Ralph C. Leader; Hy. Meineke, all of Houston, Tex., in behalf of House bill 5620, the proposed General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5278. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry, "The Father of the United States Navy"; to the Committee on the Library.

SENATE

SATURDAY, AUGUST 5, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, August 2, 1939)

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

The Reverend Duncan Fraser, assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O gracious Father, we humbly beseech Thee for the United States of America; that Thou wouldst be pleased to prosper it with all truth, in all peace. Where it is corrupt, purify it; where it is in error, direct it; where in anything it is amiss, reform it. Where it is right, establish it; where it is in want, provide for it; where it is divided, reunite it; for the sake of Him who died and rose again, even Jesus Christ, Thy Son, 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, August 4, 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 Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	Lodge	Shipstead
Andrews	Downey	Lucas	Smith
Ashurst	Ellender	Lundeen	Stewart
Austin	George	McCarran	Taft
Bailey	Gerry	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Bankhead	Gibson	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Barkley	Guffey	Miller	Townsend
Borah	Gurney	Minton	Truman
Bulow	Hale	Murray	Tydings
Burke	Harrison	Nye	Vandenberg
Byrd	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Hayden	Pepper	Wagner
Capper	Herring	Pittman	Walsh
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Colo.	Russell	White
Clark, Mo.	King	Schwartz	
Connally	La Follette	Schwellenbach	
Danaher	Lee	Sheppard	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SLATTERY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on important public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On August 3, 1939:

S. 2065. An act to provide for the regulation of the sale of certain securities in interstate and foreign commerce and through the mails, and the regulation of the trust indentures under which the same are issued, and for other purposes; and

S. 2666. An act providing for the exchange of certain park lands at the northern boundary of Piney Branch Parkway, near Argyle Terrace, for other lands more suitable for the use and development of Piney Branch Parkway.

On August 4, 1939:

S. 281. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930;

S. 522. An act to provide pensions to members of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who become disabled by reason of their service therein, equivalent to 75 percent of the compensation payable to war veterans for similar service-connected disabilities, and for other purposes;

S. 683. An act for the relief of Fae Banas;

S. 755. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Borg-Warner Corporation;

S. 1322. An act for the relief of Dorothy Clair Hester, daughter of E. R. Hester;

S. 1558. An act to provide for the acceptance of an easement with respect to certain lands in New Mexico, and for other purposes;

S. 1722. An act for the relief of Hannis Hoven;

S. 1773. An act to provide that no statute of limitations shall apply to offenses punishable by death; and

S. 1882. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Ross.

TAX EXEMPTION—AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 127)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed:

To the United States Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 2139, an act "To exempt from taxation certain property of the American Friends Service Committee, a nonprofit corporation, organized under the laws of Pensylvania for religious, educational, and social-service purposes."

The purpose of the bill is to exempt from taxation the property situated in square 153, in the District of Columbia, described as lot 804, being 1708 New Hampshire Avenue Northwest, which property is used as a residence for students attending educational institutions in the District of Columbia.

In recommending disapproval of the bill, the President of the Board of Commissioners raises a number of fundamental objections. The basic theory upon which exemption from taxation is granted certain institutions is that the exempted institutions perform work which might otherwise have to be carried on by the Government at the expense of the taxpayers and conversely that the exemption of such institutions contributes to the continuance of their work, thereby materially lessening the burden upon the taxpayer. In the instant case, the exemption of this property from taxation would increase the tax burden on other residents of the District of Columbia, since the use of the premises as living quarters for students of different nationalities, 50 percent of whom are reported as Americans, does not in any sense relieve the local government of any definable public burden. As a matter of fact, such exemption would unfairly discriminate against and create a precedent for similar demands from numerous other university organizations, fraternal and otherwise, which provide living quarters for students in the District of Columbia.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

I concur in the objections and adverse recommendation of the Board of Commissioners and am, therefore, withholding my approval of this bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 4, 1939.*

PAYMENT TO SAN CARLOS APACHE INDIANS—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 128)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 18, a bill "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 bill provides, by a declaration to that effect, for the payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians of $33,725 for 232,320 acres of land. It would appear, however, that this represents in reality a payment at $1.25 per acre, for such ceded lands as have been included in homesteads, national forests, power sites, public water reserves, and State of Arizona school land grant, lien or indemnity selections, an area much smaller than that named in the bill.

The bill further provides that, after payment for the lands that have been included in homesteads, and so forth, the remaining acreage of ceded lands shall be reopened to location and entry under the public-land and mineral-entry laws of the United States. While I would not favor legislation that would provide for the payment to the Indians of $1.25 per acre for this remaining acreage, I would favor its restoration to the Indians. The provision of the pending bill reopening these lands to public entry, and thus depriving the Indians of the future use of the lands and even of their present receipts from such lands, appears to me definitely objectionable.

It seems to me that this legislation is also objectionable because of its specific description of a payment for a total of 232,320 acres of land when it is apparent that the amount provided in the bill represents payment for a very much smaller acreage.

In these circumstances, I feel that this matter should receive the further consideration of Congress, and that I would not, therefore, be justified in approving the present bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 5, 1939.*

INTERLOCKING BANK DIRECTORATES—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 126)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, Senate bill 2150, "An act to amend section 8 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' particularly with reference to interlocking bank directorates, known as the Clayton Act." If it was in the public interest in 1935 for the Congress to decide to terminate these relationships, it is in the public interest to terminate them now. Affected banks and affected directorates have had over 4 years to make adjustments. That would seem to be a liberal time.

If the Congress wishes to reverse itself and allow interlocking directorships in the future, it can, of course, do so. But I do not think that the Congress should nullify its policy, declared in 1935, by extending interlocking directorships for another 4 years on top of the 4 years' extension which has already been given.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 5, 1939.*

CELEBRATION OF ANNIVERSARY OF WRITING OF THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER (S. DOC. NO. 129)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation for the Commission for Participation in the Celebration of the Anniversary of the writing of The Star-Spangled Banner, amounting to $5,000, fiscal year 1940, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST SESSION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The VICE PRESIDENT, under the terms of House Concurrent Resolution 33, agreed to subsequently today, appointed the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], members, on the part of the Senate, of a joint committee to make plans and suitable arrangements for fitting and proper exercises, to be held on February 1, 1940, in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the commencement of the first session of the Supreme Court of the United States.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS, ETC., AFTER FINAL ADJOURNMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 35, which was read, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 35

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, notwithstanding the adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign any enrolled bills or joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and which have been examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills of each House and found truly enrolled.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for the present consideration and adoption of the resolution.

The concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

NATIONAL ADVISORY HEALTH COUNCIL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1540) to adjust the compensation of the members of the National Advisory Health Council not in the regular employment of the Government, which were, on page 1, lines 9 and 10, to strike out "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert "Federal Security Administrator", and on page 2, lines 6 and 7, to strike out "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert "Federal Security Administrator."

Mr. BAILEY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House. The amendments are wholly clerical in character.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolution of the Senate of the State of Massachusetts, which was referred to the Committee on the Library:

Resolutions memorializing Congress in favor of the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry, "the father of the United States Navy"

Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States a bill providing for the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry, known as the father of the United States Navy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts records itself in favor of said bill and respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact the same into law; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Commonwealth send a copy of these resolutions to the presiding officers of both branches of the Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

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

Assembly Joint Resolution 132

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to convey to the State of Wisconsin certain federally owned property at Tomah

Whereas the Federal Government owns a tract of land containing about 360 acres at Tomah, Wis., with certain buildings thereon, which the Federal Government heretofore has used for an Indian school; and

Whereas all of this property, excepting the hospital, has been idle for the past 4 years; and

Whereas this property with the buildings thereon, including the hospital, could be used by this State for veteran activities or for other important State purposes; and

Whereas it is considered that the Federal Government would be willing to convey this property to the State of Wisconsin rather than permit it to lie idle and deteriorate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Wisconsin Legislature respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to convey to the State of Wisconsin the federally owned property at Tomah, including all buildings thereon, which heretofore has been used as an Indian school; be it further

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

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

Senate Joint Memorial 16

To the Honorable President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, President of the Senate of the United States, and the Honorable Anthony J. Dimond, Delegate from Alaska:

Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in fourteenth regular session assembled, respectively represents:

Whereas the Federal Government officials are again advocating the setting aside of Admiralty Island, off the coast of Alaska, as a national park reserve; and

Whereas there is no need or demand on the part of the people of Alaska or other parts of the United States for such reservation; and

Whereas the national-park reservations in the Territory of Alaska have not been administered to the best interests of the people of the Territory and the United States; and

Whereas in national parks already existing in the Territory predatory animals have been allowed to increase and scatter to other parts of the Territory and to maraud to the great destruction of other game and fur-bearing wildlife, both within and without the national parks; and

Whereas it is a matter of record that residents and settlers who have been brought within the bounds of national-park reservations in Alaska in the past have been persecuted and harassed by Park Service officials for the purpose of forcing them to move out of such boundaries: Now, therefore—

Your memorialist strongly urges that Admiralty Island, off the coast of Alaska, do not be made a national-park reservation and that there be no other national-park reservations made in the Territory of Alaska on the grounds that they have proven detrimental to the best interests of the Territory and the United States.

And your memorialist will ever pray.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a petition from J. W. Stockton, Rensselaer, Ind., praying for reconsideration of the loan program in the interest of farmers, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a petition from Fairbanks (Alaska) Mine Workers Union, Local No. 444, praying for inclusion of the W. P. A. amendments in a pending appropriation measure, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a petition from Iron Workers Local No. 172, Columbus, Ohio, praying for inclusion in a pending appropriation measure of a prevailing wage-scale provision for workers under the W. P. A., which was ordered to lie on the table.

PENSIONS TO DISABLED WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. AUSTIN presented a resolution adopted by the convention of the American Legion, Department of Vermont, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there are a great number of World War veterans throughout the country who are totally and permanently disabled for gainful employment through various causes and who still are ineligible for the $30-per-month non-service-connected pension by reason of the stringent regulations covering physical examinations: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, by the Department of Vermont, American Legion, in convention assembled this 29th day of July 1939, That Congress and the Veterans' Administration be asked to liberalize the requirements of the pension so that unemployability where it exists, and is proven, shall be a first consideration in the adjudication of such claims, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Vermont delegation in Congress, and to the Veterans' Administration in Washington.

ARTHUR M. FIELDS, JR.—POSTHUMOUS COMMISSION TO GRADUATE OF THE NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate passed a bill authorizing the President to issue a posthumous commission to a graduate of the Naval Academy, class of 1939, who died at the Naval Academy Hospital before he received his commission. I have received from the father of this young man a letter of appreciation, which I ask to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. B. KLEINERT RUBBER CO.,
New York, August 3, 1939.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: Thank you for sending to me a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which is recorded your presentation of a bill authorizing the President to issue a posthumous commission of ensign to my son Arthur, Jr.

I noted with considerable interest that you had met Arthur at the exercises of presentation of awards. Although you had but a momentary glimpse of the boy, when compared to my 23 years with him, I believe that you, too, can see, as I do, that such things do not "add up." Just now two and two no longer add up to four.

You are right when you state that a commission issued to Arthur would be of comfort to his mother and myself, in that he was truly a Navy man and throughout his illness could see nothing except the day when he would join his ship and view the blue Pacific. His becoming an officer of the United States Navy, we know, would be the one thing he would want, and which wish we desire so much to satisfy.

I want to thank you, as does his mother, for the efforts that you have put forward in his behalf.

Sincerely yours,

A. M. FIELDS.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 4108. An act to provide for the transfer of United States Employment Service records, files, and property in local offices to the States;

H. R. 6259. An act for the relief of Jack D. Collins; and

H. R. 6808. An act for the relief of Matilda Larned Bouck.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6898) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain helpless and dependent children of veterans of the Civil War.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2 to the bill (H. R. 5681) to authorize the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation to purchase and distribute surplus products of the fishing industry, and that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3 and 4 to the bill, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6379) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker has affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 628. An act to allow the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to extend the period of amortization of home loans from 15 to 25 years;

S. 1617. An act for the relief of John Nicholas Chicouras;

S. 2654. An act to amend subsection (n), section 77, of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, concerning payment of preferred claims;

H. R. 1428. An act for the relief of First Lt. Samuel E. Williams;

H. R. 2049. An act for the relief of Olin C. Risinger;

H. R. 2096. An act for the relief of Lucile Snider and Cliff Snider, Jr.;

H. R. 2250. An act for the relief of Frank Malles, Jr.;

H. R. 2344. An act for the relief of James McConnachie;

H. R. 2363. An act for the relief of the estate of Harvey T. Combs;

H. R. 2440. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Smith;

H. R. 3122. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River near The Dalles, Oreg.;

H. R. 3156. An act for the relief of Anna E. Hurley;

H. R. 3172. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Fiske Warren;

H. R. 3676. An act for the relief of C. E. Hendrickson and Stephenville Hospital, Stephenville, Tex.;

H. R. 3689. An act for the relief of the Columbus Iron Works Co.;

H. R. 3853. An act for the relief of Floyd Elton;

H. R. 3933. An act for the relief of Otho L. Curtner;

H. R. 3962. An act for the relief of Grace Campbell;

H. R. 4033. An act for the relief of Albert R. Rinke;

H. R. 4062. An act for the relief of Clarendon Davis;

H. R. 4072. An act for the relief of Emmitt Courtney;

H. R. 4141. An act for the relief of Celia Press and Bernard Press;

H. R. 4252. An act for the relief of J. George Bensel Co.;

H. R. 4275. An act for the relief of Harry Vrountas and Theodore Vrountas;

H. R. 4300. An act for the relief of Anton Saganey, John J. Beatty, Frederick J. Coppenrath, Joseph R. Driscoll, Edward A. Morash, and Michael L. Siderowicz;

H. R. 4482. An act for the relief of Byron MacDonald;

H. R. 4549. An act for the relief of William H. Radcliffe;

H. R. 4554. An act for the relief of Francis A. Leete and Sarah Leete;

H. R. 4601. An act for the relief of Paul W. McCoy;

H. R. 4606. An act for the relief of the Toledo Terminal Railroad Co., of Toledo, Ohio;

H. R. 4616. An act for the relief of M. F. Gubrud;

H. R. 4725. An act for the relief of William L. Rull;

H. R. 4726. An act for the relief of James W. Gilson;

H. R. 4831. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and interpreter of the Menominee General Council, members of the Menominee Advisory Council, and official delegates of the Menominee Tribe;

H. R. 4875. An act for the relief of Mamie Hoffman;

H. R. 4885. An act for the relief of James M. Harwood;

H. R. 5115. An act for the relief of Harry W. Lyle;

H. R. 5259. An act for the relief of Mrs. Layer Taylor;

H. R. 5266. An act for the relief of Mina Keil;

H. R. 5338. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John Eckendorff, and Mr. and Mrs. Alexander G. Dorr;

H. R. 5348. An act for the relief of certain postmasters;

H. R. 5350. An act for the relief of Caryl Burbank, Preston A. Stanford, and Fire Association of Philadelphia;

H. R. 5383. An act for the relief of H. A. Dixon;

H. R. 5491. An act to pay salary of Ruth Dornsife;

H. R. 5557. An act for the relief of V. H. Scheuring, Elmer Eggers, and Thomas Fahey;

H. R. 5607. An act for the relief of George A. Meffan, United States marshal, district of Idaho;

H. R. 5698. An act for the relief of H. H. Rhyne, Jr.;

H. R. 5704. An act to amend Private Law No. 310, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, an act for the relief of D. E. Sweinhart;

H. R. 5803. An act for the relief of Clyde Equipment Co.;

H. R. 5845. An act to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the shore of North Carolina at or near Wrightsville Beach, New Hanover County;

H. R. 5857. An act to amend Private Act No. 286, approved June 18, 1934, entitled "An act for the relief of Carleton-Mace Engineering Corporation";

H. R. 5894. An act for the relief of John E. Garrett;

H. R. 5895. An act for the relief of James D. Larry, Sr.;

H. R. 5923. An act for the relief of Simon A. Brieger, as legal representative of the estate of Thomas Gerald Brieger, a deceased minor;

H. R. 5931. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Hessman;

H. R. 5951. An act for the relief of the heirs of Emma J. Hall;

H. R. 5953. An act for the relief of Marie Heinen;

H. R. 5998. An act to amend section 32 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to extend the times for commencing and/or completing the construction of other bridges over the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1935;

H. R. 6021. An act to repeal the minimum-price limitation on sale of the Akron, Ohio, old post-office building and site;

H. R. 6271. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Secretary of the Interior, the State of Washington, and the Great Northern Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate either a combined highway and railroad bridge or two separate bridges across the Columbia River at or near Kettle Falls, Wash.;

H. R. 6362. An act for the relief of Annie Bearden, Ruth Bearden, Essie Burton, Beatrice Carter, Mary Cobb, Addie Graham, Annie Grant, Sallie Harris, Minerva Holbrooks, Omie Keese, Sallie Marett, Josie McDonald, Jessie Morris, Martha O'Shields, Mae Phillips, Leila H. Roach, Belva Surrett, and Shelley Turner;

H. R. 6441. An act authorizing the county of St. Louis, State of Missouri, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River near Jefferson Barracks, Mo.;

H. R. 6490. An act for the relief of W. R. Fuchs, former disbursing clerk, Department of Agriculture; J. L. Summers, former disbursing clerk, and G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Division of Disbursements, Treasury Department;

H. R. 6491. An act for the relief of Roscoe B. Huston and Simeon F. Felarca;

H. R. 6492. An act for the relief of John L. Hicks, rural rehabilitation supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Department of Agriculture, Santa Rosa, N. Mex.;

H. R. 6662. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Dauphin County (Pa.) Authority to construct, maintain, and operate a highway bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Harrisburg, Pa.;

H. R. 6728. An act for the relief of Stacy C. Mosser, receiver for the Great Northern Majestic Building Corporation;

H. R. 6805. An act for the relief of Sam E. Woods;

H. R. 6907. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Susquehanna River from the borough of Wyoming, in the county of Luzerne, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to Jenkins Township, county of Luzerne, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 6963. An act for the relief of Buford Lee Pratt;

H. R. 7049. An act for the relief of John L. Summers, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7096. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes";

H. R. 7262. An act granting the consent of Congress to Frank O. Lowden, James E. Gorman, and Joseph B. Fleming, trustees of the estate of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.;

H. J. Res. 320. Joint resolution to amend Public Resolution No. 46, approved August 9, 1935, entitled "Joint resolution

requesting the President to extend to the International Statistical Institute an invitation to hold its twenty-fourth session in the United States in 1939";

H. J. Res. 341. Joint resolution to dissolve the United States Supreme Court Building Commission;

S. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance for public use of certain highways in the Shenandoah National Park; and

S. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution giving the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the States of Iowa and Missouri establishing a boundary between said States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. BURKE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6804) for the relief of George E. Miller, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1153) thereon.

