the Budget Bureau. So, after 22 years, we are just beginning to wind up a governmental agency that includes the Director General of Railroads and the War Finance Corporation that should have been wound up a long time ago.

Federal Prison Industries Board should be in the Department of Justice. Nobody quarrels with that.

National Training School for Boys: I have one regret about that. It is that the board of trustees should have been abolished, including the consulting trustees. This training school, where they commit wayward boys, should be administered by the Prisons Bureau under the Department of Justice. That is the place for it. The consulting trustees of the National Training School for Boys, however, are our good colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MASSINGALE] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. As I read the language, the consulting trustees are also abolished. I hate to see my friend from Oklahoma, SAM MASSINGALE, abolished—I do not know whether he is here or not this afternoon—but then I am afraid he voted for the reorganization bill, so he cannot kick on being abolished at this point.

Then there is the Codification Board. There is no reason why Congress ever should have created a separate board for this purpose. It consists of three from the Department of Justice and three from the National Archives. This is turned over to Archives, where it belongs. Then there is the Coal Commission. We have heard it bandied around the Chamber that no tears were shed about the abolition of the Coal Commission, and this is true. It was a political stamping ground. At the last session of Congress I put figures in the RECORD showing how many jobs went to Kentucky, to West Virginia, to Pennsylvania, and some of the other favored States. Not even the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, who was supposed to have an abiding interest in the Coal Commission, could find occasion to weep a tear over its abolition; but while we are finding comfort in its abolition, Mr. Speaker, let me show you how the will of Congress in one respect has been beautifully abolished. When we set up the Coal Commission and passed the National Coal Act in 1937 I voted for it. I voted for the first act in 1935. When that bill was under consideration on the floor we set great store in preserving the independence of the consumers' counsel. He is the gentleman who is separately appointed by the President. He has authority under section 2 of the act to appoint his own employees, and we vested him with authority to sit at every hearing of the Coal Commission and to file protests; and we gave him authority by legal certificate to secure information from the Coal Commission.

When the Commission was set up the President of the United States appointed a good two-fisted independent to be consumers' counsel. It was John Carson, of Michigan, secretary to former Senator Couzens, and I say to you that he was an independent of independents. He served notice on the Commission to give him some information and they refused to do so. He went to the Attorney General and proposed to file suit against the Coal Commission or bring that kind of action that would mandamus them and get the information he wanted in the interests of the coal consumers of this country. I indicted the Coal Commission on the floor of this House on their own testimony before the Appropriations Committee last year. They brought a Budget—gentlemen, you can believe it or not—they testified that 2 days before they came before the committee they had not even seen the figures in the Budget. Fancy that sort of business! So they indicted themselves, I did not indict them. Then we got John Carson's testimony dealing with his difficulties in the Coal Commission. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Commission is abolished, the functions are abolished, the functions

are now vested in the Secretary of the Interior. The reorganization plan did not wipe out the Coal Act. Make no mistake about that. It is still on the books; the district boards will still be on the books, the need for a coal structure and a price structure is still there, and the Secretary of the Interior is going to make the set-up in order to effectuate the purposes of the act; but the reorganization plan says also that the consumers' counsel is abolished, and his functions are vested in the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior under the direction of the Secretary. You have done what?

The President of the United States has merged and destroyed the independence of the consumers' counsel, because they are all under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior under this plan, and unless I miss my guess, Mr. Speaker, you are going to hear a great deal more about this before the reorganization plan and its effects are put in moth balls.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman, who has studied this question carefully, tell us what, in his opinion, will be the number of jobs which will be taken away from the Coal Commission? Will it be limited to six of the seven members of the Commission who have been operating, or will it go into the whole structure of the Coal Commission?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The seven Commissioners will be abolished, likewise the consumers' counsel. All the attorneyships down there have been abolished. The jobs of all the other 1,200 people in the Coal Commission have been abolished; all the juicy patronage jobs have been abolished, because they are parts of the Commission.

If you ask me what the Secretary is going to do, I do not pretend to know, but I will say that the coal industry will know it has a boss when the Secretary of the Interior gets to working on it. Make no mistake about that. It will have a real boss. I regret that the independence of the consumers' counsel had to be destroyed. You never saw any intimidation of it in another body or any comment in the press as to the effect, so far as the consumers' counsel is concerned. So much for the Coal Commission.

There is a Bureau of Insular Affairs. I want to leave one thought with you on that. It is merged with the Division of Territories over in the Department of the Interior. That is all right. But I express this interest as to the future. As we know the act that we passed giving independence to the Philippines in 1946, if it becomes effective will make the Philippine problem purely a defense problem. We will have no more actual territorial administration than will be necessary, and most of the work of the Bureau of Insular Affairs deals with the Philippines. So I am wondering if in 1946 when independence may become an actuality it will be transferred back to the War Department.

Then there is the Bureau of Fisheries which is transferred over to the Department of the Interior from the Department of Agriculture or from the Congress, which I think is perfectly all right. It is in the interest of conservation and that is where it belongs.

I come now to the Bureau of Biological Survey. There is a lot of kick about taking that out of the Department of Agriculture. I have no complaint about that because if it is a conservation agency it will probably be all right to have it over in the Department of the Interior.

The next is the Mount Rushmore Memorial Commission, which is supervising the carving of the four huge heads in that granite mountain up in South Dakota. Their accounting has certainly been bad in the past and not what it ought to have been. We have had great difficulty in getting the whole story at times and I think it is in the public interest to transfer it where the President did transfer it, that is, to the National Park Service.

Then there is the Inland Waterways Corporation, which is the result of the Transportation Act of 1920 when the Secretary of War was empowered to promote waterway transportation in this country. In 1924 this Corporation was set up. I agree that it belongs in the Department of Commerce. Probably that is a good move. But there is

one thing that caught my fancy there. It has a subsidiary corporation known as the Warrior Terminal Line, which operates an 18-mile railroad down at Birmingham, Ala. I do not see anything in the reorganization message providing for the disposition of the Warrior Line; yet all of the capital stock of the Warrior is held by the Inland Waterways Corporation. It may be an oversight on my part. Maybe it did not come to my attention. For aught I know it might have been abolished long ago and put out of existence. I bring this to your attention because it came to my attention in the course of an examination of this matter.

Then there is rural electrification. I do not see my friend from Mississippi on the floor this afternoon. May I say with respect to transferring rural electrification to the Department of Agriculture that if the transfer of the Farm Credit Administration and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to the Secretary of Agriculture was all right, then this is all right; but in my first observations on plan No. 1, I did not concur in that transfer. I do not see why the Secretary of Agriculture has to be encumbered with every function, even though it may be remotely incident to rural activities. A far better place for rural electrification would have been to consolidate it with the Federal Power Commission or put it under the Federal Loan Agency, where they put Electric Home and Farm Authority under the first reorganization plan. I believe that would have been a far more logical place for this particular institution.

Now I want to get to something which, in my opinion, is not in the public interest. I refer to the preservation of functions of the National Emergency Council, which, in my judgment—and I say this without qualification—is the biggest piece of fakery in the Government establishment today. I talked here 3 or 4 weeks ago with two men who were State directors of the National Emergency Council, and they would bear out my statement if free to talk.

It was set up by Executive order in 1933. For some singular reason the President decided it ought to be abolished. So he entered an order abolishing it as of the 16th of September 1937. Later he amended the order and said it shall continue in existence until the 30th of June 1938, unless sooner abolished. I wonder what made him change his mind? First, he says, "We will put it out of business," and signed the order, issuing it from the White House; then suddenly he changes his mind and decides it ought to be retained. So it was retained.