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5138) to make unlawful attempts to interfere with the discipline of the Army, the Navy, and the Coast Guard; to require the deportation of certain classes of aliens; to require the fingerprinting of aliens seeking to enter the United States; and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1154) thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7293) to amend section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to make permissive the acquisition of legislative jurisdiction over land or interests in land acquired by the United States, reported it without amendment.

Mr. KING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4532) to make effective in the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico rules promulgated by the Supreme Court of the United States governing pleading, practice, and procedure in the district courts of the United States, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7327) for the relief of the Nevada Silica Sands, Inc., reported it without amendment.

VIOLATIONS OF FREE SPEECH AND RIGHTS OF LABOR—REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, due to the log jam at the Government Printing Office which always occurs at the end of every session, two reports of the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor under Senate Resolution 266 have not been revised in page form and bound. One, part III, deals with the labor policies of employers' associations, the National Association of Manufacturers; and the other, part IV, Citizens' Committees. I ask unanimous consent that these reports may be given report numbers by title, and, when they are finally bound, that they may be filed with the Secretary of the Senate after the adjournment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Wisconsin is granted.

USE OF REFRIGERATOR CARS

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, a subcommittee of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee is conducting a hearing on a very important bill and will shortly submit a report on it. As chairman of the subcommittee, I ask unanimous consent that, as soon as the report may be prepared, I may file it and have it, together with a short statement and a copy of the bill itself, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD submitted the following report for printing in the RECORD:

The subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2753) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to require the continuation of the present practice of supplying special types of refrigerator cars for the transportation of fresh meats, packing-house products, butter, eggs, cheese, and dressed poultry, having considered the same, recommend its enactment.

The bill, S. 2753, represents a sound and carefully considered method of meeting a serious emergency that now confronts the shippers of the farm products above described.

Ever since the movement of said farm products by railroad began, the shippers thereof have supplied themselves with suitable special refrigerator cars, specially designed and constructed for these products by private refrigerator-car companies. The shippers obtain these cars from the private car companies owning them.

S. 2753 provides as follows:

"A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to the use of refrigerator cars

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That subsection (11) of section 1 of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Shippers in interstate commerce of fresh meats, packing-house products, or dairy products (including butter, eggs, cheese, and dressed poultry) shall have the right to supply themselves with such safe and adequate refrigerator cars as they deem efficient and proper for the transportation of such products; and it shall be unlawful for any common carrier to refuse to accept such cars for transportation in interstate commerce of such fresh meats, packing-house products, or dairy products (including butter, eggs, cheese, and dressed poultry).' "

A ruling of the American Association of Railroads, which claims to be a combination of practically all first-class railroads, effective September 1, 1939, suddenly and arbitrarily will deprive small independent packers, cooperatives, and shippers of dairy products of the right they have always exercised of selecting suitable special refrigerator cars for their traffic. But said arbitrary ruling will leave unaffected the large packers in the full and undisturbed use of their special refrigerator cars without any interference whatever.

These large packers will continue to ship large quantities of butter, eggs, cheese, dressed poultry, fresh meat, and packing-house products in their fine special cars in direct competition with the cooperatives, small packers, and dairy shippers, who under the ruling will be thrown back upon inferior cars that they have never before been compelled to use.

The railroad refrigerator cars that will be substituted for the special refrigerator cars are inefficient and wholly unsuitable for these perishable farm products. The small packers and dairy shippers and cooperatives will thus be seriously discriminated against.

The position of the railroad association is that under the present law they have the right to furnish cars. They admit, however, that they do not have the special kind of refrigerator cars required by these perishable farm products to serve all shippers alike. Therefore, they propose to permit the large packers to continue to use the special cars, several thousand of them, that these large packers now use.

In other words, this discriminatory rule is directed only against the competitors of the large packers, namely, the farm cooperatives, small packers, and dairy-product shippers.

S. 2753 does not change present practices, but its purpose is merely to continue an operation of equality that has existed at all times in the past, and which this combination of railroads is arbitrarily and suddenly changing. S. 2753 puts all shippers of these farm products, large and small, under the same rule for obtaining the special refrigerator cars demanded by these very perishable farm products.

The subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate Commerce recommends the enactment of S. 2753.

HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, *Chairman*.
HOMER T. BONE.
TOM STEWART.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD submitted the following statement for himself:

The above report is signed by all the members of the subcommittee who conducted hearings. It is a unanimous report of this committee.

The hearings conducted by the subcommittee on this Senate bill 2753 are the basis of the report made by the committee. These hearings are available to Members of the Senate and will show that large shippers for farm cooperatives, small and independent meat packers, object very strenuously to the order agreed to by the Associated Railway Executives. This order, unless rescinded, will take effect September 1 this year, 1939. The effect of it will be that small packers and cooperative shippers who have had the kind of refrigerator cars that they want and that are built especially for the dairy and poultry trade will be taken over by a competing company, the General American Co.

It appears that the so-called North American Co. have built these cars to meet a special trade. They have rendered a special service according to the shippers. The shippers claim that this company has given them cleaner cars for dairy products and for the shipment of eggs, and because of their heavier insulation they have saved them a great deal of money on icing cost and packing cost.

The large packers like Armour, Cudahy, and others are permitted to use their own cars. The Swift Packing Co. sold their cars to the General American Car Co. which is now expected under the agreement of the Associated Railroads to take over the cars that have been used by the cooperatives and smaller packers. These people will then not continue to enjoy these cars built especially for them and which have been found so satisfactory, and they claim that under this rule they will have to take the

"run of mine" of cars which had proven so unsatisfactory to them in the past.

It is interesting to note that it is stated that Swift & Co. are large stockholders in the General American Co. that are to take over the cars of the North American Co. These independents and cooperative shippers will then be compelled to hire cars from a company in which one of their chief competitors is a heavy stockholder.

The testimony of Mr. Gormley before the committee and speaking for the Associated Railroads—said with full knowledge of what had been done and what was intended to be done—answered questions asked him, as follows, hereafter:

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. You claim that these companies that these people talk about got their business not because they are able to save money by it, or because they furnish them better cars, but because they have better solicitors; and you want to stop that solicitation?

"Mr. GORMLEY. That is not the whole story, Senator. The North American Car Co. dealt with all these people through the years. They had no railroad contracts; they had no other means of using their cars, and on account of the relationship they established through these years, by the money that the shippers made from the use of these cars, naturally they still have a kindly feeling for that company. We would not object to that. But when, since this decision of the Commission, they still persist in going out and, through I do not know what kind of methods, upsetting a contract that another car line has with a shipper who is entirely satisfied, but for some other reason wants to change to something else, that has an upsetting influence and it must be eliminated.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. How long has it been since these various practices were stopped?

"Mr. GORMLEY. In 1935, by the issuance of that order.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. Did I understand you to say that you intend to buy some of these private companies?

"Mr. GORMLEY. Yes; negotiations are under way.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. The railroad association?

"Mr. GORMLEY. No; not the association, but the railroad-controlled car lines and other lines that have contracts with railroads.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. What lines are they?

"Mr. GORMLEY. The Pacific Fruit Express, the Fruit Growers Express, the General American—I have not a list of them here.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. They have contracts?

"Mr. GORMLEY. Yes.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. And negotiations have been going on?

"Mr. GORMLEY. Yes. They do not propose to buy those cars that are strictly in the meat-packing business. They have asked that we take the whole thing over.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. The car lines?

"Mr. GORMLEY. Yes.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. The car lines have asked you to take them over?

"Mr. GORMLEY. This particular North American Car Co. So that is what we are going to do—take all of their cars.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. Has the North American Co. asked you to buy them?

"Mr. GORMLEY. No; but we told them we would.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. Were they willing to sell?

"Mr. GORMLEY. Well, I don't know how willing they were. They need not have been in that position if they had not persisted in doing the things we asked them not to do.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. Under this ruling can they continue to operate without selling?

"Mr. GORMLEY. No. They can as to certain of their cars.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. Not their own?

"Mr. GORMLEY. Yes; certain of their own that are assigned to meat-packing companies. But they wanted us to take those with the others. We are going to pay them a fair price for them. A lot of this investment was made after 1927 when they were notified, and also all the financial houses were notified that some way was going to be found to stop this practice.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. Who owns the North American? Is it a stock company?

"Mr. GORMLEY. I assume so.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. Who owns the General American?

"Mr. GORMLEY. The General American Car Co.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. Who are the owners?

"Mr. GORMLEY. All the stockholders.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. Do you know who they are?

"Mr. GORMLEY. Oh, no.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. Is it only one company that you intend to buy or that you have to buy?

"Mr. GORMLEY. No. The North American and the Dairy Shippers Dispatch. Those are the principal ones.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. Have you told them you would buy them also?

"Mr. GORMLEY. Yes.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. Do they have to sell, under this rule, or go out of business?

"Mr. GORMLEY. That is what they pretty nearly have to do. We will continue the use of those cars. The Dairy Shippers Dispatch cars are very old cars.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. Will the American Association of Railroads have a subsidiary to take them over?

"Mr. GORMLEY. All we do is to act as the intermediary in handling it for the car lines that take them over.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. You want other car lines to take them over?

"Mr. GORMLEY. Yes; railroad-controlled car lines.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. You make this rule that they cannot continue in business so they will have to sell?

"Mr. GORMLEY. Yes.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. Who negotiated this arrangement for the American Association of Railroads? Did they have a meeting of the board of directors?

"Mr. GORMLEY. Oh, yes. It was considered by the board.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. Were you present at that meeting?

"Mr. GORMLEY. Yes.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. Was there a record made?

"Mr. GORMLEY. Yes.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. A record was made of that meeting?

"Mr. GORMLEY. Yes.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. May we have a copy of that record?

"Mr. GORMLEY. Yes, sir.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. Was it part of the understanding that all the railroads would have to agree on this? They all agreed on this, did they?

"Mr. GORMLEY. Yes, sir.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. It is the action of the association?

"Mr. GORMLEY. Yes. We have no dissenting opinions about it.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. You have the authority from the association?

"Mr. GORMLEY. Yes, sir. That is right.

You will notice in his testimony that he says that the North American Co. that has furnished these cars to the cooperatives and independent packers must, under the rule issued by the Associated Railroads and going into effect September 1, sell to a competitor company and go out of business. This looks very much like coercion and blackjacking of a company that has rendered service of great satisfaction to its customers. I believe this transaction will warrant a further investigation by the Senate of the United States and the Federal Trade Commission for the purpose of learning how far such transactions trespass upon the antitrust law and the unfair trade practices under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

The Department of Justice might well go to the depths of this transaction to learn whether or not the concerted action of the Associated Railroads in this case constitutes a conspiracy to prohibit competition among shippers and car companies furnishing them service and to destroy a company in its right to do business and injure shippers who have benefited by extraordinary efficient service rendered by such company.

I regret this matter came to the Congress too late in the session to pass remedial legislation.

HENRIK SHIPSTEAD.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

Mr. TRUMAN (for Mrs. CARAWAY), from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

On August 4, 1939:

S. 2. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the State of Nevada to be used for the purposes of a public park and recreational site and other public purposes;

S. 821. An act for the relief of Charles L. Kee;

S. 882. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Nadine Sanders;

S. 1234. An act to amend section 13 (a) of the act approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1069), entitled "Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938";

S. 1448. An act for the relief of Anna H. Rosa;

S. 1899. An act to provide for the detail of a commissioned medical officer of the Public Health Service to serve as assistant to the Surgeon General;

S. 1989. An act to provide for the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters of the United States, for the apportionment of the cost of such alterations between the United States and the owners of such bridges, and for other purposes;

S. 2133. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the State of Nevada;

S. 2239. An act for the relief of Dorothy Clair, G. F. Allen, and Earl Wooldridge;

S. 2427. An act authorizing the naturalization of John Ullmann, Jr.;

S. 2478. An act to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases;

S. 2697. An act to facilitate the execution of arrangements for the exchange of surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States for reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials produced abroad;

S. 2893. An act to provide for the local delivery rate on certain first-class mail matter;

S. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to accept the invitation of the Government of Norway to the Government of the United States to participate in an international exhibition of polar exploration, which will be held at Bergen, Norway, in 1940; and authorizing an appropriation to cover the expenses of such participation; and

S. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution to authorize compacts or agreements between or among the States bordering on the Atlantic Ocean with respect to fishing in the territorial waters and the bays and inlets of the Atlantic Ocean on which such States border, and for other purposes.

On August 5, 1939:

S. 628. An act to allow the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to extend the period of amortization of home loans from 15 to 25 years;

S. 1617. An act for the relief of John Nicholas Chicouras;

S. 2654. An act to amend subsection (n), section 77, of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, concerning payment of preferred claims;

S. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance for public use of certain highways in the Shenandoah National Park; and

S. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution giving the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the States of Iowa and Missouri establishing a boundary between said States.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 2967. A bill to provide for a Bureau of Fine Arts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. BROWN):

S. 2968. A bill to amend the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended; and

S. 2969. A bill for the relief of Louise Thorne; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. GIBSON:

S. 2970. A bill for the relief of Linn D. Taylor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 2971. A bill 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; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 2972. A bill to repeal the second sentence of subsection (a) of section 15 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. CONNALLY (for himself and Mr. SHEPPARD) introduced Senate bill 2973, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 2974. A bill to assist the States in the improvement of highways; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. NYE:

S. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution providing that the United States should maintain a policy of strict neutrality in Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY STATUTES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senate entered an order for the printing of 10,000 additional copies of the report on Calendar No. 1092, Senate bill 1935. I ask that that order made yesterday at my request be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ACCEPTANCE ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT GARNER AT PHILADELPHIA, JUNE 27, 1936

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech of acceptance delivered by Hon. JOHN NANCE GARNER, Vice President of the United States, at Franklin Field, Philadelphia, Pa., June 27, 1936; which appears in the Appendix.]

DIGEST OF LEGISLATION, SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a digest of legislation enacted by the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress and data on the economic situation, which appear in the Appendix.]

GENERAL LEGISLATION OF PUBLIC INTEREST PASSED BY SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

[Mr. MINTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix a list of laws of public interest passed by the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, which appears in the Appendix.]

RAILROAD LEGISLATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHEELER

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a recent address by Senator WHEELER on the subject of railroad legislation; which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEECH OF SENATOR PEPPER AT MEETING OF INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION, THE HAGUE, 1938

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by Senator PEPPER before the Interparliamentary Union, The Hague, in 1938; which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR DAVIS IN LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by him at the First Baptist Church, in Los Angeles, Calif., on August 22, 1926, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SOUTH—ECONOMIC PROBLEM NO. 1

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by President Graham, of the University of North Carolina, and an address by himself, on the subject The South as Economic Problem No. 1, together with additional data by way of supporting statements, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE PROGRESSIVE DESTRUCTION OF THE SOUTH'S ECONOMY

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of June 8, 1939, on the subject The Progressive Destruction of the South's Economy, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPORTANT SHIFTS IN CONSTITUTIONAL DOCTRINES—ADDRESS DELIVERED BY FRANK J. HOGAN

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Frank J. Hogan, president of the American Bar Association, at the association's sixty-second annual meeting, San Francisco, Calif., July 10, 1939, entitled "Important Shifts in Constitutional Doctrines," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S ENCROACHMENT UPON THE STATES—ADDRESS BY CONSUELO NORTHROP

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Federal Government's Encroachment Upon the States, delivered by Consuelo Northrop on July 20, 1939, at a conference at Hanover, N. H., held under the auspices of the Braman Fund Committee for Defense of the Constitution, which appears in the Appendix.]

MODERNIZATION OF RAILROAD EQUIPMENT—ARTICLE BY GEORGE H. PEDERSEN

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD certain excerpts from an article by George H. Pedersen dealing with the subject of the modernization of railroad equipment, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISCHARGE OF 18-MONTHS'-SERVICE W. P. A. EMPLOYEES

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Post of August 1, 1939, relative to the discharge from W. P. A. rolls of employees who have had 18 months' service, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD STAMP ACTIVITIES OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION

[Mr. SCHWELLENBACH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer relative to the administration of the food-stamp activities of the Surplus Commodities Corporation, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES IN THE NORTHWEST—EDITORIAL FROM THE SEATTLE POST-INTELLIGENCER

[Mr. SCHWELLENBACH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer on the subject Transportation Facilities in the Northwest, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL HEALTH BILL, ADMISSION OF REFUGEE CHILDREN, IMMIGRATION, ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF JUSTICE CARDOZO

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD speeches and articles on problems affecting the national health, admission of German refugee children, immigration, and an address on the anniversary of the death of Hon. Benjamin N. Cardozo, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSAL FOR INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN IRRIGATION PROJECTS IN NEBRASKA

[Mr. SCHWELLENBACH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the World-Herald of Omaha (Nebr.) August 3, 1939, with respect to a proposal by Senator BRIDGES for investigation of Nebraska irrigation projects, which appears in the Appendix.]

PURCHASE BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION OF RAILROAD OBLIGATIONS

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, day before yesterday I introduced by request Senate bill No. 2956, which has been referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. The purpose of this measure is to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase the obligations of railroads or to make loans to railroads so as to enable them to purchase such obligations.

At the present time approximately one-third of the mileage of all the railroads of the country is in bankruptcy or receivership. The obligations of another third of the railroads, which comprise many roads of importance and undoubted stability, are selling at large discounts from face value, in some cases at 20, 30, and 40 cents on the dollar. The roads in this latter group are having difficulty meeting their fixed charges.

For various reasons which I need not elaborate at the moment, no major road has been reorganized successfully in the last 10 years. Undoubtedly influenced by this fact, this Congress has passed the so-called Chandler bill, whose purpose is to permit certain roads to work out compositions with their creditors for the postponement of principal or interest maturities, but it is not probable that under this bill these roads will get permanent relief, since under the bill it is unlikely that there can be effected any substantial shrinking of the debt structures. S. 2956 provides a definite method for reducing the debt structure of a railroad.

This is a "request bill." I have introduced it during the closing hours of this session in order that it may have study and discussion during the recess. Legislation of this character must be so safeguarded that there is no probability of loss to the Federal Government through its operation. Likewise, railroad investors must be safeguarded against any speculative practices which will prevent them from securing a full measure of the benefits contemplated by such an act.

Mr. President, a vast amount of railroad bonds have been purchased by thrifty American citizens as an investment for their savings. Many of these people are not familiar with the intricacies of corporate finance. These investors have already been subjected to severe losses because so many railroads have been unable to pay interest on their debts and have had to resort to the courts. Others are faced with similar losses. We must, therefore, so safeguard legislation of this character that the undoubted benefits which will flow from the enactment of such a measure will accrue to the small investor as well as to the large institutional holder of railroad securities. If this request measure, S. 2956, does not meet these essential requirements, it should be amended so that it will.

Mr. President, many persons familiar with the complexities of the railroad problem, including some high Governmental officials, have advocated legislation of this character. Among these is National Conference of Investors, a Nation-wide organization of many thousands of railroad investors. This organization has submitted to me a memorandum regarding the scope and purpose of legislation of this character, which I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, so that Senators may have opportunity to give the matter careful consideration during our recess.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I add to what the Senator has said, for his encouragement, that a special committee of the Senate, which investigated the subject of incentive taxation, agreed on only one principle, among the two or three presented, and that was the precise principle for the painless reorganization of the railroad debt structure to which the Senator addressed himself. I am glad he offered his bill. I think it is as sound as a nut.

Mr. TRUMAN. I think it contains a great deal of merit, and I hope it will be carefully studied to be sure there are no flaws in it.

I ask unanimous consent for the inclusion in the RECORD at this point of the memorandum to which I referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The memorandum is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 4, 1939.*

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This organization, through its national board of directors and with the approval of its State units, has urged the enactment of legislation which will authorize the R. F. C. to purchase railroad obligations or make loans to railroads so that the railroads themselves may buy in such bonds. Senate bill 2956, which yesterday you introduced at request, carries this authority to the R. F. C.

NECESSITY FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION

A major problem of many railroads is their inability to service their debts with current low earnings. In the case of many carriers interest payments are being paid in part from surpluses which are rapidly vanishing.

Unless their earnings increase, a number of important railroads may be forced into bankruptcy or reorganization.

As a consequence, the bonds of these border-line railroads are selling at depressed prices. These market prices not only reflect the low current earnings of the railroads but the possibility of bankruptcy. For example, the 5-percent bonds of an important railroad are currently selling at 30 cents on each dollar of their face value, in spite of the fact that the road, during the past 5 years, earned on the average more than 80 percent of its fixed charges and at the present time is earning them in full. That is to say, of the $50 which the subject railroad is obligated to pay as interest on each $1,000 of its outstanding bonds, it earned over $40 (on the average during the past 5 years). If that road could borrow funds from the R. F. C. at, say, 3 percent, with which to purchase a substantial amount of its bonds at an average price of $50 (and pledge the bonds so purchased as collateral for the loan), the R. F. C. would hold $2,000 of such bonds for each $1,000 it loaned. On the basis of the last 5 years' earnings, it would have earned $80 with which to pay the $30 annual interest due to the R. F. C. on the $1,000 which was borrowed to purchase $2,000 face value of bonds mentioned above.

This is two and two-thirds times interest requirements and constitutes an exceedingly sound loan for the R. F. C.

RESULTS IF S. 2956 IS ENACTED

Several results in the public interest would be achieved:

1. The road would escape bankruptcy.

2. Those of its bondholders who sold their bonds will receive a better market price than they would obtain otherwise, and would sell their bonds at a price that more nearly approximates their true value.

3. Those holders who did not sell would have greater assurance of receiving their future interest, as the total interest payment of the railroad would be reduced.

4. Because the annual interest requirement of the railroad would be reduced, it would have larger funds available for maintenance and capital improvements, with resulting increases in employment.

REVENUE ACT CONTEMPLATES THIS LEGISLATION

Legislation which will permit transactions of this character was contemplated in the Revenue Act of 1939, which exempts from taxation book profits accruing therefrom.

Many railroads could improve their financial positions through the loan operations contemplated by S. 2956. To give a concrete

illustration, we cite the case of the Boston & Maine, an outstanding and well-managed railroad, as presented in the June 22 issue of Standard Statistics:

"THEORETICAL OPERATIONS

"If R. F. C. funds were made available to the Boston & Maine at 3 percent for this purpose, for example, that road might well be able to get in half of the $103,777,500 mortgage bonds outstanding in the hands of the public at an average price of 50 or less. Its total bond interest would thereby be reduced by $2,447,957 annually, offset in part by $770,829 interest on the $25,694,325 R. F. C. loan that would be needed to finance the operation, or a net annual saving of $1,677,128.

"Total fixed charges would thus be reduced from $7,428,554 to $5,751,426. Charges were actually covered an average of 0.84 time over the past 5 years; on the indicated reduced basis they would have been covered an average of 1.10 times. Applying the same formula to the Katy, the 5-year average of fixed-charge coverage of 0.66 time would be raised to 0.94 time.

"Other roads that might adopt such a method of reducing charges include the Lackawanna, Illinois Central, Southern Pacific, Southern Railway, Nickel Plate, New York Central, and Pittsburgh & West Virginia. Institutions would be provided with a market in which to reduce their holdings of speculative rail bonds. Investors who elected to retain their holdings, as well as stockholders, would benefit from the reduction in fixed charges.

"In a word, this is the one legislative proposal that would provide a partial immediate solution to the railroad problem. Agitation in its behalf is coming so late in the legislative session, however, that the chances of adoption are narrow unless investors can be stirred from their normal lethargy and give it more than passive support."

We submit that S. 2956 is in the public interest; that it provides ample safeguards to the Government and to investors; and that its enactment will be beneficial to railroads which avail themselves of its provisions, to their investors, their employees, and patrons, and, by releasing funds for investment, will contribute to national recovery.

Yours truly,

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF INVESTORS,
By ROBT. E. SMITH, *Chairman*.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2046. An act to change the designations of the Abraham Lincoln National Park, in the State of Kentucky, and the Fort McHenry National Park, in the State of Maryland;

S. 2745. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases;

S. 2778. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924; and

S. 2779. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," known as the Healing Art Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, approved February 27, 1929.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4117) to provide for the payment of attorney's fees from Osage tribal funds.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5734. An act for the relief of World War sailors and marines who were discharged from the United States Navy or United States Marine Corps because of minority or misrepresentation of age; and

H. R. 6424. An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 33), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a joint committee consisting of five Members of the House of Representatives and five Members of the Senate shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, respectively, which is empowered to make plans and suitable arrangements for fitting and proper exercises, to be held on the 1st day of February 1940, in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the commencement of the first session of the Supreme Court of the United States, held at the city of New York on Monday, the 1st day of February 1790.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1042. An act for the relief of the Epes Transportation Corporation;

S. 1815. An act for the relief of Evelyn Mary Locke;

H. R. 139. An act to amend paragraph (1) of section 96 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code relating to method of computing annuities;

H. R. 3927. An act for the relief of Marijo McMillan Williams;

H. R. 3959. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of recreational demonstration projects, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4108. An act to provide for the transfer of United States Employment Service records, files, and property in local offices to the States;

H. R. 4872. An act to establish the Benjamin Harrison Commission to formulate plans for the construction of a permanent memorial to the memory of Benjamin Harrison, twenty-third President of the United States;

H. R. 4965. An act for the relief of J. Harry Walker;

H. R. 5129. An act authorizing and providing for the construction of additional facilities on the Canal Zone for the purposes of more adequately providing for the defense of the Panama Canal and for increasing its capacity for the future needs of interoceanic shipping;

H. R. 5333. An act to amend the acts granting increased compensation to civilian employees for the period July 1, 1917, to June 30, 1924;

H. R. 5835. An act to authorize the President to render closer and more effective the relationship between the American republics;

H. R. 6037. An act to amend section 194 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States", approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. L. 1088);

H. R. 6259. An act for the relief of Jack D. Collins;

H. R. 6808. An act for the relief of Matilda Larned Bouck;

H. R. 6898. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain helpless and dependent children of veterans of the Civil War;

H. R. 7132. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of the Playa de Flor Land & Improvement Co., approved May 21, 1934; and

S. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution readmitting Mary Cohen Bienvenu to citizenship.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 5734. An act for the relief of World War sailors and marines who were discharged from the United States Navy or United States Marine Corps because of minority or misrepresentation of age; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 6424. An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 6379. An act to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

AMENDMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KING. Mr. President, on behalf of the Finance Committee of the Senate, I submit a conference report on House bill 6635, proposing amendments to the Social Security Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6635) to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 22, 23, 57, 58, 69, 70, 103, 104, 117, 118, 153, 154, 166, 168, 169, 176, 177, and 182.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 71, 72, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 80, 81, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 155, 156, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 165, 167, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 178, 179, and 181, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "including after January 1, 1940, methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Board shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(14) Service performed by an individual in (or as an officer or member of the crew of a vessel while it is engaged in) the catching, taking, harvesting, cultivating, or farming of any kind of fish, shellfish, crustacea, sponges, seaweeds, or other aquatic forms of animal and vegetable life (including service performed by any such individual as an ordinary incident to any such activity), except (A) service performed in connection with the catching or taking of salmon or halibut, for commercial purposes, and (B) service performed on or in connection with a vessel of more than ten net tons (determined in the manner provided for determining the register tonnage of merchant vessels under the laws of the United States); or" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and wildlife"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "including after January 1, 1940, methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Board shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "including after January 1, 1940, methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Board shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "including after January 1, 1940, methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Board shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "including after January 1, 1940, methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Board shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 508. (a) Section 531 (a) of such Act is amended by—

"(1) Striking out '$1,938,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$3,500,000'.

"(2) Striking out '$5,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$15,000'.

"(3) Inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided*, That the amount of such sums apportioned to any State for any fiscal year shall be not less than $20,000'.

"(b) Section 531 (b) of such Act is amended by striking out '$102,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$150,000'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 17, line 1, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "$12,000,000" and insert "$11,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(14) Service performed by an individual in (or as an officer or member of the crew of a vessel while it is engaged in) the catching, taking, harvesting, cultivating, or farming of any kind of fish, shellfish, crustacea, sponges, seaweeds, or other aquatic forms of animal and vegetable life (including service performed by any such individual as an ordinary incident to any such activity), except (A) service performed in connection with the catching or taking of salmon or halibut, for commercial purposes, and (B) service performed on or in connection with a vessel of more than ten net tons (determined in the manner provided for determining the register tonnage of merchant vessels under the laws of the United States); or"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and wildlife"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 157: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 157, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and wildlife"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 163: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "including after January 1, 1940, methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Board shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 164: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 164, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: On page 26, line 12, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "old-age assistance" and insert "aid to the blind"; on page 96, line 3, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "clause (1) of"; in line 7, strike out "clause" and insert "subsection"; in line 21, strike out "clause (1) of"; and on page 97, lines 18 and 19, strike out ", increased by 5 per centum"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 180: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 180, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In addition to the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, on page 36, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments insert the following new sentence: "No interest shall be allowed or paid on the amount of any overpayment refunded or credited by reason of the provisions of this section."

And the Senate agree to the same.

WILLIAM H. KING,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
DAVID I. WALSH,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
THOS. H. CULLEN,
JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
JERE COOPER,
ALLEN T. TREADWAY,
FRANK CROWTHER,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, it is important that the conference report be disposed of as soon as possible. The hour of adjournment approaches, and it would be most unfortunate if the work of the House and the Senate during this

session of Congress—which resulted in the preparation of the so-called security measure now before us—should prove unavailing. The original Social Security Act was hailed by many American citizens as an important achievement, and its operations were regarded with more or less concern. It was hoped by its earnest supporters that it would meet the high expectations of the people and prove an important subject in the direction of promoting the general welfare of the people. Even those who were most optimistic concerning its benefits and advantages recognized that imperfections would be discovered in its framework and in its administration.

The Committee on Ways and Means of the House, early in the session, addressed itself to the task of modifying and amending the provisions which had proved unsatisfactory. The work of the committee was painstaking and met with general satisfaction. The bill came to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Finance, which sympathetically addressed itself to the study of the bill. Generally speaking, I think it may be said that the Senate committee and the Senate itself gave general approval of the measure as it came to the Senate. The Committee on Finance, after due consideration, reported the bill back to the Senate with a number of amendments, and the Senate, after considering the work of the Committee on Finance, passed the bill after having made a number of amendments. I should say in passing, however, that most of the amendments were not of great importance, but many of them were rather of a clarifying or explanatory nature. Following the passage of the bill by the Senate, conferees were appointed by the House and the Senate for the purpose of considering the Senate amendments and with a view to reconciling any differences found to exist between the two bodies. The conferees met upon many occasions during a period of 20 days and earnestly addressed themselves to the task before them. Most of the amendments offered by the Senate were disposed of within a few days but a number (and I might say the most important ones) engaged the attention of the Senate for a number of days thereafter. An agreement was finally reached and a report prepared to be submitted to the House and the Senate.