In the Emergency Relief Act of last year we gave it life until the 30th of June 1939. Now, when the Relief Act for this year comes on the floor in a couple of months there will be a provision in that act to give the National Emergency Council another lease on life until the 30th of June 1940. Make no mistake about that. It will be there. I can tell you right now it is going to be there because the President, in his special relief message of the 27th of April, said he wanted legislation to continue it, and he wants one and one-half million dollars for the next fiscal year for the National Emergency Council.

What do they do? What kind of business do they perform? Let us take a look. I read all the testimony of the former executive director when he appeared before the Appropriations Committee last year. The first thing they do is to act as an information office. For whom? For radio commentators, newspapers, magazines—for anybody. That is his language when he testified before the committee. What else? They run a press intelligence service. How many people are employed? Forty-five. How much money is expended? Over \$62,000 a year. What do they do? They take from six to eight thousand clippings a day. They wear calluses on their fingers from using the shears. Clipping what? They clip over 400 newspapers daily. What happens? They get out a bulletin—a clipping bulletin. It goes to the head of every department in the Government every day.

What else do they do? They get out a magazine abstract. They abstract all the choice editorials and expository articles in the magazines everywhere, put them in a bulletin, and this

bulletin goes to the desks of all the leaders in the administration.

What else do they do? As the former Director testified:

We are here to answer questions for anybody who comes to Washington, including governors, mayors, and officials.

Oh, yes. It is very essential, in his language, that they get accurate information from the right source. Yes; he measures his language when he talks.

What else? They have a State director in every State in the Union, and in some cases these State directors hold two jobs. In Texas the W. P. A. administrator is also the State director of the N. E. C. In South Carolina the W. P. A. administrator is also the director of the N. E. C. In still another State the Federal Housing administrator for that region is the director of the N. E. C. There are 112 jobs in this agency paying in excess of \$4,000. There are 19 jobs paying over \$8,000 a year. Yes; some fat plums there, if you please.

What do these State directors do? They contact the legislatures. As the Director testified over there, they have to get the legislatures to consider enabling legislation to conform with what is going on in Washington. He said, among other things, that they had over 267 bills that were pending in the legislatures of the 48 States that should enable those States to get into line with the operations of the Federal Government. Yes, domination from Washington, if you please.

The N. E. C. had \$875,000 last year. How much for this next year? One million five hundred thousand dollars. That is what the President asked for in his supplementary message of April 27. Are there going to be twice as many newspapers to clip? Are they going to publish twice as many newspapers? Are there going to be twice as many magazines to abstract? What is the purpose of all this? You know what it is. It has put in the hands of the White House, where this activity has been transferred, the greatest political instrumentality this country has ever seen, and how beautifully it works.

Mr. Lowell Mellett, a man of ability, a man of capacity, one of the outstanding men for Scripps-Howard, is going to operate that end of the show. He is going to be one of the assistants, I understand, who, in the language of my friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], have a passion for anonymity. Yes, Lowell Mellett is probably going to get that job and will be the director of the functions of N. E. C. How beautiful it will be. First of all, you put out hand-outs from the White House. You put out canned phonograph records. Yes; no mistake about that. You saw what appeared in the press the other day, did you not? This is from the Washington Times of May 9:

In an electrically transcribed address which N. E. C. distributed to 150 local radio stations, the President charged that in some communities radio broadcasts were the only medium through which citizens could obtain factual and accurate information on their Government.

One of the N. E. C. jobs will be to send out these canned broadcasts from the White House to the little radio stations—to offset what? The fact that maybe they feel they are not getting a square deal in the newspapers. That is what part of the \$1,500,000 is going to be used for; and what a grand set-up it will be. Broadcasts go out, hand-outs go out, and then what?

Well, they have to find out what the public puke is. When you send up a trial balloon you have to get the reaction. Where do they get the reactions? The clipping bureau, the magazine abstracts. Oh, yes; it is a two-way operation. You test out public sentiment, then you get that great swing of reaction and so right into the White House it goes, not into the National Emergency Council. That is abolished. All the functions have been merged in the Executive Office of the White House. And we are going to pay the bill. The taxpayers are going to pay the bill to the extent of \$1,500,000 for the greatest political contrivance this country has ever seen. I do not asperse the President one bit when I say that. I am just giving you the fact as illustrated and demonstrated by all the evidence that has come to hand.

If you want to go further with your interpretation, you can. A certain distinguished Cabinet member has gone on a swing through the country. I do not know what for and nobody knows definitely about that. But here is the one-man N. E. C. Oh, that is the way to let anybody down in 1940 who is not agreeable to the man who presides over the destinies of the New Deal. They have given it to him here in the N. E. C., and he is going to use it. So he is going to offset those aspirants who are nurturing closeted thoughts as to what lies ahead in 1940; whether they be members of the Cabinet or whether they be presiding over some little dynasty far out in the Pacific, it does not make any difference. The President of the United States now has the N. E. C. vested officially in him by reorganization plan No. II, to be implemented by \$1,500,000 of good public funds.

When the relief bill comes on this floor in a couple of weeks or months, or whenever it is, the provision will be in there to extend the life of these functions until 1940. If there is any strength and any breadth left in this body, I will be on this floor in an effort to strike it from the bill and to do my best to stop it as an outrage upon the American people and the American taxpayers. [Applause.] Fancy the Republican Party coming up here and saying to the Congress, "Now, we have an office down on Jackson Place and we have 45 people working down there. What we want is \$1,500,000 or \$2,000,000 to run it until 1940."

There is just as much logic in that request as there is in keeping the functions of the N. E. C. alive under a very distinguished editor who is going to use it, as I see it, for political purposes; and to bear this out, here is a page from the testimony on the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938.

Listen to this; this is good.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, in questioning the Executive Director of the N. E. C., asked:

What is there in the picture to make you ask for \$1,000,000 for next year?

The Executive Director replied:

The first half of the fiscal year 1938 and the fiscal year 1939 are not comparable. So far as fiscal years are concerned, that period is comparable with 1936, because of the fact that the demands for information during an election year are tremendous as compared with the demands in an off year.

[Laughter and applause.]

That was the Executive Director of the N. E. C. testifying before the Committee on Appropriations—"the demands in an election year are so much greater in comparison with an off year."

Mr. Speaker, there is the story on reorganization plan No. II. And now, if there are any questions, I shall be pleased to yield.

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

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

Mr. SHORT. I infer from what the gentleman has said that the N. E. C. is a purely propaganda agency.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is no question about that.

Mr. SHORT. And its only function is to extol the virtues of the New Deal. Of course, it is necessary to continue the emergency in order to continue the New Deal, because it was founded upon emergency and continues to feed and fatten on emergency.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I will say to my friend from Missouri, life is just one crisis after another. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHORT. And I would like to say this to the gentleman, if he will permit, I think the Members would do well to bear in mind that Mr. Mussolini rose to power through his newspaper in Milano and Mr. Hitler has gained supreme power through Joseph Goebbels and his propaganda assistants. I do not want to charge that the man in the White House aspires to become a dictator, but I do want to point out that all dictators have risen to the zenith of their power through such propaganda agencies as the N. E. C., which the gentleman has so ably described.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is the first and the most necessary instrumentality.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not quite agree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] when he says that the New Deal has prospered and grown fat on this propaganda. I do not think it has grown fat, I do not think it has prospered, but I do think that what the gentleman really means is that it continues to live and maintain life, even though it is growing weaker, by virtue of these agencies. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SHORT. I accept the correction of my friend from Michigan. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. GIFFORD. I think the gentleman has possibly aroused in the hearts of some of us a little fear that reorganization plan No. II is not so good after all. But I want to ask the gentleman if he can visualize, in the event hearings had been held, whom we could have summoned to appear before the committee to give us information.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, we might have summoned the new Executive Director of the N. E. C. functions, but he probably would have said, "Well, I just do not know a thing about it." We might have summoned some of the department heads, but do you not know that they were cautioned that they must not talk to us relative to any reorganization plan.