The House has approved the report of the conferees and it is now before the Senate.

There has been so much discussion during this session of Congress, and particularly during the past few days, that I shall pretermit any extended remarks in submitting the report for action by this body. I regret exceedingly that the report was not submitted by the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. HARRISON]. He and the able and distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] were not in agreement with the other conferees of the Senate with respect to an important provision in the bill. It is a great pleasure to state to the Senate that both of these Senators, with great zeal and earnestness, discharged the responsibilities resting upon them as conferees. They battled courageously and earnestly for all of the amendments which were adopted by the Senate, and made important contributions to the perfecting of the measure which is now before us.

One of the most controversial provisions of the bill was the so-called Connally amendment which had been adopted in the Senate. For many days in the consideration of the bill this amendment was referred to and all of the conferees on the part of the Senate and the managers on the part of the House considered this amendment. I emphasize the fact that the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was the author of the proposed amendment, and during the consideration of the bill while in conference he, with very great ability and zeal, battled to secure its adoption. As stated, the other Senate conferees stood with him and joined in urging the managers on the part of the House to yield in their opposition to the amendment.

As I have indicated, after more than 20 days of discussion—earnest, serious, and sometimes most vigorous—an agreement by the conferees of the House and the Senate was reached.

As stated above, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] were unwilling to yield on the so-called Connally amendment and, as a result, the report submitted fails to have their signatures to the same. As I have stated, this I very much regret. It affords me very deep and profound regret not to have these two able and distinguished Senators parties to this conference report.

Mr. President, as I have indicated, the House accepted most of the Senate amendments, including those of great importance. I think substantially all of the amendments adopted by the Senate, which were of magnitude, were accepted by the House.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. I beg to differ with the Senator in regard to that. I am not complaining, because I know that the conferees on the part of the Senate did everything possible to uphold the amendments which I offered and which were adopted by the Senate. I regard them as exceedingly important. One provided for a study, similar to that made by the Council on Old Age Insurance. That study was of great use, and, I am sure, guided the committee in its deliberations and conclusions upon the amendments which were considered and adopted by the Senate. I wanted a similar study to be made of the many complex issues of unemployment insurance. I thought that was a very important amendment which was not kept in the bill.

If I may refer to the other, it provided for a study of disability insurance. Under the law a very unfortunate situation exists. Those who might have contributed for 10 or 15 years to an old-age insurance fund, because of illness and inability to continue their occupation are left without any aid at all until they reach the age of 65, if they do live that long, or may even be disqualified altogether.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator desires to address the Senate in opposition to the conference report, I shall be glad, after I have concluded my observations, to yield the floor to him.

Mr. WAGNER. I merely wanted to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that I thought he was minimizing the amendments which were adopted by the Senate with reference to the studies, because he said that the House agreed, except as to the Connally amendment, to all of the important amendments adopted in the Senate. I want to express, however, my appreciation of the Senate conferees' action in urging these amendments on the House conferees, as strongly and as long as they did.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, every person regards his view as of primary importance. I appreciate the devotion of the Senator from New York to the social-security plan and to policies relating to labor and matters relating to the welfare of the country.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I join with the Senator in what he has said, in commendation of the devoted and able services of the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. Before he proceeds to another aspect of this conference report, I desire to record my commendation of the tireless efforts, the fine leadership, and devotion to duty the chairman of the committee exemplified during the long and arduous hours and days we have been preparing this legislation. And what I have said about him applies equally to the Senator from Texas. Both these able Senators are entitled to the fullest praise and credit for the many beneficial provisions embodied in this bill and which will be a distinct advance in the social-welfare program of the country.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, with reference to the observations made by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], may I say that the conferees upon the part of the Senate

urged the adoption of the amendment, but if I may be permitted to speak of Members of the body at the other end of the Capitol, the House conferees were adamant. In the statement which was submitted by the conferees on the part of the House the following appears:

The managers on the part of the House also desire to state that there are two very important proposals to which the conferees gave a great deal of attention. These are the so-called Connally amendment, providing for greater Federal matching in the case of old-age assistance, and the Massachusetts plan which would enable the States to make a State-wide reduction in unemployment compensation contribution rates under certain conditions. The conferees believe that a comprehensive study of the subject matter covered by these two proposals should be undertaken which will enable the Congress to deal more intelligently with the problems involved than is possible at the present time.

Mr. President, it was the view, I believe, upon the part of the managers of the House, that it was unnecessary at this time to undertake the study to which the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] refers, but that at a more propitious time a further study would be made of the entire social security system—a study perhaps broader than that contemplated by the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, as I have observed, after prolonged discussion by the conferees of the two Houses, substantially all of the amendments offered by the Senate were accepted. I believe I am not inaccurate in stating that all of the differences were reconciled, leaving a sole controversial matter; that is, that relating to the Connally amendment. As I have stated, it was only with great reluctance that the four Senate conferees yielded on this point. We believed, from the attitude of the managers upon the part of the House, that unless the Senate receded upon that point, the conference would end in failure; that is, there would be no legislation at this time dealing with social security.

Without being critical of the managers upon the part of the House I feel constrained to say that they were unyielding upon the so-called Connally amendment, and if the Senate conferees had insisted upon its adoption, the conference would have ended in failure.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator advise us what the great objection was to the Connally amendment on the part of the House?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, after hours and days of discussion, and consideration of the various views presented, it would be impossible in a limited time even to present a fragment of the multitudinous arguments which were assigned by the managers upon the part of the House, but, generally speaking, their view was—and I think I am interpreting their objection accurately—that it would disturb a system which had been adopted, and that if we began to modify the plan which was the basis of the social-security program, other changes would be made, which might ultimately so mutilate it as to work its destruction.

They had in mind, and it was suggested in the consideration of the conference, the condition of the social-security laws in Germany and in England.

As Senators know, the social-security systems of the countries referred to finally met with disaster; that is, they failed to meet the requirements made of them. Their funds were depleted and resort was had to their respective treasuries. Reorganizations were instituted and even then there were serious impairments of the plans provided.

In reply to the inquiry from the Senator from Idaho, I think I am accurate in stating that the managers upon the part of the House believed that to accept the Connally amendment would be an impairment of the social-security system which had, generally speaking, commended itself to the American people. They believed, as I interpreted their attitude, that we should give trial to the present law and that to make such a material change in the theory upon which the social-security system rested would be unwise.

Both the House bill and the Senate bill provided for raising the maximum amount to be matched from $30 per month to $40, so this provision will be included in the bill without the necessity of action on the part of the conference committee.

The House has receded on the amendment to the unemployment-insurance provisions, the purpose of which was to allow the States to reduce their unemployment-insurance contributions if a certain reserve fund has been attained and minimum-benefit standards have been provided. It was felt that further study and experience was necessary before such action could be taken.

Mr. President, in my opinion a further study of the social-security system will call for additional amendments to the present law, as well as to the measure now before us, if it shall be enacted into law. Important measures dealing with social relations and public welfare grow out of experience. It is conceded by those who have given much study to social problems and to plans akin to those found in social-security legislation that mistakes are made and that through evolutionary development weaknesses are discovered and eliminated. Undoubtedly Congress will give further study to the provisions of the social-security law and, as stated, will, as the years go by, find changes necessary in order to meet developing and changing conditions.

Mr. President, referring to the bill before us we find that provision is made for taxing workers over age 65 and their employers, beginning January 1, 1939, instead of January 1, 1940. It is these individuals who have already reached age 65 who will be the first to retire, but the present law disregards for both benefit and tax purposes all wages after 65, thereby making it most difficult for all these individuals to qualify. This amendment has the approval of the Treasury Department and the Social Security Board.

After considerable discussion, agreement was reached to provide that the States participating under the Federal social-security program must provide a plan for the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis. And I am sure that will commend itself to my friend the Senator from New York, and also to the distinguished Senator who is now occupying the chair [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

The amendment worked out by the conference committee provides, however, that the Board shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, or compensation of any particular employee appointed in accordance with such State plan. These provisions will cover old-age assistance, aid to dependent children and the blind, unemployment compensation, and maternal and child-welfare services.

The conferees have retained the increases made by the Senate in the authorizations for appropriation for maternal and child-welfare services. However, instead of the additional $4,000,000 per year voted by the Senate for public-health work, this sum has been cut to $3,000,000 per year.

The House bill increased the authorization for vocational rehabilitation from $1,938,000 to $2,938,000. The Senate, as Senators will recall, struck out this provision and increased the authorization to $4,000,000. The conferees have agreed upon the sum of $3,500,000.

With respect to Indians under the public-assistance programs the Senate has receded from its amendment so that the situation is left the same as under the present law. In view of the many questions arising out of this amendment, the House conferees felt that it was imperative that any action on this subject be deferred until the Ways and Means Committee could give more detailed consideration to the many ramifications of the proposal.

Mr. President, the Senate has receded on its amendments to create advisory councils to study and report on unemployment insurance and disability benefits. It was thought best, as I indicated a few moments ago, not to include reference to temporary councils in permanent legislation of this kind.

Before concluding my remarks I should like to state that the attention of the conference committee was directed to the question of the effect of the definition of agricultural labor contained in this bill upon questions which have heretofore arisen concerning the meaning of the term "agricultural labor" used in the present law. Agricultural labor is

exempt under the present law, but the term is not defined. The definition in this bill will not take effect until January 1, 1940. A number of questions have arisen as to whether particular activities are or are not within the meaning of the term "agricultural labor" under the present law. Some of these questions are now in litigation. It was the sense of the conference committee that these questions now in dispute should be determined in the ordinary way, by the courts or otherwise, and that the Congress should not at this time attempt to indicate what meaning should be given to the term "agricultural labor" with respect to its application before the time arrives for the new definition to take effect.

Mr. President, I shall not take the further time of the Senate in discussing the report. While it may not meet with entire satisfaction, I cannot help but believe that if the measure before us is enacted into law, it will be received with general satisfaction. It will prove of benefit to employers as well as to employees as it deals in a more generous and humane manner with various groups of persons who are brought within its terms.

As I have indicated, the report meets with the approval of the House conferees and, as I am advised, it met with the unanimous approval of the House. The statement submitted by the managers upon the part of the House, which had been printed in the RECORD, sets forth in a very clear manner the various amendments and the disposition made of the same.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

Mr. HARRISON obtained the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish, so far as possible, that all Senators may hear the statement about to be made by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. I thank the Senator from Texas. I want the Senators to hear the statement of the Senator from Texas also. However, I hope the Senator will not ask for a quorum call at the present time.

Mr. President, I find myself in a very embarrassing position. Naturally one who has taken a great deal of interest in the formulation of a piece of legislation, such as the Social Security Act amendments, and has followed it through the meanderings of committee hearings, through debate on the Senate floor, and through a long conference between the House and Senate conferees, and who cannot subscribe to the report which was finally agreed to, should make an explanation of his position. For that reason, and for that reason only, am I stating to the Senate the reasons for my failure to sign the conference report.

Mr. President, I feel that the report embodies some far-reaching and very beneficial provisions. In many respects the legislation is of a highly constructive character. I will not take the time of the Senate by discussing in detail all of those particular provisions. I do desire, however, to mention briefly some of the provisions which, as I have stated, I feel are of a very important character. Considerable tax relief is granted by the freezing of the old-age insurance pay-roll taxes, which becomes effective January 1, 1940, and should prove very helpful to our general economic situation. Taxpayers are granted additional relief through the provision that only the first $3,000 an employer pays an employee for a year is taxed under the unemployment-compensation provisions. This provision already exists with reference to old-age insurance. Tax penalties against the taxpayer are greatly modified and past delinquencies are adjusted. The legislation eliminates the so-called nuisance taxes which have been collected from fraternal and other nonprofit organizations. The old-age insurance provisions adopted by the House and further liberalized by Senate amendments, and agreed to in conference, will greatly help those who have already reached the age of 65 and will give them a chance to earn retirement quickly.

The amendments liberalize the present law by increasing old-age insurance benefits, and also provide benefits for the wife, the surviving widow, the children, and, in some instances, the parents of deceased wage earners. The report contains increased authorizations for many very worth-while services, including maternal and child health, public health work, services to crippled children, and vocational rehabilitation. All of these are splendid contributions to social advancement. The change from one-third to one-half of the Federal share of costs in granting aid to dependent children will be extremely beneficial. Some assistance to the poorer States is provided in the new basis of sharing the cost of Federal administration of the State public-assistance programs. The legislation clarifies the present situation which exists with reference to the definition of agricultural labor.

Mr. President, I should have been delighted to have signed the report. However, I was greatly interested in the principle embodied in the Connally amendment, and because of the failure on the part of the House conferees to permit the amendment to be reported to the House for a roll-call vote, and their failure to accept the Connally amendment, either in the form agreed to by the Senate or in some modified form, as suggested by the Chairman of the Social Security Board, which reduced the amount carried in the original Connally amendment from $120,000,000 to around $13,000,000 annually, I could not subscribe to that method of procedure, and, therefore, I felt I could not sign the report.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WAGNER in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to say, as one member of the committee, that it was a matter of deep regret to me that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] did not feel that they could conscientiously sign the report. I should like to say for the RECORD, in case in the future anyone should be searching it and not find the names of the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Texas upon the report, that I accord to them a full measure of credit for any of the improved features which were put in the bill by the Senate Finance Committee, or which were put in the bill on the floor of the Senate, or were obtained after a long and protracted conference as concessions from the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HARRISON. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. Of course the big question which wrought the sharp differences between the conferees of the House and those of the Senate was over the so-called Connally amendment.

Mr. President, it would have been easy for the House conferees to take the Connally amendment back to the House and obtain a roll call vote on it. I went so far as to say that if there had been an opportunity afforded the House to vote, and if on a yea-and-nay the House had turned down the Connally amendment, I would then have been willing to sign the report. I am sure the Senator from Texas took the same position, as did other Senators on the conference committee. All the Senate conferees appealed to the House conferees to do that; but they were adamant and refused.

Mr. President, I think I know something about the rules of the House. I once served in that body. The House has not changed its procedure under which conferees may bring in a partial report and obtain a vote of the House on any particular matter in disagreement; but the House conferees refused to do that. I do not presume to dictate the course of action which must be followed by House conferees, but I could not sign the report under those circumstances. I presume the House conferees considered that a matter of principle was involved, but I cannot see any great principle involved in the 50–50 matching provisions of the present law. The social-security bill itself contains other bases of grants-in-aid to States. The issue of making a more reasonable

provision for the Federal share of assistance to the aged will be before the country until better provision is made. It would not destroy but would preserve this great social-security system if, in the poorer States, the Federal Government made a little larger contribution.

I, for one, do not subscribe to the Townsend plan. My friend from California [Mr. DOWNEY] recently made a very eloquent speech in support of it. I have opposed, and will continue to oppose, this plan because I do not think it workable or practical. However, I believe that when the people of my State, or any other poor State, cannot provide more than six or seven dollars a month from a combined Federal and State contribution, the Federal Government should come in and contribute in the ratio of at least 2 to 1 up to $15, or some like amount.

I know that the House conferees felt that there had been a vote in the House on this question. In the consideration of the bill in the House an amendment had been offered which carried a Federal contribution of 4 to 1 for old-age assistance. That amendment was voted down, but it was voted down by a teller vote, not a roll-call vote. Then an amendment was offered providing a 3-to-1 contribution, and later an amendment was offered providing a 2-to-1 contribution on the part of the Federal Government, but each amendment was voted down in the House. However, in the Senate we went on record. Every man showed his colors. Why should the House membership be protected by not having a record vote on the Connally amendment?

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask the Senator if it is not his view that if the Senate conferees had insisted on the House conferees taking the amendment back to the House for a vote, we should have obtained a vote in the House?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, there is often a division among Senate conferees. I do not desire to criticize any of my colleagues. My own personal view is that if there had not been a sufficient number to sign the report the House conferees would have taken the amendment back to the House. I am assuming my own responsibility for not signing the report. I was strongly in favor of the idea expressed in the Connally amendment. However, there is so much good in the report, and so much that will be of benefit to the working people of the country as well as to the taxpayers, that I shall vote for the report if it comes to a roll call.

Mr. President, I want the Senate and the country to know that I shall also continue to exert my efforts toward a real liberalization in Federal contributions for old-age assistance. It would have been a narrow and partisan view to have voted against the larger pension which will be shared equally by Federal funds, though it benefited only those in richer States. I feel that Members of the House as well as my colleagues of the Senate will be equally generous with those citizens of our country in the poorer States.

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the Senator if he does not think that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and other proponents of the Townsend plan owe a debt of gratitude to the committee for the impetus it has given to the Townsend plan by the action which the Senator did not approve?

Mr. HARRISON. I think the action taken in the report, refusing to give larger Federal assistance to the States, will give great encouragement to those who shout and talk and plead for increased old-age pensions along the lines of the Townsend plan. It was with the idea of helping the poorer States which cannot help themselves, that I supported the so-called Connally amendment in the committee and fought for it on the floor, even against my own committee.

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. KING. Is it not true that day in and day out all the conferees on the part of the Senate insisted upon the Connally amendment? I know that up to the last moment I pleaded with the House conferees to take the matter back to the House and obtain a vote. I do not think I am betraying any confidences when I say that the conferees on the part of the House stated that they would not under any circumstances take the matter back to the House, and that if the Senate conferees insisted upon their view there would be no bill.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator insisted, up to the last day, that the House conferees take the amendment back to the House for a vote.

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. The Senator will remember the question which I raised in connection with the bill concerning employees in the fishing industry.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Would the Senator object to stating briefly for the RECORD the result of the conference in that connection?

Mr. HARRISON. The measure as finally agreed upon is entirely along the lines of the Senator's suggestion. The limitation as to tonnage of vessels employed in that industry is even lower than the tonnage we discussed. I have forgotten the exact figure of the Senate as to the tonnage.

Mr. KING. The figure was 20 tons.

Mr. HARRISON. I believe it was reduced to 10 tons. The amendment was broadened from the viewpoint of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I wish to express to the Senator from Mississippi and other members of the conference committee my appreciation of the very sympathetic and clear way in which a study was made of this subject. It was unfortunate that when the bill was brought into the Senate it was subject to criticism. Having confidence in the Senator from Mississippi, I permitted the Senate amendment to be adopted, even though I was opposed to it, he having assured me that the subject would receive study, and that if the Senate amendment were in error the error would be corrected. I wish to say that the Senator from Mississippi and the employees of the committee cooperated fully in the study of the subject.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the tonnage was reduced from 400 to 20 tons; and the Senator will find a full explanation on page 2 of the report.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, that is all I have to say.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I desire to say just a word.

First, I wish to direct my attention to a statement made in the report by the Finance Committee to the Senate when the social security bill was reported to the Senate, and a similar statement—in fact, identical—which was contained in the report submitted by the House Ways and Means Committee to the House of Representatives.

The matter to which I refer has to do with the definition of farm labor, particularly as it applies to maple sirup, gum, turpentine, and rosin. The conference committee made a supplemental statement in the conference report to the House upon that question; and the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], who has submitted the report to the Senate, likewise has incorporated the statement in his report.

The purpose of bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate is to comment on the definition of farm labor. Farm labor, of course, is excluded from the Social Security Act. The definition is somewhat broadened or clarified by the provisions of the House bill, which provisions were not amended in the Senate. In the report it was stated that after January 1, 1940, certain workers would not be included in the Social Security Act because thereafter, by virtue of the amendment, they would become farm laborers.

It so happens, Mr. President, that litigation had arisen with respect to the producers of gum turpentine and rosin,

and had been going on for several months; and the statement, therefore, might have been interpreted as an opinion by the committee that under the original act the producers of gum turpentine and rosin were not, in fact, farmers, and were subject to the pay-roll tax. So that the statement now submitted by the managers on the part of the House and on the part of the Senate is to the effect that it is not the purpose of the Congress in clarifying and broadening the definition of farm labor, to affect adversely pending litigation or the question involved in pending litigation.

In that connection, I wish to make a further statement. The producers of gum turpentine and rosin have been recognized as farmers, and the laborers employed by them as farm laborers by act of the Congress. In the Farm Agricultural Marketing Act approved August 15, 1929, as amended by the act approved March 4, 1931, they are expressly classed as farmers. In the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act the producers of gum turpentine and rosin are recognized as farmers, and, under the soil-conservation program, they are receiving benefits. Furthermore, they are expressly recognized as farmers in the terms of the Wage-Hour Act. Likewise, they have been the recipients of loans by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and only the producers of farm products are eligible under the act of Congress for loans under the Commodity Credit Corporation Act.

So, Mr. President, it seems proper that some note be made of the insertion in the report filed by both the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee on the social security bill when the bill was laid before the respective Houses for action. It is not the intent of the Senate Finance Committee, at least, and it may be stated with reference to the Ways and Means Committee, to prejudge the contention made, continuously insisted upon and now insisted upon, in the courts by the producers of gum turpentine and rosin that they are, in fact, farmers and are not within the terms of the act. The statement made in Finance Committee report was inadvertently made.

Mr. President, I desire to make a further statement. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has called the attention of the Senate to the fact that the conference committee on the bill proposing amendments to the Social Security Act has been in session for 3 weeks. Among the most difficult of the amendments considered by the conference was the Connally amendment. There were many other amendments on which there was, of course, prolonged discussion by the members of the conference. The distinguished chairman of the committee of the conference on the part of the Senate, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], in the Finance Committee, on the floor of the Senate, and in the conference steadfastly, ably, and conscientiously insisted upon the retention of the Connally amendment. I myself supported that amendment in the Finance Committee and on the floor of the Senate, and in the conference.

I may say, I think, without any impropriety, that I never voted to recede from insistence upon the Connally amendment. I believed that the principle was sound, and I believed it was advisable to insert the provisions of the Connally amendment in the old-age benefit provisions of the Social Security Act. I still believe so, because the wide inequality of treatment of our old people by the Federal Government, based upon any premise that may be imagined, cannot be maintained permanently as a part of our law. It is true that the inequality of treatment of the worthy aged people in the several States is predicated upon the failure of the States to make adequate provision or to match the full contribution which the Federal Government itself is authorized to make; but I said on this floor, and I now repeat, that it does not matter whether that is true; there is that inequality; it is inequality between American citizens, and it is no answer to say that, because the State has not done so and so, therefore the Federal Government was not called upon to do so and so, when the Federal Government established this system and invited the States to come in, believing, of course, that the States would all make a contribution under the law as it was passed of $15 per month for their worthy aged citizens and thereby make available the $15 which the Federal Government was authorized to provide. Under the conference-report agreement now before the Senate, the amount has been increased to $20 per month; but, as a matter of fact, some of the States have not contributed $15 per month or anything like it; as a matter of fact, some of the States are not able to pay $15 per month. But it does not make any difference, in my judgment, so far as the issue is concerned, whether the States are unwilling or unable to match the full Federal contribution or at least so much of that contribution as will provide the bare physical necessities to the aged people of this country who are eligible under both State and Federal law.

So, I believed in the Connally amendment; and I still believe in it. It would have given at least a minimum benefit to the aged people of each State, a minimum that would have, at least, taken care of what may be described, even strictly, as the barest necessities of life. But we failed in the conference to induce the House conferees to accede to that amendment and to recede from the position taken by the House.

The distinguished Senator from Mississippi has already made a statement regarding the effort to induce the House conferees to take this amendment back to the House of Representatives for a vote. I will not repeat that, but I do wish to say that, so far as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the author of the amendment, are concerned, and so far as I am concerned, we insisted upon the amendment to the last, and certainly no two Senators could have presented with more ability, more earnestness, and more seriousness the position taken by the Senate in its vote upon the Connally amendment than did the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I happen to have been one of the Senate conferees on the bill proposing amendments to the Social Security Act. I did not sign the conference report, and I want the Senate and the country to know why I did not sign it.

The attitude of the House conferees from the beginning was that of stubborn resistance to permitting the House to have an opportunity to vote by a record roll-call vote on the so-called Connally amendment. That was soon apparent to every Senate conferee who attended the conference, as they all did. Knowing that attitude of the House, I felt that a mere request of the Senate conferees that the House conferees take the amendment back to the House for a separate vote would be entirely futile and of no effect.

If four of the Senate conferees had stood their ground as they stood it throughout the deliberations up until the last conference, I feel confident that the House of Representatives would have had a chance to vote upon this amendment; and if it had had such a chance, and had rejected the amendment, my feelings about the matter would be very different from those which I entertain at the present moment. With all due deference to my colleagues on the conference committee, I feel that the Senate conferees, in undertaking to carry out the mandate of the Senate, should have insisted and demanded that the House conferees take this subject back to the House of Representatives for a separate vote. That, however, was not done.

Mr. President, two very important amendments were pending before the conference. One was the so-called Connally amendment. The other was an amendment moving back from 1940 to 1939 the coverage into the old-age insurance system of about 250,000 persons who will become 65 years of age during the present year, and are not covered by the present law; but under the Senate amendment they will secure old-age assistance for their allotted period, to the cost to the fund of $695,000,000. That $695,000,000 does not come out of the Treasury of the United States, but comes out of the trust fund accumulated by the payments by employers and employees under the old-age insurance system. The effect of the amendment is to take $695,000,000 out of that fund and give it to persons, who under the present law are not entitled to old-age insurance, and take

it away from those who are paying it in now, and expect to get the benefits in future years. Had they not been brought in—they have paid for insurance for only a year or two—under the present law they could have applied for what they had paid in upon becoming 65, and could have received its return; but instead the other amendment brings them in, 250,000 of them, and hands them $695,000,000 out of the trust fund. That amendment was the price of the rejection of the Connally amendment. The House accepted that Senate amendment, and then, as the price of it, they killed the Connally amendment by the change of attitude on the part of one of the Senate conferees.

Mr. President, I now desire to talk a little while about the Connally amendment. I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] for their very generous and kind remarks with respect to the amendment.

Under the present Federal law it is provided that for old-age assistance the Federal Government simply pays to the beneficiary the same amount that the State in which he resides may pay him. Under that system a rich State receives more, and a poor State receives less. It receives less when it needs more—and it gets more when it needs less. The President of the United States has indicted the present system. The President of the United States, in transmitting to the Congress of the United States the report of the Social Security Board, drew an indictment against the present system when he said—I read from the President's message of January 16, 1939—

> I particularly call attention to the desirability of affording greater old-age security. The report suggests a twofold approach which I believe to be sound. One way is to begin the payment of monthly old-age insurance benefits sooner, and to liberalize the benefits to be paid in the early years. The other way—

I want Senators to listen to this. I want the House of Representatives, which did not have an opportunity to vote upon this question, to listen to this. I do not care about the House conferees listening to it, because it would have no effect upon them. They assumed to act without referring this matter to their own body, whose commission they bore. Whether they feared the result there, or whether it was simply a spirit of self-opinionated, aggressive action on the part of the House conferees, I am not prepared to say. But what does the President say?

> The other way is to make proportionately larger Federal grants-in-aid to those States with limited fiscal capacities, so that they may provide more adequate assistance to those in need. This result can and should be accomplished in such a way as to involve little, if any, additional cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. President, those are the words of the President of the United States. Those words are an indictment of the present 50-50 matching system. He says it is not fair—not in so many words, but the result of his suggestion is that the present 50-50 system of old-age assistance matching is not just and is not sound.

What is the attitude of the Social Security Board? The Social Security Board recommended that there be a variable grant with reference to old-age assistance. This is what the Social Security Board said in its report, which was transmitted by the President:

> VARIABLE GRANTS
>
> Federal grants-in-aid under the three public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act will total approximately a quarter of a billion dollars during the current fiscal year. These grants are made to all States on the same percentage basis, regardless of the varying capacity among the States to bear their portion of this cost. The result has been wide difference between the States.

I am glad the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] has entered the Chamber, because in a moment I propose to make reference to his activity.

> The result has been wide difference between the States, both in number of persons aided and average payments to individuals. Thus in the case of old-age assistance the number of persons being aided varies from 54 percent of the population under 65 years of age in the State with the highest proportion to 7 percent in that with the lowest proportion. Similarly State averages for payments to needy old people range from about $32 per month to $6.

These are not my words. These are the words of the Social Security Board, which is supposed to know more about this system than anybody else. These are the words of the President of the United States in approving the attitude of the Board:

> While these variations may be explained in part on other grounds, there is no question that they are due in very large measure to the varying economic capacities of the States.
>
> The Board believes that it is essential to change the present system of uniform-percentage grants to a system whereby the percentage of the total cost in each State met through a Federal grant would vary in accordance with the relative economic capacity of the State. There should, however, be a minimum and maximum limitation to the percentage of the total cost in a State which will be met through Federal grants.

The junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], after his very fine work on the unemployment committee, filed in the Senate a report proposing the adoption by the Congress of the theory of variable grants in old-age assistance. He is entitled to great credit for the work he has done along that line. When this bill was in the Finance Committee, consideration was given both to the plan proposed by the Senator from South Carolina and to the amendment which I afterward offered. There was no difference between us as to securing results; but because of there being so many objections to the theory of variable grants, on the theory that it would give some States proportionately more than others and would thereby take money from the richer States and hand it over to the so-called poorer States, it was felt that my amendment, which treats all States alike and gives to each the same percentage, probably would command more support. Therefore, when the bill reached the Senate I offered the amendment which provides that the Federal Government shall contribute $2 to the State's $1 up to the amount of $15, and that thereafter there shall be an equal division as between the State and the Federal Government.

Mr. President, what is the present system, and what is the result in the various States? I hold in my hand a table showing the amounts received, average payment per recipient of old-age assistance, for June 1939, which is the latest available report.

What is the result, under the present matching system, of old-age assistance in the various States? There are 16 States, I believe, which are now paying jointly, between both the Federal Government and the State Government, less than $15 a month. Half of these sums are paid by the Federal Government and half by the State governments.

For instance, the State of Connecticut pays $26.03. In other words, in Connecticut, out of the Federal Treasury, out of money which all the people pay, out of taxation contributed by the poor States as well as the rich States, out of money contributed by every little fellow who buys a gallon of gasoline for his old, worn-out Ford, out of that kind of money the Federal Government pays $13 to the old-age recipient in the State of Connecticut, and pays $3.01 to the same sort of an individual residing in the State of Arkansas. Is that a balanced program? Is that equality?

Is that carrying out the theory of real old-age assistance and generosity through this system we have inaugurated?

In the State of Maine the Federal Government pays $10.26½ per capita. In Massachusetts it pays $14.16½. In New Hampshire it pays practically $12 a month. In Rhode Island it pays $9.46. In New York the Federal Government pays half of $23.57. In Delaware, however, it pays $5.48. If an old fellow happens to live over on the Delaware border, in Delaware, the Federal Government says, "You need only $5.48 of Federal money." If he lives a quarter of a mile farther west, over on the Pennsylvania side, the Federal Government says, "Old fellow, I will give you $10," as against what is received by the man a quarter of a mile away, who resides in Delaware. It is the same Federal Government, the same sort of an individual, a citizen of the same Republic, occupying the same standard of need, occupying the same condition of want, but the Federal Government gives to the one a large amount and to the other a small amount.

Within the District of Columbia the Federal Government pays $12.78. In Maryland the Federal Government pays one-half of $17.42, whereas in North Carolina the Federal Government pays the same sort of an individual one-half of $9.59, or $4.79, as against $8.70 in the State of Maryland.

I am sorry the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is not in the Chamber at the moment. In Virginia the man who is in want, the old citizen 65 years of age, gets out of the Federal Treasury $4.81, while a citizen similarly situated, if he happens to be a resident of California, would get $16 out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAVIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me make this comment, that under the amendments about to be accepted the amount in California will automatically be lifted to $20.

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly.

Mr. DOWNEY. So that the senior citizen in California will be getting really about six or seven times as much as those in Virginia, and I may say to the Senator from Texas that we in California do not want to take advantage of the other States in the Union.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from California for his very helpful suggestion and for his interruption.

Under a provision of this bill the maximum contribution has been raised to $40 a month, instead of $30 a month, and States like California, which are able to avail themselves of it, no doubt will avail themselves of it, and, as a result, the old-age pensioner in California will get $20 out of the Federal Treasury as against $3 in Arkansas, and $4.70 in the State of Virginia. That is what will happen. That is happening under the present system, under this system which is so sublimated and so perfect that we must not lay our hands upon it at all.

Mr. President, if the measure of responsibility is to be according to the ability of the States and their economic condition, why did the Federal Government ever invade the field of old-age assistance? Why did it not leave it to the States? Why did it not say to the States, "Raise your own money, and disburse it among your old-age citizens"? But the Federal Government steps in and says, "This is a Federal responsibility, at least to some degree." It says, "The Federal Government has an interest in this matter. We will set up a Federal system," a system which practically coerces and influences every State to come into the system, and then it makes these pitiful provisions with respect to the amount each State will receive.