Mr. GIFFORD. And the gentleman cannot possibly tell us who advised the President about this matter?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I have some thoughts on the subject, but I would not want to do anybody an injustice by having their names appear in print unless I was reasonably sure.

Mr. GIFFORD. It would, perhaps be doing an injustice.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I wish the gentleman would bring out, however, if he has the time, whether the Bureau of Lighthouses and the Coast Guard are going to be merged or fused or are they still to be kept separate with one man over them with assistants who know nothing about it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They are all going to be consolidated in the Coast Guard. That is my understanding from my reading of the language of the reorganization proposal, and to me it is rather singular that the President says in his message that he puts the Inland Waterways Corporation in the Commerce Department because it is a part of the transportation system and he wants to coordinate such activities there. Well, what in the name of Heaven is the Bureau of Lighthouses except an aid to water-borne commerce in the country, both along the coast and in the larger lakes regions.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to remind the gentleman that I feel, as I am sure many others here feel, we have had no opportunity to find out about how they are going to fuse these agencies or what they are going to do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My good colleague on the committee will recall that we were reproached somewhat for having rushed in a disavowal program when the first bill came along; but this plan came up on the 9th of May, and the very day it came up a disavowal resolution was introduced by the Senator from South Carolina, and they disposed of it in 5 minutes on the 12th day of May, ostensibly on the theory that all the great and learned legislators are presumed to know everything that was in it.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to remark here that for 2 long years I was on that committee before the gentleman came on the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. And we listened day in and day out and could get no information whatever as to what would be the effect if we created the sort of house they desired. They wanted a 12-room house, and at no time could we get anybody to say what they would put in the various rooms. We finally had to say that we would not build those rooms until they had at least some things to put in them, and lost our interest and

enthusiasm. It was this gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] who came in toward the end from the Committee on Appropriations, who has finally aroused in himself the enthusiasm and ability to tell you something. I could not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Do I understand the gentleman from Illinois to also intimate that if the N. E. C. were not in existence, these people would necessarily have to be hired by the Democratic National Committee?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have heard that intimation.

Mr. HINSHAW. And I have heard it intimated also that the birthday balls were being run by the N. E. C.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That has been stated. It is a most interesting development.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Getting back to the Argentine incident, it seems to me that the most reprehensible thing about that transaction was the statement of the President that that foreign beef is superior to the American beef.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I would like to know if the gentleman knows by what process the President arrived at that conclusion?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not the slightest idea, but the thing that has been going through my mind is that the American people have been eating this American beef and have found it palatable and wholesome, and I wonder why we must put the "gobs" of the Navy in a separate class and pamper dainty stomachs, and if that is the fact, let us find dainty food in other corners of the earth, to see that their nautical energies are preserved.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. No doubt the gentleman from Illinois is aware of the fact that in 1937 we imported over 41,000,000 pounds of canned corned beef into this country and that last year we imported more than 78,000,000 pounds of canned corned beef, and at the present time more than 90 percent of all of the canned corned beef consumed in this country is being imported in direct competition with the American producer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Paying direct and indirect benefits to help farm commodities, and then letting in these products in competition reminds me of the man who got caught in a mudhole with his automobile down near Atlanta some years ago. A farmer came out with his boy and a team and helped him get the machine out of the mudhole and at the end of that time he said, "How much?" The farmer said, "\$3." The automobile man then asked the farmer whether he pulled lots of people out of this mudhole, and the farmer said, "Oh, yes; 12 or 15 every day." Then the man said, "And do you also pull them out at night?" And the reply was "No," because at night the boy and himself were too busy filling the hole up with water again, and that is the way this program seems to work.

Permit me a final note by way of recapitulation. Of many things in the reorganization plan No. II every Member will heartily approve, even though they give no hint of substantial economies. One or two proposals seem a bit illogical, such as transfer of Lighthouses to the Treasury and Rural Electrification to the Department of Agriculture. However, these do not adversely affect the public interest very seriously and their transfer to these various departments is a matter of opinion. I have no quarrel with these.

But I deem it necessary to assert and reassert my opposition to the transfer of our foreign-trade functions to the Department of State. It would have been better to have transferred the functions incident to foreign trade and the negotiation of reciprocal-trade agreements to the Department of Commerce and kept them entirely free from diplomacy and international politics. Finally, the President could have done infinitely better by abolishing the N. E. C. and then

requesting a modest appropriation for the actual work of coordination that it might undertake instead of converting it into a propaganda agency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the next special order I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] for 20 minutes.

HOW IDLE GOLD SHOULD BE USED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the reason I have asked for this time is to discuss the gold that is owned by the United States Government. Under a law that was passed by Congress, the title to all gold in the United States is in the United States Government. That gold is in the mountains of Kentucky, and it amounts to \$15,855,697,899.86 as of May 10, 1939. When William Jennings Bryan was running for President back in 1896, he advocated the issuance of a certain kind of money. He was told by the best-informed bankers in America and in the world at that time that the best money in the world is money that has 40 cents in gold behind every dollar. And that is certainly good money. No one can dispute it. England remained on the gold standard for more than 100 years with less than 10-percent gold. So there is no reason why anyone should say that more than 40 cents in gold for each dollar should be used as a backing for money in this Nation or any other nation in the world. So that is good money. If we apply that principle today, we have enough gold; the Government owns enough gold to pay off or to issue or otherwise dispense or distribute \$39,637,000,000. That in addition to more than \$4,000,000,000 that could be issued on silver, according to present laws.

DISHONEST NOT TO USE THIS GOLD

Now, it occurs to me as being not only wrong but absolutely dishonest for this Government to continue to borrow money and issue tax-exempt, interest-bearing bonds for the purpose of obtaining that money when it has sufficient gold and silver reserves to pay off the entire national debt. So I, for one, am opposed to any more bonds until we use this gold. There is no reason why it should not be used. If you owned a railroad and you had thousands of extra idle box cars, would you be buying more box cars? If you needed \$100,000 in your business and you had \$100,000 in the bank, would you go and borrow \$100,000 to use in your business? No. You would use the money that you have.

SAVE BILLION DOLLARS A YEAR INTEREST

So here is this Government with all this enormous gold and silver reserve, enough to pay off the entire national debt and save more than \$1,000,000,000 a year in interest, not using it—idle; absolutely idle. I say it is a dishonest policy and should not be permitted.

Now, who is responsible for it? Is the President responsible for it? Is the administration responsible? Is the Congress responsible? I say that the responsibility is on Congress—the House and Senate. It is on all of us. We should make it possible for that gold and silver to be used for that purpose. Would you issue it all at once? No. That would not be the right thing to do. It would probably destroy our currency system to issue it quickly. No one is advocating that. But I do say that you can adopt a policy, after making this gold available, of eventually paying off and retiring the entire national debt and, pending such payment, to use it to pay the running cost of the Government and for other purposes that money is needed by the Government. Why should we continue to issue bonds in view of this situation?

HOW MUCH IS A BILLION DOLLARS?

Do you know how much a billion dollars is, which we could save each year by the retirement of this national debt? I

will tell you how much a billion dollars is, as far as one comparison goes. Last year one and three-quarter million people received old-age assistance. Three-quarters of a million children received benefits through the dependent children provision of the social-security law, and 50,000 blind people received benefits through social security. Those three groups received \$500,000,000 in all. So the amount we are paying in interest on the national debt that should not be paid, that over a period of time should be liquidated by the Government's own credit, is twice as much as those two and a half million people received last year from State and Federal governments.

EQUAL TO \$30 FOR EVERY SCHOOL CHILD

It is equal to \$30 for every child in America who is between 5 and 17 years of age. That is what a billion dollars amounts to.

EQUAL TO \$7.70 PER CAPITA A YEAR

A billion dollars is equal to \$7.70 a year for every man, woman, and child in America. So it is worth saving and can be used for a better and more beneficial purpose than it is being now used.

I know what the stock argument is against this proposal. Our critics will say, "Why, that will cause inflation; the banks issue a lot of money; then if the Government puts out a lot of money it will cause inflation." But there is a way of preventing that. In years gone by a bank could accept deposits which, in effect, means it could extend loans equal to \$10 for every \$1 that the bank had. These reserve requirements were raised in 1937.

The soldiers were going to be paid \$2,000,000,000, and some of these people who have much to do with our financial policies said it was going to ruin the country, and they had a law passed that would permit them to raise the reserve requirements of banks so as to plow under some of that money, and they succeeded in the passage of that law. But the result was when this money was paid out to the veterans and business and trade was stimulated and helped and the country was going back on the road to prosperity, the Federal Reserve Board put the brakes on too quickly by raising the reserve requirements of banks, which resulted in plowing under and destroying more than \$3,000,000,000 of potential credit. So they were determined to see that the veteran money did not do any harm, and they did something that was disastrous. So that was the cause of the depression at the end of 1936 and the beginning of 1937. Then the reserve requirements were changed again to make it a little easier.

The point I am making is this: That by changing the reserve requirements of banks as this money is paid out by the Government, there is no danger in the world of an excess amount of money or inflation. We can change the reserve requirements from 10 to 1, as it was, to 8 to 1, as it is now with some banks, and, as the Government puts out more money, 6 to 1, 5 to 1, 4 to 1, or 2 to 1, and the time will come when 100-percent reserve requirements could be required in order to prevent any inflation of the currency.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. There would have to be an amendment to existing legislation in order to permit raising those requirements in accordance with the need if the plan the gentleman has outlined were carried out. Am I not correct?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is correct in the statement that it would require a change in existing law.

Since we have this gold, why should we not use it? Why permit it to remain idle in a mountain in Kentucky? Why take it out of one mountain and put into another mountain? Is there any logic to that? Is there any reason? If we have it, why not use it?

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. What about the money that was taken from the banks for which we issued gold certificates? Would the gentleman pay them back in gold? What would

the gentleman do with them? What is the amount of these certificates?

Mr. PATMAN. We have in gold certificates outstanding today \$2,858,000,000 actual gold certificates issued to the Federal Reserve banks in the denomination of \$100,000, because they are not in general circulation. I presume the banks decided it was too much trouble even to print those gold certificates, so they commenced the policy of just accepting a credit on the books and have a make-believe transaction of a gold certificate's passing.

Ten billion three hundred and eighty-three million dollars of gold is tied up in a credit to the Federal Reserve banks. Not even a gold certificate is issued on it. As for the remainder, some is in the gold redemption fund as a backing for the United States notes, with which the gentleman is familiar; \$1,800,000,000 is in the stabilization fund; and some is in the general fund of the Treasury.

The argument is made that the Federal Reserve banks have title to this gold. They do not. They have no title in the world. It is a fictitious transaction entirely, it is a subterfuge. The Federal Reserve banks cannot get this gold unless the gold is needed to pay off or liquidate international balances, or unless it is to be used in the arts, trades, or sciences. These are the only reasons for which this gold can be obtained, and the Federal Reserve Bank has no title whatsoever to this gold.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD OWN THE 12 FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

Now, here is the way this gold can be used: The national banks of the country and a few of the State member banks own \$134,000,000 of stock in the 12 Federal Reserve banks. There is no reason why they should own it, it just gives them a right to receive 6 percent on an investment of that much. It does not help the Federal Reserve Bank, it is too insignificant to cover the billions of dollars of transactions handled by these banks. It is not needed for any reason whatsoever. The Government should reimburse those banks this \$134,000,000 and should take charge of these 12 Federal Reserve banks. I know the argument will be made that the Government is getting into business. No; that is not right. It is no more getting into business when it takes over the 12 Federal Reserve banks than it is getting into banking by operating the United States Treasury; it is exactly the same thing. These 12 Federal Reserve banks do not do business with individuals, they do not do a private business; they do a governmental business. They operate for the Government by issuing the Government's credit. It being a governmental function, therefore, the Government should control that governmental function, and that governmental function should not be performed by directors and officials of privately owned institutions and by selfishly interested banking officials of this country.

The people who are interested in money, the banks—they have a selfish interest just like anyone—would have to operate in their own interests. They are under no oath or obligation to operate in the public interest; no, they are under obligation to operate in the interest of their stockholders and the banks that they represent. So, were the Government to purchase the stock of these 12 Federal Reserve banks, take over these gold certificates and this gold, and adopt an orderly policy of liquidating the national debt it would not only save eventually this \$1,000,000,000 a year that we are paying on tax-exempt interest-bearing bonds but it would give the people a much-needed medium of exchange with which to do business.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman amplify just a little more his statement with reference to liquidating the public debt? I am exceedingly interested in the gentleman's address. Will the gentleman amplify the program he has in mind for ultimately liquidating the present national debt in view of the continuous increase in that debt from year to year?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I can tell you my view of how it can be done.

Mr. KEEFE. I would like to get the gentleman's view.

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

Mr. PATMAN. I would have the Government purchase the stock in the 12 Federal Reserve banks. These 12 Federal Reserve banks would then be owned by the Government. The open-market committee could gradually purchase Government bonds as they are offered at the market, as they become due, or as they become callable, and purchase these bonds on the credit of the United States and, if necessary, backed by the gold we have in the hills of Kentucky. I know it would take a long time to do that. It is not a program that should be quickly gone into or hastily executed. It would take probably 10 or 15 years, probably 25, but the entire national debt can be liquidated in this way, and safely liquidated, just as today the Federal Reserve banks own \$2,500,000,000 in Government bonds. Where did they get those bonds? They purchased them in the open market. That is the only way they can acquire them. They have no right to buy them directly from the Treasury. So, in the same way other Government bonds can be acquired.

In fact, the Federal Reserve banks have almost gone out of the business for which they were organized. They are only holding Government bonds, bought with Government credit, on which the Government continues to pay interest. Last year the total operating expense of the Federal Reserve System amounted to \$37,000,000. More than \$35,000,000 of it was paid with interest on Government obligations that had been purchased on the credit of the Government. When the Federal Reserve banks buy bonds the interest should cease, and it would cease if the Government owned these banks.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. If the Government were to take over the Federal Reserve banks, and I favor that policy, it would not change the volume of money issued or in circulation and it still would not change the credit situation or the bank-check money, which is 95 percent of all the so-called money used in this country.