Mr. President, in West Virginia the Federal Government pays its old-age pensioners $6.76. In Kentucky the old-age pensioner receives $4.325 of Federal money. Michigan, which is richer, has drawn a lot of its riches from the contributions of Kentuckians, who ride in automobiles, and who buy articles from Michigan; yet the old-age pensioner in Kentucky receives $4.325 as against $8.22 in the State of Michigan. Every old pensioner in the State of Michigan gets practically $2 of Federal money for every dollar of State money. Yet Senators say it is unfair to provide that we shall reverse that proposition and pay him $2 of Federal money for each dollar of State money up to a maximum of $15.

In Ohio the Federal Government pays $11.28; in Illinois, $9.61; in Indiana, $8.58. In Wisconsin the old-age pensioner receives $10.60, whereas in Alabama the old-age pensioner receives $4.64.

Is there any justice in that? Is there any equality in it? I am talking about Federal funds now; I am not talking about State funds. A State can pay all it may desire to pay. There is no inhibition, there is no prohibition, there is no impediment to a State's paying what it pleases, but it is our responsibility as to the amount of Federal money that is paid to the old-age pensioners, whether they live in California or whether they live in Arkansas, or Alabama, or North Carolina, or Virginia, or in the city of New York.

Is a man's want any less, if he lives in circumstances of penury, whether he resides in Alabama or resides in New York? Is there any climatic condition with respect to this system which makes it any easier for an old man to get bread and meat in Florida than in Colorado or in California? No, Mr. President; but that is the system.

I shall not weary the Senate by detailing all the States in which old-age pensioners get less than $15. Under the terms of my amendment every State in the Union would be treated exactly as every other State. My amendment would stimulate and lift up the ones in the very low bracket to somewhere near a decent level. It would make possible, in my opinion, the payment of at least $15 a month to every old-age pensioner in the United States. From then on the States and the Federal Government would contribute equally in additional payments.

Mr. President, I ask to have this table printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Average payment per recipient of special types of public assistance in States with plans approved by the Social Security Board, by regions and States, June 1939

[Data corrected to July 15, 1939]

Region [1] and State	Average payment per recipient for June 1939		
	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children [2]	Aid to the blind
Total	$19.42	$31.19	$23.15
Region I:			
Connecticut	26.03		25.02
Maine	20.53	37.53	23.08
Massachusetts	28.33	56.96	22.30
New Hampshire	23.64	40.44	22.51
Rhode Island	18.95	46.27	
Vermont	15.09	29.06	20.98
Region II: New York	23.57	47.52	24.20
Region III:			
Delaware	10.96	30.89	
New Jersey	19.59	29.72	22.80
Pennsylvania	21.34	35.11	
Region IV:			
District of Columbia	25.57	43.21	26.66
Maryland	17.42	30.82	21.04
North Carolina	9.59	15.38	14.59
Virginia	9.63	22.51	13.05
West Virginia	13.53	21.05	16.87
Region V:			
Kentucky	8.65		
Michigan	16.44	34.10	23.32
Ohio	22.57	38.84	19.75
Region VI:			
Illinois	19.23		
Indiana	17.17	27.48	19.69
Wisconsin	21.20	36.61	22.78
Region VII:			
Alabama	9.29	12.44	8.88
Florida	13.86	25.72	14.60
Georgia	8.12	20.49	10.01
Mississippi	7.34		7.19
South Carolina	8.18	16.23	10.99
Tennessee	13.21	18.35	14.69
Region VIII:			
Iowa	19.90		23.31
Minnesota	20.67	35.13	25.15
Nebraska	15.45	24.18	15.92
North Dakota	17.70	32.34	19.72
South Dakota	18.30		17.06
Region IX:			
Arkansas	6.02	8.14	6.53
Kansas	17.67	26.66	18.89
Missouri	18.77	19.27	
Oklahoma	17.72	12.02	14.72
Region X:			
Louisiana	10.52	21.39	13.44
New Mexico	11.85	21.31	14.82
Texas	14.16		
Region XI:			
Arizona	26.34	31.90	24.95
Colorado	28.20	29.68	27.74
Idaho	21.45	26.90	21.45
Montana	17.02	23.43	21.05
Utah	20.76	33.57	25.78
Wyoming	23.03	30.90	28.13
Region XII:			
California	32.45	41.99	48.03
Nevada	26.57		
Oregon	21.38	40.03	25.27
Washington	22.15	29.27	30.42
Territories:			
Alaska	27.65		
Hawaii	12.62	35.59	14.90

[1] Social Security Board administrative regions.
[2] Average per family.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have another table, one relating to the per capita income in the various States, and that is the test of ability to pay; that is the test as to taxation resources.

In New York State the average income is $700 a year.

In North Dakota the per capita income is $260 per year. Can it be said that the people of North Dakota are as well able to contribute by way of taxation as are the citizens of New York, who on an average receive twice as much income as those who live in North Dakota?

In Connecticut the per capita income is $607 a year compared with South Dakota per capita income of $275 per year.

The average per capita income in California is $605 per year, compared with the average annual per capita income in Louisiana of $300 a year. The income of the individual in California is twice that of the individual in Louisiana.

Mr. President, I ask that the table to which I have just referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Average old-age-assistance payment per recipient (title I), December 1938

United States	$19.55
California	32.43
Colorado	29.99
Massachusetts	28.56
Connecticut	26.66
Nevada	26.46
Arizona	26.10
New York	24.18
New Hampshire	23.08
Ohio	23.01
Washington	22.10
Wyoming	21.62
Idaho	21.55
Oregon	21.30
Pennsylvania	21.19
Wisconsin	20.78
Maine	20.71
Montana	20.48
Utah	20.45
Minnesota	20.42
South Dakota	20.04
Oklahoma	19.94
Iowa	19.82
Kansas	19.62
New Jersey	19.32
Rhode Island	18.78
Illinois	18.52
Missouri	18.48
Maryland	17.51
North Dakota	17.38
Nebraska	17.12
Michigan	17.11
Indiana	16.53
Vermont	14.47
Texas	13.84
Florida	13.84
West Virginia	13.79
Tennessee	13.23
New Mexico	11.15
Delaware	10.84
Louisiana	10.26
Virginia	9.54
Alabama	9.51
North Carolina	9.36
Georgia	8.76
Kentucky	8.73
South Carolina	7.40
Mississippi	6.92
Arkansas	6.15

Per capita income by States 1935

United States	$432
New York	700
Connecticut	607
California	605
Delaware	590
Rhode Island	561
Nevada	545
Massachusetts	539
Wyoming	526
New Jersey	517
Illinois	500
Montana	482
Pennsylvania	478
Michigan	473
Maryland	473
Wisconsin	467

Per capita income by States 1935—Continued

Ohio	$460
New Hampshire	438
Washington	434
Minnesota	416
Maine	414
Colorado	406
Indiana	402
Arizona	401
Oregon	394
Iowa	370
Missouri	366
Vermont	366
Kansas	365
Nebraska	361
Florida	353
Utah	348
Idaho	344
New Mexico	322
West Virginia	318
Texas	316
Virginia	305
Louisiana	300
South Dakota	275
North Dakota	260
Oklahoma	259
North Carolina	253
Georgia	253
Kentucky	240
Tennessee	232
South Carolina	224
Alabama	189
Arkansas	182
Mississippi	170
District of Columbia	966

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the table reveals the reason why the States in the lower economic brackets have not been able to provide adequate old-age-pension payments.

I wish to refer to Arkansas. In Arkansas the per capita income is $182 per year. Think of it; $182. Yet the conferees on the part of the House insist that the man living in Arkansas, with an income of $182 per year, is just as able to pay by way of taxes as the citizens of New York whose income is $700 a year.

In Mississippi the per capita income is $170 a year. Yet it is said that that State is just as able to pay old-age assistance as Connecticut, where the average income is $607 per year.

In the District of Columbia the per capita income is $966 per year. That is higher than the per capita income of any State in the United States. Yet it is not required to pay any more than the State of Arkansas or the State of Alabama.

What about Alabama? The per capita income in Alabama is $189 a year, compared with $605 in California, $590 in Delaware, $561 in Rhode Island, and $545 in Nevada.

The per capita income in South Carolina is $224 per year. In Tennessee it is $232, in Kentucky it is $240, in Georgia it is $253, and in North Carolina it is $253, Oklahoma $259, and in Louisiana $300.

Mr. President, there is a reason for that. Many States such as Georgia, Mississippi, and Alabama have large colored populations. Under the laws of those States the colored population, of course, and very justly, receives the same consideration in matters of this kind that people of the white race receive, and yet they contribute practically nothing in the way of tax payments to the resources of the State. That means that out of the meager resources of the other portion of the population, due to the economic condition in which they find themselves by reason of the policies of this Government for the past 75 years, they find themselves unable through taxation resources to provide adequate or sufficient sums to make decent payments for old-age assistance.

Mr. President, I need not rehearse the economic reasons for the condition of a large section of the Republic in regard to its income and its resources. We know what those policies have been in the past. The South and Southwest are agricultural sections. We have contributed to the growth of the industrial sections of the Republic through high-protective tariffs which have drained from our agricultural areas

our resources of money, and transferred them to other sections of the Republic.

Today in the matter of freight rates the South and the Southwest pay a heavier toll, they pay a higher tribute in the way of freight rates than any other part of the American Union. That results from the law of the United States. It is because of the policies of the Federal Government. It is not because of any fault of ours.

Mr. President, what is the result? The result is that our sections have been impoverished by these policies, and because we are impoverished we have to suffer another humiliation by reason of the fact that the Federal Government contributes five times as much to an American citizen in California as it does to another American citizen, for the same causes and under the same conditions, simply because he resides in the State of Arkansas. He receives four times as much if he resides in the State of New York as he does if he resides in the State of Arkansas. If he resides in the State of Alabama he receives $4.87, and if he resides in Connecticut he reecives $13.33.

It is not just, it is not fair, it is not equitable, it is not sound, and I shall tell the Senate why. Unless the Federal Government recognizes the necessity of making an adequate contribution to old-age assistance to those in the lower brackets we shall have here thundering at the doors of the Senate and thundering at the doors of the House of Representatives waves of protests which will be in the forms of demands along the line of new schemes of pensions, either in the form of the Townsend plan or a wholly Federal system.

Senators need not delude themselves about that. They need not pretend that they cannot hear or they cannot see, because those who can see and can hear are bound to know that those results are inevitable. But if we can adopt my amendment and assure every old-age pensioner at least $15 a month, with a contribution over that sum as the States may be able to contribute, we will give the strongest answer, we will give the firmest resistance, we will give the best argument on earth against these other wild schemes that are going to be forced upon us.

Let Senators not fool themselves that they are not going to yield either. Public opinion is the master in this Republic. When it is aroused, when it is stimulated, when it is vibrant, when it is aggressive, public opinion is stronger than any political ruler, any functionary that holds a place under the American flag. It is stronger than the edicts of Congress; it is stronger than any executive pronouncement. Public opinion, when it is formed and molded and fashioned, and is aggressive, is the most compelling force in America today.

Let Senators not delude themselves that politicians—and statesmen—are going to be resistant. They always have responded, or they have gone home, and if there is one thing a Senator or a Representative does not want to do it is to go home for good. [Laughter.] He might not mind going home for a vacation, but if it is a question of going home for good, he is opposed to it.

Mr. President, I wish to talk a little more about the details of the conference. I wish to be plain. Mr. President, I do not see the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. I should like to have him present in the Chamber, because there may be something said which might interest him.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Clark, Idaho	Hatch	Miller
Andrews	Clark, Mo.	Hayden	Minton
Ashurst	Connally	Herring	Murray
Austin	Danaher	Johnson, Calif.	Nye
Bailey	Davis	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Downey	King	Pepper
Barkley	Ellender	La Follette	Pittman
Borah	George	Lee	Radcliffe
Bulow	Gerry	Lodge	Russell
Burke	Gibson	Lucas	Schwartz
Byrd	Guffey	Lundeen	Schwellenbach
Byrnes	Gurney	McCarran	Sheppard
Capper	Hale	McKellar	Shipstead
Chavez	Harrison	Mead	Smith
Stewart	Townsend	Van Nuys	White
Taft	Truman	Wagner	
Thomas, Okla.	Tydings	Walsh	
Thomas, Utah	Vandenberg	Wheeler	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a moment ago I was discussing the economic injustices which have been inflicted in the past and are now being inflicted upon the people in certain sections of the United States in the matter of freight rates, in the matter of tariffs, and in the matter of building up industrial sections at the expense of agricultural sections—all done by the Government. There is even a more recent instance of injustice and inequality practiced by the Government itself. I refer to the wages paid to Works Progress Administration employees in the various sections of the United States.

It will be remembered that under the old system the W. P. A. wage in the South was about $19, as I recall. I do not have the figures before me. The wage in the South was about $19 as against more than twice that much in other sections.

Mr. HARRISON. More than three times as much.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish some Senator who has the figures available would supply me with the figures. From two to three times as much was paid to W. P. A. workers in New York and New England and industrial areas as was paid to W. P. A. workers in the State of Texas and other Southern and Southwestern States. Is that economic justice? Yet, it is demanded that out of our want and penury we must contribute toward old-age pensions as large an amount as the opulent and prosperous States in the Union. Under the present system States which are wealthy are given more, and the poor States are given less.

> For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance; but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath.

That is the doctrine of the present system, Mr. President. To the rich, powerful, and opulent State which is able to pay $30 a month the Federal Government says, "We will give you $15 per head." To the poor State which is in penury and rags it says, "We will give you $3.08."

Mr. President, I now wish to discuss the reasons why the Connally amendment was done to death. From the beginning of the conference the House conferees refused to take back to the House of Representatives the so-called Connally amendment. There had never been a record roll-call vote in the House of Representatives. The attitude of the House conferees was such that the only way by which the Senate could have secured a yea-and-nay vote in the House was for the Senate conferees to have stood just as stubbornly as the House conferees stood. But the Senate conferees did not do that. When it takes a club to get results it does not do any good with a very soft, purring voice to say, "Please take it back to the House for a vote." When a bludgeon is the only instrument that can get the desired results, it is useless to employ a feather duster.

I wish someone would notify the Senator from Wisconsin that I should like to have him attend the session at this time, for he is largely responsible for the funeral, and I think he ought to attend it. [Laughter.]

Had the Senate conferees told the House conferees, in so many words, that they would not recede until the House conferees should take the so-called Connally amendment back to the House of Representatives and obtained an expression upon it from their supposed masters, their theoretical masters, the House would have voted upon it.

I wonder why they did not take it back. Were they afraid to get an expression of the views of the Members of the House of Representatives itself? They owed it to themselves, they owed it to the country, and they owed it to the Senate of the United States to secure a yea-and-nay vote in the House; and the Senate conferees owed a duty to the Senate of the United States, their masters, to demand and insist that the House of Representatives should have a separate vote on this amendment.

If the House had had such a vote and had rejected by a decisive vote the Connally amendment, the Senator from Texas would not now be submitting these remarks. But I feel a sense of resentment that the conferees on the part of the House of Representatives took the course they followed, and I feel a very deep sense of disappointment that the Senate conferees did not regard it as their duty to the Senate to demand that the House conferees submit the amendment to a vote of the House.

I have the highest regard for all the Senate conferees, but I feel that they owed the duty to their associates on the conference committee and to the Senate itself, after the Senate had solemnly expressed itself on a record roll-call vote on that particular amendment to insist that the House of Representatives do the same thing.

This is supposed to be a democratic Government; ours is supposed to be a representative system; it is supposed to be a Government of constitutional processes. One of those processes is that the House of Representatives, initiating legislation of this kind, shall express itself whether the conferees or whether their masters desire it to do so or not.

I am sorry the Senator from Wisconsin is not in the Chamber. I should like to have him here, Mr. President, for I desire to submit some remarks that I think the Senator from Wisconsin will be interested in. I have undertaken to have him come here; but if he does not come in, I am going to make the remarks anyway. If anyone is interested in having him here, I suggest that he send for him.

Mr. President, I was undertaking to point out a few moments ago what I thought should have been done with respect to securing a separate vote in the House of Representatives on the so-called Connally amendment. I stated that I thought it was the duty of the Senate conferees, representing the Senate and not their own personal views, to have insisted, not by saying, "Won't you please take it back to the House?" but by demanding that the House conferees take the amendment back to the House for a separate vote by that body. The Senate conferees for a while insisted, but at the final conference one of the members changed his mind, and the result was that the conference agreed.