Mr. PATMAN. It could if you issued a mandate. I would give this Board a mandate and would provide in the law that in the event it did not carry out the mandate any official of the Board could be removed by the passage of a resolution by either House of Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. It would still take legislation directed against the Board?

Mr. PATMAN. It would take legislation; yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. If the gentleman's theory is correct that the Government can issue printing-press money to extinguish the national debt because we have gold in the hills of Kentucky, would it not also be possible under that principle to further reduce the gold content of our American dollar, print more money, and repeal our tax laws?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is bringing up something which he may discuss himself. Does the gentleman claim that money which is backed by 40-percent gold is printing-press money? Is that his definition of printing-press money?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, the gentleman does not know much about the subject or I do not know much about it. He is the first man in official life I have ever known to say that such money so backed by 40-percent gold is printing-press money.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. It is inflation and printing-press money and the New Deal might just as well debase the gold content of the dollar some more, print more money, and stop collecting taxes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD on this subject and on another subject, and to include a resolution passed by a farmers' organization.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a brief speech made by the president of the Lincoln Memorial University.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Immigration may be allowed to sit all day Wednesday in order to hold hearings.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is that agreeable to the Republican members of the committee?

Mrs. O'DAY. I do not know. I am just making the request.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what bills are going to be considered by the Immigration Committee?

Mrs. O'DAY. There are a number of bills that we had up last year.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Is it the intention of the committee to have hearings on the Wagner-Rogers bill on Wednesday?

Mrs. O'DAY. We have witnesses coming in on various immigration bills.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. It is not the intention to have hearings on the Wagner-Rogers bill?

Mrs. O'DAY. We are not. I do not know about any other committee.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I mean the Immigration Committee.

Mrs. O'DAY. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mrs. O'DAY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include the heading of a petition sent me by a number of citizens of the Black Hills of South Dakota.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to take exception to the remarks last week credited to the President of the United States when he announced his approval of a purchase of 48,000 pounds of Argentine corned beef for use by the United States Navy. The President is supposed to have justified the purchase on the grounds that the Argentine beef is not only "cheaper" but "better" than the American-grown product.

As to the imported beef being cheaper in price, there is no argument. Argentine beef is produced under much cheaper conditions, and in a country where the standard of living is lower and where the tax burden is less than in the United States.

If price is the consideration, then this country could save hundreds of millions of dollars by purchasing all of its requirements in the foreign market and thereby building pay rolls for the alien coolies and peasants of foreign lands. We could save millions of dollars by purchasing German steel for our battleships and for our Government buildings, but John L. Lewis and the United States Steel Trust will not permit that. If you think so, just look back to 1937, when German steel started to underbid American steel on certain Govern-

ment contracts. Very quietly and somewhat mysteriously the tariff on steel was promptly raised to shut the foreign product entirely out of the market. We bought no German steel.

In this connection it might be mentioned that in the year 1937 alone American steel was protected by tariff to the tune of \$731,000,000, every penny of which was paid by the American public. In that 1 year American consumers could have been saved \$731,000,000 by buying their steel abroad, but our benevolent Government saw to it that the American steel producer was protected, and I do not disagree with that policy if it is as consistently followed in the case of other American industries.

But, unfortunately, this is not the case. Agriculture has no John L. Lewis wielding the "big stick" in its interest. Agriculture has no great monopoly of land ownership to ward off foreign competition. And so the Polish hams and the Argentine corned beef and the foreign fats and oils continue to pour into the American market, while good old Iowa hog lard dips in price to an all-time low.

The amusing part of it all is, however, that the President has been misled by his economic advisers. The Argentine beef is not cheaper than our domestic beef. It just appears to be cheaper.

Figured on the basis of an 800-pound steer in the Argentine, which would dress approximately 52 percent, or 516 pounds of dressed meat after it is deboned, we would have 250 pounds of corned beef. At 9 cents a pound, this would net the Argentine farmer \$22.50, assuming that the hide and byproducts would pay processing costs.

Let us compare this with a Nebraska steer of equal weight. Allowing 50 cents per hundred for transportation and marketing costs, the Nebraska steer would have to sell at \$22, or \$2.75 per hundred, to compete with Argentine beef.

But the Argentine beef costs us more than \$22.50, because we must also tax ourselves to pay the Nebraska farmer to take out of production the four acres required to produce 800 pounds of beef. This will cost us approximately \$40, so that the total costs of the Argentine beef is in reality \$62.50.

This is not all, however. Because of the peculiar turn-over of money in our domestic economy, each dollar of farm income translates into \$1 of factory pay rolls and \$7 of national income.

Therefore, if we produce the steer ourselves, we will have both the steer and the money. On that basis let us give the Nebraska farmer \$9 per hundred for a good 800-pound range steer, or \$72, then the 250 pounds of corned beef would cost the Government 28.8 cents per pound, and our Navy would have a good quality of beef.

The Nebraska farmer would have the \$72 that the packer would have to draw out of our capital structure. The \$72 when spent by the Nebraska farmer will create \$72 of factory pay rolls in the United States and \$514 of national income or dollar turn-over in goods. Deducting the \$72 to buy the meat for our Navy, we still have the use of \$442 of good United States money, and we will have added \$72 of permanent capital to our capital structure.

And to those Congressmen who are representing industry, I suggest that you ponder the question of whether we would not all be better off to trade out \$72 with our Nebraska farmer and get the turn-over of our own dollar than to trade \$22.50 worth of other goods with Argentina and then tax ourselves to pay for both the beef and for curtailing production.

Now, as to Argentine beef, fresh, salted, or "corned willie" variety, being superior or even equal in quality to the pampered product of the Iowa feed yards, no Iowan, no mid-westerner, no Texan—in fact, no true connoisseur of the noble art of what is what in gastronomy—can possibly agree. Can it be that our discerning and otherwise discriminating Chief Executive has never experienced the unforgettable delight of sinking his teeth into a juicy, succulent Sioux City T-bone steak cut from the left loin of an Iowa corn-fed steer? If not, I respectfully recommend the adventure. And as an Iowa farm boy who has raised his own 4-H blue-ribbon baby beef, as a "suey" stick swinger who has piloted many thousands of fattened steers from stockyard pen to packing house,

and as a citizen who has since accumulated considerable heft and paunch as the result of a steady diet of midwestern meat, I feel impelled to conclude my remarks simply by saying that our President, in extolling the alleged superiority of Argentine beef, either speaks from lack of gastronomical experience or he just must have been misinformed. [Applause.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MALONEY, for 10 days, on account of official business.
To Mr. HAVENNER, for 8 days, on account of official business.
To Mr. FERNANDEZ, for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

To Mr. SHANLEY, for today, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 964. An act creating the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 16, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will hold public hearings on Tuesday, May 16, 1939, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 3835, a bill to authorize the Post Office Department to cooperate with the several States in the collection of State taxes.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs in room 1310, New House Office Building, at 10:30 a. m. May 16, 1939, for the consideration of H. R. 6069, to promote the efficiency of the national defense.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Indian Affairs at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday next, May 17, 1939, for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 117, H. R. 2390, H. R. 5002, H. R. 5409, and H. R. 5451.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be meetings of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday and Thursday, May 17 and 18, 1939, for the public consideration of various private bills.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

A subcommittee of the Committee on Patents will hold hearings in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building, on Tuesday, May 23, 1939, at 10:30 a. m., on H. R. 3605, a bill to provide a permanent force to classify patents, etc., in the Patent Office. Hon. JOHN M. COFFEE (Washington) is chairman of the subcommittee.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

There will be a public hearing before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary on May 24, 1939, at 10 a. m., on the bill (H. R. 2318) to divorce the businesses of production, refining, and transporting of petroleum products from that of marketing petroleum products. Room 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings in room 219, House Office Building, at 10 a. m., on the bills and dates listed below:

On Wednesday, May 31, 1939, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 4985, relating to fishery educational service in Bureau of Fisheries (CALDWELL); H. R. 5025, purchase and distribution of fish products (BLAND); and H. R. 5681, purchase and distribution of fish products (CALDWELL).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

743. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal years 1935 and 1937, amounting to \$14,412.12, and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1939 amounting to \$235,070, in all, \$249,482.12 (H. Doc. No. 292); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

744. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation of \$713,200 for domestic air-mail service, Post Office Department, for the fiscal year 1940 (H. Doc. No. 293); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

745. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill for the relief of John L. Hicks, rural rehabilitation supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Santa Rosa, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Claims.

746. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 24, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of Choctawhatchee River, Ala. and Fla., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted January 11, 1938; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

747. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 24, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of Franklin Canal, La., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted April 4, 1938; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

748. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 24, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Chincoteague Bay, Accomac County, Va., with a view to providing a protected anchorage and harbor for small boats at Chincoteague, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

749. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 24, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Oyster Creek, Anne Arundel County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved June 20, 1938; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

750. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 24, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of waterway from Chesapeake Bay, through Accomac County, Va., to the Atlantic Ocean, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved June 20, 1938; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

751. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 24, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of Bayou Queue de Tortue, La., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted April 4, 1938; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

752. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for salaries and administrative expenses, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the fiscal year 1939, amounting to \$350,000 (H. Doc. No. 294); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

753. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for salaries and administrative expenses of Electric Home and Farm Authority, Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Export-Import Bank of Washington, for the fiscal year 1940 (H. Doc. No. 295); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

754. A letter from the Chairman, the Textile Foundation, transmitting the annual report of the Textile Foundation for the fiscal year ending December 31, 1938; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

755. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 50 items from the Department of the Navy which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

756. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 24 items from the Department of the Interior which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

757. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of six items from the Department of the Interior which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

758. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 96 items from the Panama Canal which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

759. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 16 items from the Department of Labor, which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

760. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 211 items from the Department of Commerce, which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

761. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 44 items from the United States Civil Service Commission, which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

762. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 10 items from the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

763. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 68 items which the United States Maritime Commission has recommended should be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

764. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers from the Post Office Department, Postal Service, which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

765. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 2,597 items from the Department of Agriculture which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2310. A bill to provide national flags for the burial of honorably discharged former service men and women; with amendment (Rept. No. 615). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 2413. A bill for the protection of the water supply of the city of Ketchikan, Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 616). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 4497. A bill to prescribe rules for the enrollment of Menominee Indian children born to enrolled parents, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 617). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 5506. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the State Water Conservation Board of Montana and the Tongue River Water Users' Association for participation in the costs and benefits of the Tongue River Storage Reservoir project for the benefit of lands on the Tongue River Indian Reservation, Mont.; without amendment (Rept. No. 618). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Indian Affairs. House Joint Resolution 264. Joint resolution to approve the action of the Secretary of the Interior deferring the collection of certain irrigation construction charges against lands under the San Carlos and Flathead Indian irrigation projects; without amendment (Rept. No. 619). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAVENNER: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 5766. A bill to provide for the acquisition of drydock facilities for the Navy on San Francisco Bay, and to authorize the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 620). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HESS: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 499. An act to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1909, as amended, so as to extend commissary privileges to civilian officers and employees of the United States at naval stations beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 621). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 588. An act to provide for an additional midshipman at the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2566. A bill to limit the authority of circuit judges to hold district courts and of district judges to sit in circuit courts of appeals; without amendment (Rept. No. 623). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 625. Report on the disposition of executive papers in the Department of Agriculture. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 626. Report on the disposition of executive papers in the Works Progress Administration. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 627. Report on the disposition of executive papers in the Department of the Interior. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 628. Report on the disposition of executive papers in The National Archives. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 629. Report on the disposition of executive papers in the Federal Reserve System. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 630. Report on the disposition of executive papers in the United States Food Administration. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 631. Report on the disposition of executive papers in The National Archives. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 632. Report on the disposition of executive papers in the Tennessee Valley Authority. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 633. Report on the disposition of executive papers in the Department of the Treasury. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 634. Report on the disposition of executive papers in the Department of the Interior. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 635. Report on the disposition of executive papers of the War Industries Board. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 6109. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Niagara River at or near the city of Niagara Falls, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 636). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 4965. A bill for the relief of J. Harry Walker; without amendment (Rept. No. 624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5699) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Jones; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6287) for the relief of Alfred P. Hay; Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6312. A bill conferring citizenship upon alien World War veterans; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 6313. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 6314. A bill authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Osage Tribe of Indians on account of their lands sold by the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 6315. A bill authorizing an appropriation to provide office facilities for the county and home demonstration agent in the Miami, Okla., post-office building, and for kindred purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SCHULTE:

H. R. 6316. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate within the District of Columbia the sale of milk, cream, and ice cream, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1925; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 6317. A bill to provide for the retirement of certain members of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SIROVICH:

H. R. 6318. A bill to amend the civil-service law to permit certain employees of the legislative and judicial branches of the Government to be transferred to positions under the competitive classified civil service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6319. A bill to amend section 6 of title I of the act entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government," approved March 20, 1933, as amended; to provide out-patient treatment for non-service-connected disabilities of World War veterans who have 50-percent disability directly incurred in, or aggravated by, service in the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 6320. A bill to establish the status of funds and employees of the United States Naval Academy laundry; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 6321. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTON:

H. R. 6322 (by request). A bill for the extension of admiralty jurisdiction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 6323. A bill to provide for the creation of the George Rogers Clark National Memorial, in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6324. A bill to provide for the more expeditious settlement of disputes with the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6325. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate interstate commerce in bituminous coal, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 6326. A bill to amend the act to provide for the retirement of disabled nurses of the Army and the Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 6327. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to adjust the compensation of certain employees in the Customs Service," approved May 29, 1928, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6328. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by section 34 (c) of the Customs Administrative Act of 1938 (U. S. C., 1934 edition, Supp. IV, title 19, sec. 1001, par. 1529 (a)); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 6329. A bill to give the American market to the American farmer on all Government purchases of food products raised in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. J. Res. 294. Joint resolution providing for the presentation by the President of the United States of a certain monument to the people of Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM:

H. J. Res. 295. Joint resolution providing for the reassertion of a foreign policy of genuine neutrality for the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOSER:

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution to print House Document No. 212, with "Concurrent Resolution No. 12, adopted March 16, 1939", deleted, and the legend "Not printed at Government expense" substituted; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. Res. 192. Resolution proposing the appointment of a select committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the

facts concerning the purchase of Argentine beef; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. Res. 193. Resolution for the observance of Flag Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Concurrent Resolution No. 26, with reference to section 73 of the Hawaiian organic act; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Concurrent Resolution No. 69, with reference to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Resolution No. 29, with reference to freight rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Assembly Joint Resolution No. 6 with reference to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Assembly Joint Resolution No. 3, with reference to the development of Playa del Rey Harbor; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Resolution No. 15, concerning the Bankhead Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Concurrent Resolution No. 22; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 15; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 22; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their legislative Resolution No. 31, concerning Missouri River navigation; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Memorial No. 1 and Senate Memorial No. 3, with reference to claims; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Joint Resolution No. 49-A, with reference to H. R. 4723, to correct the military record of Oberlin M. Carter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 6330. A bill for the relief of Greco Canning Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 6331. A bill granting a pension to Belle Musgrove; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Ohio:

H. R. 6332. A bill granting a pension to Josephine Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 6333. A bill for the relief of Mary Alexina McKinnon; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McANDREWS:

H. R. 6334. A bill for the relief of the estate of Clarence Waldrep; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 6335. A bill granting a pension to Teresa G. McDonough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan:

H. R. 6336. A bill for the relief of Addie White; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHUETZ:

H. R. 6337. A bill for the relief of Anastazja Nowik; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 6338. A bill for the relief of Paul G. Lorenz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 6339. A bill for the relief of Frances Wetterer; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6340. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Plozy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 6341. A bill granting a pension to Catherine Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 6342. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Ennis; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6343. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Armstrong; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee:

H. R. 6344. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Hamilton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VREELAND:

H. R. 6345. A bill for the relief of Theodore R. Flohl; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia:

H. R. 6346. A bill for the relief of the dependents of Earl E. Rice, a deceased World War Veteran; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 6347. A bill granting a pension to Onie Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 6348. A bill granting a pension to Stranger Horse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

3047. By Mr. ANDERSON of California: Resolution, requesting the President of the United States and the officials of the Departments of the Treasury and Interior to take necessary steps to make available the sum of \$20,000,000 for the construction of the Shasta Bypass Tunnel, the Shasta Dam, and the Shasta Dam power plant, and thereby enable the contractors to reemploy thousands of workmen which they have been compelled to lay off because of inadequate funds, the said resolution, which is signed by Frank M. Shearer, president, and W. B. McFarland, secretary, Local Painters' Union, No. 1146, Redwood City, Calif., being signed and adopted April 13, 1939; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3048. Also, resolution, favoring legislation for additional funds to continue work of the Public Works Administration, said resolution, which is signed by Mayor L. I. Hitchcock, City Clerk K. Z. Mansfield, and approved by City Councilmen James R. Bengard, Romilda Dedini, H. P. Fanning, P. W. Henry, all of King City, Calif., being adopted and signed May 3, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3049. By Mr. BOEHNE: Petition of Mrs. Ivan C. Emily, Crandall, Ind., and others, petitioning help to promote the general welfare of the people of the United States by securing the passage of legislation which will stop, so far as is possible by Federal law, the great advertising campaign for the sale of alcoholic beverages now going on by press and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3050. By Mr. BUCK: Petition of Margaret Harvey and 40 others, of Sacramento, Calif., urging that the Seventy-sixth Congress enact the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3051. By Mr. COCHRAN: Memorial of the faculty and students of the Notre Dame College, South Euclid, Ohio, regarding the proposed Neutrality Act, submitting five suggestions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3052. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Resolution of the Clackamas County Central Labor Council, of Oregon City, Oreg., Richard G. Hoover, executive secretary, pointing out that Japanese aggression against China affects economic life of American people and that citizens of the Pacific coast are virtually unanimous in their denunciation of Japanese aggression and ruthless treatment of the helpless Chinese, asserting that 54 percent of all materials comprising Japanese munitions are obtained in the United States, and therefore urging the prompt consideration and approval by the Congress of House bill 5432; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3053. By Mr. DEROUEN: Petition of the faculty and students of Notre Dame College, South Euclid, Ohio, praying for the enactment of a more rigid Neutrality Act designed to keep the United States out of any foreign entanglement or war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3054. Also, petition of the Townsend Club of Lake Arthur, La., endorsing House bill 2 and Senate bill 3, and urging the passage and enactment into law of this legislation during the present session of Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3055. Also, petition of the Townsend Clubs of Iota and Welsh, La., endorsing House bill 2 and Senate bill 3, and urging the passage and enactment into law thereof this session; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3056. By Mr. DISNEY: Petition of the American Association of University Women, Tulsa, Okla., relating to revision of the neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3057. Also, petition of Cleo Farr Post, American Legion, Salina, Okla., relating to transfer of the United States Employment Service; to the Special Committee on Government Organization.

3058. By Mr. FULMER: Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to consolidate the administration of the laws touching social security, public welfare, and the Works Progress Administration under one department, submitted by J. E. Hunter, clerk, house of representatives, Columbia, S. C.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3059. By Mr. GEYER of California: Petition of Nellie Pratt, Los Angeles, Calif., and 29 others, petitioning the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3060. Also, petition of Bertha I. Hamilton, Los Angeles, Calif., and 29 others, petitioning the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3061. Also, petition of Louella M. McDonald, Los Angeles, Calif., and 29 others, petitioning the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3062. Also, petition of Mary S. Harrison, Inglewood, Calif., and 51 others, petitioning the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3063. Also, petition of Anna M. Deems, Los Angeles, Calif., and 17 others, petitioning the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3064. Also, petition of Nelson E. Graham, Los Angeles, Calif., and 20 others, petitioning the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3065. Also, petition of Swan A. Swanson, Los Angeles, Calif., and 29 others, petitioning the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3066. Also, petition of C. A. Wagner, Los Angeles, Calif., and 29 others, petitioning the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3067. Also, petition of Jennie E. Smith, Los Angeles, Calif., and 59 others, petitioning the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3068. Also, petition of George L. Smith, Los Angeles, Calif., and 59 others, petitioning the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3069. Also, petition of W. P. Rogers, Los Angeles, Calif., and 75 others, petitioning the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3070. Also, petition of William G. Radtke, Los Angeles, Calif., and 119 others, petitioning the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3071. Also, petition of Mrs. J. V. Lippitt, Los Angeles, Calif., and 29 others, petitioning the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3072. Also, petition of Joe V. Shaffer, Los Angeles, Calif., and 59 others, petitioning the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3073. Also, petition of Carl G. Bergstrom, Los Angeles, Calif., and 20 others, petitioning the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3074. Also, petition of Olive B. Chamberlain, Los Angeles, Calif., and 29 others, petitioning the Seventy-sixth Congress

to enact the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3075. Also, petition of Effie I. Ellsworth, Torrence, Calif., and 29 others, petitioning the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3076. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the United Federal Workers of America, Local 53, New York City, favoring the passage of House bill 960; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3077. Also, petition of the faculty and students of Notre Dame College, South Euclid, Ohio, concerning pending neutrality legislation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3078. Also, petition of Grand Lodge, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio, concerning the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

3079. Also, petition of Eastyarn, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Wagner-Rogers bill; to the Committee on Labor.

3080. Also, petition of Sears Oil Co., Inc., Rome, N. Y., concerning the extension of the Connally Act, Senate bill 1302 and House bill 4547; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3081. Also, petition of the International Baby Chick Association, Kansas City, Mo., concerning the Fair Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

3082. Also, petition of the New York Board of Trade, Inc., New York City, concerning House bill 5220 and Senate bill 2065, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3083. Also, petition of the executive committee, National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Washington, D. C., concerning Senate bill 2098 and House bill 5535; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3084. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of the Prairie States Democracy, Winona, Ill., endorsed by citizens of Centerville, Iowa, urging the right of the people to rule; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3085. By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of Local No. 7, United Rubber Workers of America, of Akron, Ohio, relative to preventing any amending of the present National Labor Relations Act at this time; to the Committee on Labor.