Mr. President, there were three members of the conference who voted against the Connally amendment when it was proposed in this body. That is all right, of course; we knew where they stood. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] were those three Senators. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and myself voted for it.

So the conference was composed of seven members, three whose personal views were against the Connally amendment, and four whose personal views were supposed to be for the Connally amendment. The Senate voted for the amendment and the conferees were the delegates, the agents of the Senate.

There was another amendment, however, which I have already explained, which takes $695,000,000 out of the social security trust fund and gives it to people who are not now under the law eligible and who will not have paid into the fund more than a mere pittance. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]—and I am glad he is now present, for I do not desire to say anything about his attitude unless he is here—the Senator from Wisconsin was very anxious to secure that amendment and as a result, here, near this door, on the day before the last conference the throat of the Connally amendment was cut from ear to ear. As a further result, the House "caved in" on the amendment in which the Senator from Wisconsin was interested, involving the sum of $695,000,000 to come out of this trust fund—not out of the Treasury—and to go to the aged who become 65 years of age this year, and as a consequence the Senator from Wisconsin would not further insist that the House vote on the amendment. The result was, of course, that the Connally amendment collapsed, and the Senate conferees collapsed. Those are the facts.

If there is any Senate conferee here who disagrees with that view, I should like to have him rise and say so.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I prefer to make my statement in my own time, because I desire to review the entire conference, and I do not want to interrupt the Senator's speech.

Mr. CONNALLY. I suggested that anyone who wanted to deny what I said should rise on the floor and do so.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I simply did not want that statement of the Senator to pass without saying what I did say.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, was it not true?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; not as the Senator states it.

Mr. CONNALLY. No other Senator has denied it, and there are four of them on the floor who were on the conference committee.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not know what the Senator means——

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator heard what I said about the change of view of the Senator from Wisconsin when he got his own amendment or the one he favored, for it was not his amendment, but was worked out by the Social Security Board and the Senator from Mississippi. The price of the defeat of the Connally amendment was the $695,000,000 which is to be taken out of the trust fund, paid by employers, and by those who hope to get an old-age insurance some day out of their money, and which is to be given to people who become 65 years of age this year and who have paid in only 1 or 2 years' payments. That is the fact of the matter. So the result was that it was all left to the Senator from Wisconsin, who might as well have been the conference all by himself.

I feel very keenly that the Senate conferees did not discharge the duty to make the House of Representatives vote on this amendment. Following the precedent established by the Senator from Wisconsin about putting in the RECORD other Senators' votes on other occasions, I should like to have set down in the RECORD, following the speech he is going to make explaining his attitude, his vote in the Senate in behalf of the Connally amendment. Then I should like to have printed in the RECORD, following that, his appointment as a conferee, and his instructions to stand by that vote.

The Senator on yesterday saw fit to undertake to attack some of us who have voted, as he conceived, one way on one occasion and another way on another occasion, and to have our votes printed in the RECORD. I am very happy that he did that. Under the old Roman system, you know, they had what they called censors. A censor could remove a Senator who displeased him. We have no constitutional provision for a censor, but it is delightful to know that we have a volunteer censor who is prepared to remove any Senator who does not meet the views of the censor. I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin. He is not only the whole conference committee, but he is now the censor of the Senate. It is splendid to have that sort of a situation. I think it is fine. We have an All-seeing Eye, but that All-seeing Eye is a celestial being, and He is far away. He sits on a distant throne. I think it is fine to have a terrestrial all-seeing eye with superlative powers of moral and intellectual television by which he can look into the hearts and consciences and minds of Senators, and placard them as they ought to be placarded before their constituents. I think it is splendid.

Mr. President, that is the situation with which the Senate is confronted. I, of course, do not expect the Senate to reject the conference report. That makes it all the more important. We know what the prestige of a conference report is when it comes here in the closing days of a session. Of course, Senators say, "Oh, it is either that or no bill." That fact but accentuates and makes stand out prominently the importance of conferees carrying out the wishes of the

body that appoints them, and at least seeing that the other body respects the Senate as much as we respect the House of Representatives. We had a record vote. Every Senator here had to get right up and toe the mark. He had to say where he stood. But the House of Representatives was not permitted to vote on the matter. Nobody knows how individual Members stand.

It is suggested by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] that in the original consideration of the bill the House Members claimed that they had a teller vote or a rising vote on this amendment. Nobody knows how anybody voted. There were only a handful of Representatives on the floor when the matter was voted on. But had it happened then, it would have been quite a different situation that they voted upon than after the Senate had adopted the provision, and it was in the bill, and it came to them as a Senate amendment. All Senators know that it would then have more prestige, and more appeal, and more likelihood of being adopted, than if it had come up on an original proposition when the bill was originally sponsored, with practically all the members of the Ways and Means Committee against it. It might have been a wholly different result.

Mr. President, conferences are necessary, of course. I realize that there must be an accommodation of views, naturally; but in the accommodation of those views the Senate ought to be represented by those who are earnestly and sincerely in sympathy with and propose to carry out the wishes of the body appointing them, the Senate of the United States. I feel that the Senate conferees should have insisted to the last that the House go back and vote upon this amendment. Had that been done, and had this amendment then been rejected, you would not have heard the Senator from Texas speaking in his present tenor on this floor. I feel a sense of outrage about it all.

Mr. President, I want to say in closing that no one need beguile himself that this is the final chapter in this scene. I expect to continue at the next session of the Congress the effort to obtain substantially this particular amendment to the Social Security Act. I shall be unwilling then, as I am unwilling now, for the Federal Government to say to one citizen who resides in a rich and a powerful State, "We will give you out of the Federal Treasury, because of old-age assistance, five times as much as we give another citizen, similarly situated as to yourself, because he lives across a State border, because he lives in another geographical section of the Republic." I am willing for the States to make contributions and think they ought to make contributions, but those contributions ought to bear some relationship to the ability of the States to pay them.

What do you expect when you pass the hat in church? You do not expect the pauper to give on an equal basis with the prosperous banker who sits by his side. When you go to the United States tax collector's office you do not expect the man with $1,000 income to pay upon the same ratio or to pay the same amount as the man with $25,000 a year income or $100,000 a year income. If there is to be no humanity in the administration of this act, if it is to be based purely, cold-bloodedly upon the theory that we will match only the amounts of money contributed by the various States, then we have not made any approach to the real solution of this problem, in which the Federal Government has put its hand to the plow. This amendment of mine would practically result in every old-age beneficiary in the United States receiving at least a minimum of $15 per month. If he lived in a prosperous State, he would then receive a very substantial amount above that sum, but those in the very poorest States would get $15 per month.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am very much interested in the able statement of the Senator. I desire to say that if any plan is enacted to give four times as much to one State as to another, it is an un-American plan; and I think the so-called social security that we have before us needs much amendment if it is not to be social insecurity.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. That is the effect, though not in the language. It is not so written in the law that one State shall get four times as much as another. On the written page and in theory the law operates uniformly, of course, in every State; but the effect of it, the result of it, is that in some States the old-age pensioner gets only one-fifth as much as he gets in other States. Under the present amendment that limit is raised to $20, and if it is complied with in the rich States some of the States will pay six times as much to an old-age pensioner as another old-age pensioner will receive in another State.

Mr. President, this conference report no doubt will be adopted. I desire to enter here my solemn protest against the injustices inflicted by the final result. This fight is not over. Those of us who are interested in this amendment will renew the contest in January, when Congress again meets. If the House of Representatives is ever given the opportunity to vote upon this amendment, not in the cloakroom, not out on the street, but in the House Chamber where the roll is called and where the Members go on record, I have a sublime faith that the House of Representatives will vote in favor of it. I have had many assurances from Members of the House that they wanted an opportunity to vote, and that if they had that opportunity they had high hope of being able to adopt the amendment. I do not know whether they could or not. It is not for me to pass upon that question, but it is for me to pass upon the question of the right of the membership of the House to vote upon it. It is up to me to pass upon the question as to the right of the Senate to demand that the House conferees take this back for a separate vote. If there is to exist comity between the two bodies, if there is to be that mutual respect as between the two bodies, whenever the Senate has gone on record by a roll-call vote on an amendment, the House of Representatives owes it to the Senate, it owes it to the bicameral system of a House and a Senate, to take the amendment back and have it voted upon, and secure a final result.

Mr. President, the amendment is not dead; it is just going to slumber a little while. Under the sedative which has been administered to it, it is going to sleep for a while, but it is going to come out of the coma, it is going to come out of the slumber which has been brought on, and about next January it will be again urged, and it will continue to be urged until this plan, in substance, shall be adopted by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, it is a matter of very deep regret to me that the Senator from Texas has seen fit to question the honorable character of my conduct as a representative on the part of the Senate in the conference on the important amendments to the social-security bill. For the Senator from Texas I have always had a deep personal affection and a great respect. Nothing he has said here, so far as I am personally concerned, shall alter that feeling. I do think, however, that I should make a brief statement, because I am easy in my own conscience so far as the discharge of my responsibility to this body as a member of the conference committee is concerned.

I voted for the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] to provide a system of variable grants to States for the old-age assistance title to the Social Security Act, in accordance with the recommendations of the Advisory Council and the President, when it was submitted in the Committee on Finance. I voted for the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas in the Senate Committee on Finance, although we were unfortunately unable to obtain a majority in the committee. When the proposal came up on the floor of the Senate, I voted for the amendment.

I believe that the principle involved in the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina, and recommended by his select Committee on Unemployment, recommended by the Advisory Council on Social Security, and by the President, is a principle which must be written into Title I of the Social Security Act if it is to remain upon the statute books. Personally I preferred that amendment to

the Connally amendment because I believed that it was predicated upon the sound principle of endeavoring to ascertain the capacity of the respective States to meet in some measure the problem of assistance to the aged, rather than a flat increased contribution on the part of the Federal Government to all States, regardless of their financial capacity to meet this problem, which today is one of the most serious problems confronting the country.

Mr. President, in the conference I fought as hard and as long as I could for the Connally amendment, but during the progress of the conference—and I make this statement only in view of the attack which the Senator from Texas has made upon the Senator from Wisconsin—after we had argued and debated the amendment with the managers on the part of the House for many days, and it became apparent that the attitude of the House managers was adamant, I went to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] for whom I have great respect—and I think I may say without exaggeration that, during my service upon the Committee on Finance, we have enjoyed a cordial and friendly and mutually respectful relationship—and asked him to call a meeting of the Senate conferees in order that there might not be any misunderstanding among us.

At that meeting I stated that I believed that the Connally amendment was of grave importance, but that I personally did not regard that particular amendment as of sufficient importance to warrant a failure of the conferees to come to an agreement on the bill and to bring in a report, so that the differences between the two Houses might be composed. I stated in the meeting of the Senate conferees that I would stand by the Connally amendment up to and until we had made every honorable effort to persuade the managers upon the part of the House to take the Connally amendment back to the House for a separate record vote.

I stated, however, that, so far as I was personally concerned, I wanted my colleagues on the conference representing the Senate to know that when that stage was reached I, as an individual conferee, discharging my responsibility to the Senate, and accepting the full measure of that responsibility, would exercise my judgment that the conference should not be frustrated because of that particular amendment.

As I recall, thereafter there were several meetings of the conference; there was further debate upon the Connally amendment, and a further effort was made to have the managers on the part of the House take the Connally amendment back to the House of Representatives for a separate and a record vote.

When the conference met on Thursday, however, in the Ways and Means Committee room in the Capitol the question again arose as to whether or not the managers on the part of the House would take the Connally amendment back to the House for a separate vote. A statement was made in the conference by a member of the conference committee representing the Senate, and who was an ardent supporter of the Connally amendment, that, in his judgment, even if the amendment went back to the House for a separate vote under the conditions at which we had then arrived, and in view of the approaching adjournment of Congress, the House would without question overwhelmingly support the position upon the amendment originally taken by the managers on the part of the House. He further stated that, even if such action were taken, insofar as he was concerned he did not think it would alter the situation, and he did not think that there would be a bill at this session of Congress.

When that statement was made on Thursday I felt that I had done everything I honorably could to get the managers on the part of the House of Representatives either to recede with an amendment, or to recede altogether, or to take the Connally amendment back to the floor of the House of Representatives for a separate vote.

Following the adjournment of the conference I went to the Senator who had made this statement and said, "Now I feel that I must exercise my individual judgment. I feel that I must, in order to bring about an agreement between the two Houses, take the position that the time has arrived when the Senate should recede upon the Connally amendment"; and I think I state accurately what he said to me—namely, in effect, that he believed that I had fought valiantly and honorably for the Connally amendment, and that, so far as any action which I might take in the remaining conferences was concerned, I was certainly free to exercise my individual judgment.

Mr. President, the Senator from Texas has implied—or perhaps I should put it more bluntly, has stated—that there was a price upon my action in this matter. I have been a Member of this body for nigh on to 14 years; it will be 15 years next December. The Senator from Texas, so far as I know, is the first man, in or out of this body, to question the integrity of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, there was not any price. The question which confronted me was whether or not, in my judgment as a duly appointed conferee on the part of this body, the Connally amendment was of sufficient importance to prevent an honorable agreement between the two Houses upon this bill, and preclude the possibility of its enactment.

Early in the proceedings I had notified my fellow conferees—I had put them upon notice—that I did not believe that any one amendment should stand in the way of an honorable agreement.

Mr. President, there were still three amendments in disagreement when the conference met on Friday morning last.

There was the 2.75 amendment. There was the so-called Massachusetts or State plan. There was the question of making wages creditable as of January 1, 1939. And there was the Connally amendment.

Mr. President, there was a sincere and an earnest effort to agree made on Friday morning—time has slipped away from me, but that is a little more than 24 hours ago. Everyone knew that the Congress was about to adjourn, but still there was a conscientious effort made to get the managers on the part of the House to agree to a partial report, to settle the remaining items of difference with the exception of the Connally amendment, and to present a partial report, and to ask for further instructions upon the Connally amendment.

The managers on the part of the House unanimously, so far as I can remember, took the position that they could not honorably take that course; that if they were going back for instructions on any one of the remaining amendments they must go back on all. I think it is fair to say they did not contend that such were the rules of the House, but they contended that such was the practice of the House, and that it would be unfair to managers on the part of the House who were interested in other amendments remaining in disagreement, aside from the Connally amendment, to agree to compromise those differences and to take the Connally amendment back as a naked issue.

Mr. President, I have never been a Member of the House. I have, however, been honored by this body in the past as a conferee representing the Senate. But it seemed to me that upon the question of whether or not they could honorably take certain action I must defer to the opinion of the House conferees; That I could not decide for myself the question of their conduct toward their fellow conferees.

Assuming that they took a sound position, assuming that they felt that they had to go back to the House for instructions on all the amendments still in disagreement—the Connally amendment, the 2.75 amendment, the Massachusetts-plan amendment, and the date of January 1, 1939, to make wages creditable for title 2—what would have been the situation? There was not a senatorial conferee who did not believe and know that if the powerful representatives of the Ways and Means Committee, as managers on the part of the House, went back to the House of Representatives and asked for instructions upon these amendments, they would be overwhelmingly instructed to adhere to the original position of the House upon them. And what situation would we then have been in, with the life of this session of Congress measured in terms of mere hours?

Everyone who is at all familiar with legislative procedure knows that if the managers on the part of the House had gone back for instructions on these three important amendments, and then had come back into conference, they would have been adamant on all of them, and any opportunity for compromise or discussion or adjustment of the differences between the two Houses would have been gone, and that the measure would have had to lie over until the next session of Congress. Furthermore, be it said, if such action had been taken, the instructions thus placed upon the managers upon the part of the House would have still been binding in January when we met.

Mr. President, I would be the last to claim that the pending conference report or that these amendments make satisfactory adjustments and changes in the Social Security Act. But the Senator from Mississippi, the chairman of the committee, whose name appeared upon the original legislation, if I remember correctly—in any case, he participated in the framing and the enactment of the original law, and the consideration of all amendments that have been proposed since that time—has stated upon the floor of the Senate that, in his deliberate judgment, despite his disappointment at the elimination of the Connally amendment, which I share, he believes the amendments are of such importance to the country that he would cast his vote for the conference report if it came to a vote.

Mr. President, I do not desire to go any further in revealing what took place in the conference. I hope I have not gone too far. If I have, I plead, Mr. President, that I was placed in such a situation, by the suggestion by the Senator from Texas, that, in order to defend before my colleagues my conduct as a representative of this body, it was essential for me to do so.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. I merely rise to state that I personally found no fault with the position taken by the Senator from Wisconsin. The Senator from Wisconsin stood loyally for the Connally amendment, and I appreciate that the only reason why he finally accepted the compromise offered by the House conferees was because he felt we ought to have a conference report, and to vote otherwise might endanger the passage of the amendments. What the Senator has stated with reference to his conversation with me is correct.