3086. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the San Francisco District Industrial Union Council, San Francisco, Calif., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to the Works Progress Administration deficiency appropriation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3087. Also, petition of Jacquelyn Mamacalay, San Francisco, Calif., urging consideration of a petition with reference to the Works Progress Administration deficiency appropriation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3088. By Mr. PFELFER: Petition of the National Consumers League, New York City, concerning the Norton bill (H. R. 5435); to the Committee on Labor.

3089. Also, petition of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, Washington, D. C., opposing the Norton bill (H. R. 5435); to the Committee on Labor.

3090. Also, petition of the executive committee, National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Washington, D. C., opposing Senate bill 2098 and House bill 5535; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3091. Also, petition of the New York Board of Trade, Inc., New York City, opposing consideration at this time of House bill 5220 and Senate bill 2065; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3092. Also, petition of the Consumers' League of New York, New York City, opposing amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act, which permits lower wages for industrial home work in rural areas; to the Committee on Labor.

3093. Also, petition of the Grand Lodge, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio, opposing all proposed

amendments to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

3094. Also, petition of the International Baby Chick Association, Kansas City, Mo., concerning the Norton amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor.

3095. Also, petition of the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets, Albany, N. Y., urging an appropriation of \$500,000 for Dutch elm disease control; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3096. Also, petition of the Sears Oil Co., Inc., Rome, N. Y., opposing extension of the Connally Act, Senate bill 1302 and House bill 4547; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3097. Also, petition of the United Federal Workers of America, New York City, Local No. 53, urging support of House bill 960; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3098. By Mr. DISNEY: Petition of the Bartlesville Central Trades and Labor Council, Bartlesville, Okla., relating to Senate bill 472; to the Committee on Labor.

3099. By Mr. SANDAGER: Petition of sundry citizens of Providence and Pawtucket, R. I., requesting the passage of legislation which will stop, so far as possible, by Federal law, the great advertising campaign for the sale of alcoholic beverages now going on by press and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3100. By Mr. SCHAEFER of Illinois: Petition of the East St. Louis, Ill., Industrial Union Council, G. W. Parvin, president, C. S. McKinley, secretary, opposing the amendment of the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

3101. Also, petition of Martin Quirin and 49 other citizens of Smithton, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2, known as the General Welfare Act, which embodies provisions of the Townsend old-age pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3102. Also, petition of the United Office and Professional Workers of America, Chicago, Ill., opposing amendments to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

3103. Also, petition of Grand Lodge, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, unanimously adopted on May 9, 1939, at Second Quadrennial Convention at Cleveland, Ohio, opposing proposed amendments to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

3104. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Resolution of the Michigan Unemployment Compensation Commission, urging amendment to title IX of the Social Security Act granting right of transfer of contributions of an employer from one State unemployment compensation fund to the unemployment compensation fund of another State, with the allowance of the credit offset of 90 percent as of the date on which the contribution was originally paid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3105. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Letter of Frank E. Locke, Sherman, S. Dak., urging passage of House Joint Resolution 138, to refund hog-processing taxes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3106. Also, petition of Farmers' Union, Fifth District of South Dakota, J. A. Peters, secretary, protesting against the trade and foreign policies of the present administration as likely to lead to war and the destruction of domestic prosperity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3107. By Mr. CURTIS: Petition of the Legislature of Nebraska, concerning the subject of navigation on the Missouri River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

3108. Also, petition of the Legislature of Nebraska, concerning the subject of freight rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3109. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the New York Typographical Union, No. 6, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 591, concerning the United States Housing Act of 1937; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3110. Also, petition of the Lions Club, Davenport, Iowa, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to war supplies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3111. Also, petition of the Chattanooga Central Labor Union, Chattanooga, Tenn., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 1305, concerning Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Education.

3112. Also, petition of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Washington, D. C., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 2098 and House bill 5535, concerning the Federal Home Loan Bank Board; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3113. Also, petition of the Council of the City of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to the United States Housing Authority; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3114. Also, petition of the Council of the City of New York, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to the Wagner-Rogers bill, concerning immigration and naturalization; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3115. Also, petition of the General Gorgas Post, No. 1, the American Legion, Birmingham, Ala., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to the Dies committee, investigating un-American activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 16, 1939

(Legislative day of Monday, May 8, 1939)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Frederic F. Briggs, D. D., of Beverly Hills, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we come to Thee in our weakness and ask for Thy strength; we come to Thee with our imperfect knowledge and ask for Thy wisdom; we come to Thee with our sin and ask for Thy forgiveness. Help us ever to keep in mind our dependence upon Thee and that apart from Thee we can do nothing.

We thank Thee for Thy manifold mercies to us as a nation. May we never be guilty of the sin of ingratitude, and may we be willing to assume the responsibilities which go with our blessings. We thank Thee for our independence as a nation, and pray that we may never seek to be independent of Thee; we would not if we could; we could not if we would. Help us to remember that we are in this world not to do our own will but the will of God. Give us diligence to study Thy word, to learn Thy will, and to have courage to do it.

In the midst of a world torn by strife and hatred grant that we may be at peace with all mankind. Be with us, Lord, lest we forget. Thou who hast been our shepherd in the past continue to lead us in the paths of righteousness and honor for Thy name's sake. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, May 12, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Borah	Chavez	Frazier
Andrews	Brown	Clark, Idaho	George
Ashurst	Bulow	Clark, Mo.	Gerry
Bailey	Burke	Connally	Gibson
Barbour	Byrd	Danaher	Gillette
Barkley	Byrnes	Davis	Green
Bilbo	Capper	Donahay	Guffey
Bone	Caraway	Ellender	Gurney

Hale	Lodge	O'Mahoney
Harrison	Logan	Overton
Hatch	Lucas	Pepper
Hayden	Lundeen	Pittman
Herring	McKellar	Radcliffe
Hill	McNary	Reed
Holman	Maloney	Russell
Holt	Mead	Schwartz
Hughes	Miller	Sheppard
Johnson, Calif.	Minton	Shipstead
Johnson, Colo.	Murray	Slattery
King	Neely	Smathers
La Follette	Norris	Stewart
Lee	Nye	Taft

Thomas, Okla.
Thomas, Utah
Tobey
Truman
Tydings
Vandenberg
Van Nuys
Wagner
Walsh
Wheeler
Wiley

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent on official business for the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent on business of the Senate.

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

RECEPTION TO PRESIDENT SOMOZA—ACKNOWLEDGMENT FROM CONGRESS OF NICARAGUA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following cablegram from the President of the Congress of Nicaragua, which was ordered to lie on the table:

[Cablegram]

(Translation from the Spanish)

MANAGUA, NICARAGUA, May 12, 1939.

The honorable PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,

Washington, D. C.:

The friendly reception and the significant demonstrations extended to the President of Nicaragua by the Honorable Senate bind our democracies more closely in their common destiny and solid continental interests, and through you we express to this high body our most cordial acknowledgments.

Very truly,

AURELIO MONTENEGRO,
President of the Congress.
MARIANO ARGUELLO VARGAS,
Secretary.

ENOC AGUADO,
Secretary.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE DURING RECESS—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the 12th instant,

The following message was received by the Secretary from the House of Representatives on May 15, 1939: That the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 572) to provide for the common defense by acquiring stocks of strategic and critical materials essential to the needs of industry for the manufacture of supplies for the armed forces and the civilian population in time of a national emergency and to encourage, as far as possible, the further development of strategic and critical materials within the United States for common defense, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. FADDIS, Mr. CLASON, and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference; that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6260) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; and that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 964) creating the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.