I think, since my name has been brought into the discussion, that it is incumbent upon me to make this statement.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi for that statement.

In conclusion let me say that it was my firm and deliberate judgment that if the managers on the part of the Senate had insisted upon the conferees on the part of the House going back to the House and obtaining additional instructions on all these propositions, we not only thereby would have sealed the doom of the measure so far as any action at this session of Congress was concerned, but we would have prejudiced indefinitely, even when we met in January, the possibility of an honorable compromise being arranged between the two Houses.

Mr. President, in the past I have never hesitated to accept any responsibilities that have been placed upon me, and I shall never hesitate to do so in the future. The remarks which have been made by the Senator from Texas shall not in the least cause me to deviate so much as a hair's breadth from the course which I regard as honorable in the discharge of my official responsibilities.

Mr. DOWNEY obtained the floor.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I want to say just a word, with the indulgence of the Senator from California.

Mr. President, I do not care to add to the length of this debate. I feel, however, that I am called on to say a word further: The Senator from Wisconsin seemed to imply, or rather affirm, that I attacked his personal integrity. I never made any claim that he benefited personally by it at all. All I stated—and I shall repeat it—that the Senator from Wisconsin was very much interested in another amendment, the $695,000,000 amendment, which takes money out of the trust funds and gives it to people who are not entitled to it under the present law.

I said he was more interested in that than he was in the Connally amendment, and that he preferred to secure that amendment rather than the Connally amendment. I here and now repeat that when the conference was over the Senator from Wisconsin went out of the room with his own amendment in his pocket, and the Connally amendment got the ax. I repeat that. I do not mean that the Senator from Wisconsin obtained any personal advantage from it. I did not attack his personal integrity. I have simply stated the fact.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish to say, with the permission of the Senator from California, that the statement made by the Senator from Texas is not correct. I had no preference as between any of these amendments. But when I found that the House was adamant upon his amendment I felt that, after we had made a fight which lasted 21 days, the time had come when some amendment had to give way, and the amendment which had to give way was the one upon which the House Members were adamant. Had it been the amendment to which the Senator refers, or any other amendment, I would have felt exactly the same way.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, before the amendments as embodied in the conference report shall become law I desire to comment very briefly upon the Social Security Act from the point of view of my pension philosophy as it will be with these amendments which have been discussed. I wish to reiterate what I have said in two prior speeches in the Senate—that, in my opinion, the present Social Security Act marks the high tide of futility, impotency, and stupidity of statesmanship. The Senator from Texas has very abundantly illustrated the first issue upon which I shall comment. A law which wrings out of the poorer States money for the Federal Treasury for the benefit of the richer States cannot be characterized as other than unjust, inequitable, and absurd.

Yes, Mr. President; under the present law California, because it is a richer State, will take from the Federal Treasury at least $4 for every pensioner, as compared with $1 for Arkansas or Mississippi. Under this law we are capitalizing the misery and distress of the poorer citizens of this State of the Union. Under this law we are giving to the citizens in the richer States four times what we give to the citizens in the less fortunate States, and if that does not violate every rule of decency, common sense, and taxation, I do not know what could.

However, I desire to call to the attention of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as well as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the fact that the principles and views which they have so logically and properly expressed carry them a long, long way toward the philosophy which I am advocating; that is, the Townsend plan. I ask those Senators if it is inequitable and unfair to give to the citizen of a wealthier State, from the Federal Treasury, four times what is given to a citizen in a poorer State, is it not also unjust to give twice as much? Under the amendment of the Senator from Texas, in conjunction with the present law, California, Massachusetts, New York, and others of the more wealthy States would be entitled to $20 from the Federal Treasury for every pensioner, while 15 or 20 of the poorer States would receive only half that amount. If a fourfold contribution is not just, I ask the Senator from Mississippi if a twofold contribution by some strange process of reasoning is to be justified? I think not.

I say to Senators that by their eloquent speeches on the amendment, which should have been accepted by the House of Representatives, they have given a tremendous impulse,

thank God! to a philosophy of abundance and a decent, logical, Christian pension system.

Mr. President, let me briefly advert to another grotesque and absurd phase of the Social Security Act. I see in the Chamber certain Members whose names are revered and blessed in the labor temples of America. I cannot believe that those Senators understand what this law will do to the workers in the covered occupations. Under this strange, grotesque, obscene law, we plan to take 6 percent of the pay roll from the workers in the covered occupations and to penalize the workers, for we tax them 6 percent every month and give them substantially less than we now give as a matter of governmental charity and subsidies. I wonder how the Senators who hold the confidence of the workingmen of America can go back and say to them, "We have voted for a bill which will impose upon your pay roll a 6-percent tax, and for that we are going to give you a pension even more meager than that which we now give in most of the States as a matter of governmental subsidy."

Mr. President, I shall have to go back to the State of California and tell the workers in the covered occupations this strange and unbelievable story; and if those who hear my voice do not believe I am speaking the truth, I do not wonder, because the situation has reached the point of absurdity and is almost unbelievable.

In the next year in the State of California the workers in the covered occupations who are being taxed upon their salaries will receive annuities of $16 or $17 on the whole, while we shall pay $40 a month under this law as a matter of charity. Looking 40 years ahead, a worker in California earning an average of $100 a month, working every month in the 40 years, will receive substantially less than California now pays as a matter of governmental subsidy.

It may be that my sense of logic is wrong, and that some Senators who understand and know labor better than I do can go back to labor in the United States and say, "Yes; we supported a bill which will take $6 out of your pay check for every $100 every month; and in return we promise to pay you, 40 years from now, less than is now paid in many of the States as a matter of governmental subsidy." I cannot believe that the workers of America will understand that strange kind of philosophy.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. How much would the Townsend Plan take out of the covered worker's check every month?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I want my remarks to be brief and limited. I am merely commenting upon the measure before the Senate. However, next January I shall be happy indeed to discuss that issue before this body.

Mr. President, let me also point out to the Senate that in the United States today there are about 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 people between 60 and 65 years of age. Most of them are totally unemployed, most of them living in misery and insecurity. Any social security act which does not provide for that great body of citizens between 60 and 65 will not meet the approval of the great majority of American citizens.

Mr. President, I should like to make a further brief comment. The Social Security Act, which betrays the worker as opposed to the recipient of charity, will give to those in need who are past 65 an average of only $20 a month; and we Senators of the United States are placing our edict back of a law to degrade, humiliate, and starve people, because no one can live in decency on $20 a month.

One Senator said that a man could not starve in 5 months. Perhaps not, if he is receiving $20 a month; but he had better starve and have it over with than to exist in misery, insecurity, and degradation on $20 a month.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. In my State of Minnesota the Republican administration now in power has passed a law by which the State compels aged individuals to sign away even their little homesteads. They are not permitted to have a dollar's worth of property in their homesteads. They must sign it away to the State before they receive even a crust of bread. Then when they pass from the earth they are not permitted to leave a single dollar to their children.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his contribution, and for directing my attention to that situation. Let me tell him of a press notice which I have just received from Sacramento, Calif. A man 81 years of age had been receiving a pension in Sacramento. The State officials found that he had secreted and hidden out the tremendous sum of $654. Under our law no man who has over $500 is entitled to a pension; so the State attached the money and charged the man with fraud. The man, 81 years of age, loosed the chickens he had on his little ranch, obtained a gun, and blew out his brains. Undoubtedly he did the smart thing; for when a government becomes so small and oppressive as to haunt and pursue a man because of a breach of that kind, the unfortunate citizen had better seek a happier world.

Mr. President, in concluding let me say that the pension philosophy which we are advocating is a philosophy of abundance. We know that the farms and factories of America can produce sufficient wealth to deluge every American citizen with all the good and needed things of life. Those who say we cannot pay decent wages and decent pensions are merely saying that we must continue to live in an era of poverty. We can now produce in the United States almost twice as much as we do produce.

When I suggest that the senior citizens of America should be paid sufficient to enable them to live in decency, and some Senators say, "We are just too poor; it cannot be done," they are not referring to the workers and the businessmen and the factories and the farmers of America, because those could produce in generous abundance for every retired citizen and worker in the land. When it is said we are too poor, yes, we are too poor in ability to work out the means of distributing to the retired citizens and the workers of America that which our wealth could so abundantly produce.

Mr. President, I have intruded upon this body longer than I should. I desire in closing merely to say that the Senator from Texas is right; this question is not ended. In a land of opulent wealth, "flowing with milk and honey," with our farms and factories operating at 50 percent, retired workers, kicked out of employment in a technological civilization, will not be satisfied with any law condemning them to penury and distress when ample wealth to allow them to live in dignity and security is all around them.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bill and joint resolutions of the Senate:

S. 2141. An act to authorize acquisition of complete title to the Puyallup Indian Tribal School property at Tacoma, Wash., for Indian sanatorium purposes;

S. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution to amend Public Resolution No. 112, Seventy-fifth Congress; and

S. J. Res. 185. Joint resolution to authorize the Assistant Secretary of the Navy to continue to serve as Acting Secretary of the Navy until the appointment of a Secretary, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1648. An act to provide for the refund or credit of the internal-revenue tax paid on spirits lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the floods of 1936 and 1937 where such spirits were in the possession of the original taxpayer or rectifier for bottling or use in rectification under Government supervision as provided by law and regulations;

H. R. 5405. An act authorizing the installation of parking meters and other devices on the streets of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5685. An act to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to define, regulate, and license real-estate brokers, business-chance brokers, and real-estate salesmen; to create a Real Estate Commission in the District of Columbia; to protect the public against fraud in real-estate transactions; and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1937.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the following bills of the Senate:

S. 796. An act for the relief of Mato, Miljenko, Bozo, and Augustin Cibilic, or Zibilich;

S. 1269. An act for the relief of Emil Friedrich Dischleit; and

S. 1538. An act for the relief of Konstantinos Dionysiou Antiohos (or Gus Pappas).

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to each of the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1654. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pacios Pijuan; and

S. 1911. An act for the relief of Daumit Tannaus Saleah (Dave Thomas).

The message further announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 381) to provide funds for the maintenance and operation of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts for the fiscal year 1940, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1708. An act to amend the Employers' Liability Act;

S. 2240. An act to provide for a national census of housing; and

S. 2271. An act for the relief of Barnet Warren.

PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS PRODUCTS OF FISHING INDUSTRY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair) laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the amendments of the Senate on the bill (H. R. 5681) to authorize the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation to purchase and distribute products of the fishing industry which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
August 4, 1939.

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2 to the bill (H. R. 5681) to authorize the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation to purchase and distribute surplus products of the fishing industry.

That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 to said bill with the following amendment:

Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment and on page 1, line 3, of the House engrossed bill after "funds", insert "not to exceed $1,500,000 per year,".

That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment:

In the matter proposed to be inserted by the said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "Secretary of Commerce" and insert "Secretary of the Interior" where it appears each time in said amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3 and 4.

The motion was agreed to.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST SESSION OF SUPREME COURT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House of Representatives which was read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 33

Resolved, etc., That a joint committee consisting of five Members of the House of Representatives and five Members of the Senate shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, respectively, which is empowered to make plans and suitable arrangements for fitting and proper exercises, to be held on the 1st day of February 1940, in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the commencement of the first session of the Supreme Court of the United States, held at the city of New York on Monday, the 1st day of February 1790.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution, and, if that consent be given by the Senate, I shall then move the adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move the adoption of the resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

WATER CONSERVATION PROJECTS IN THE GREAT PLAINS AREA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1802) authorizing construction of water conservation and utilization projects in the Great Plains and arid and semiarid areas of the United States, which were, on page 3, to strike out all of section 4; and on page 3, line 17, to strike out all after "Act", down to and including "Act", in line 21.

Mr. WHEELER. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6635) to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEE obtained the floor.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

Mr. LEE. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. There are on the calendar a number of House bills which our leader is very anxious to have disposed of, and nothing can be done in that direction until the conference report shall have been disposed of. I do not desire to interfere with the Senator, but we would like to expedite the consideration of the calendar.

Mr. LEE. I will say to the Senator from Utah that I do not anticipate taking much time.

Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD an editorial from the Austin American, of Austin, Tex., under the heading Deserters Repudiate Their Party Pledge: "No Man Shall Starve," by Charles E. Green:

[From the Austin (Tex.) American]

DESERTERS REPUDIATE THEIR PARTY PLEDGE: "NO MAN SHALL STARVE"

(By Chas. E. Green)

Roosevelt-hating Democrats joined hands with reactionary Republicans and had their say this week.

Eager to discredit the administration, they scuttled the bill for "recoverable expenditures"—the lending bill—and destroyed the housing program.

These two measures remained, with the curtailed relief program, mainstays of the Government's effort to carry the Nation on toward reemployment, busy factories, buying capacity, business stimulus.

Their wreckage shows that partisan politics of '40 already has stifled the Nation's hopes of constructive action by this Congress.

Many of these Democratic House Members rode into office on the Nation's confidence in Franklin D. Roosevelt, his policies, and aims. Many persons believed with the President that wealth must be better distributed in every part of the country—jarred from the control of the money barons of Wall Street.

They now have destroyed much of the effect of the lending-spending works program of the past. They have blasted the hopes of hundreds of thousands of workers' families for food and shelter and clothing this winter. They have played into the hands of unemployment; they have put terror into the minds of those people who were told that "nobody shall starve in this Nation."

But, most of all, they have played into the hands of the bourbon aristocracy of the Republican ranks, who could never see further than the inside of their money vaults.

They have scuttled the hopes for reform of the masses who can no longer look toward a liberal viewpoint of the Democratic Party. Their action strikes at the hopes of the Democratic Party in 1940.

In 1924 the Republican Party was well pleased with the choice of John W. Davis as the Democratic nominee. Republicans approved it. They chuckled over it. Whether Coolidge or Davis went in, a good conservative was in the saddle.

They approved Davis' selection and voted the Republican ticket.

In 1940 there may be some parallel. In 1919 people began to tire of the idealism of Woodrow Wilson; of the reforms he sought. In this cynicism, they turned to Harding and his materialism, which brought on the subsequent Hoover debacle.

Wilson failed to stem the flight of the masses because he was a tired, sick man. He was defeated in spirit and soul. He had been broken on the rack of political persiflage.

Today there are many who are tired of Roosevelt; tired of his ebullient idealism. The arch conservative who prates of rugged individualism and the Constitution has snatched his lantern and is galloping down the highway shouting, "The Communists are coming."

Wall Street, which no longer can dictate the interest rate that business pays on investments, is disgruntled with "this meddling Government," that won't let it exact its full tribute from the "principalities" that constitute "their" United States of America.

But being tired of Roosevelt is a poor excuse for stranding hundreds of thousands of American families, still the victims of Hoover's depression, to bleak hopelessness of a return to Hoover policies—rewards for the powerful; subsidies and tax refunds for the rich; contempt for the poor; starvation for the jobless.

Thus it is that, while the Senate might have been expected to start the wreckage, Democrats in the House have stunned the Nation the worst since an inane Congress mumbled politics while Republicans crushed the wealth from the land and their livelihood from the people back in 1930–31.

Let the coalition of Democrats and Republicans take the political destiny of this Nation from the hands of the masses and invest it again with the eastern moneyed interests. Let them plant it under the same standard that nearly crushed a mighty nation in 1930, 1931, and 1932. Let them count their votes and chuckle in the cloakrooms and rub their hands in glee.

But there will be a day of reckoning. The man in the White House today is not a sick, tired individual. The revolters against the sell-out of the party will have a virile leader. In the districts of these deserter Democrats and elsewhere there will be rumblings, growlings. Human misery knows no season—and no political party.

Mr. President, we have in the United States sufficient natural resources, sufficient labor, and sufficient capital to develop those resources to feed every hungry mouth, to clothe every half-clad body, and to furnish shelter for every family in need in the Nation. This administration is undertaking to bring those three things together in a proper relation; it has undertaken to redistribute the national income in such a manner that every person would have a buying power. It is not so much that we need more loans in this country; it is not so much that we need construction of new factories, although that would follow certainly; what big business needs today is not so much so-called confidence as it needs cash customers, because cash customers will result in confidence.

Since this depression began labor-saving inventions have displaced millions of laborers. I recently rode through the city of Pittsburgh where there were pointed out to me factories in which I was told one could walk for a block and not see a worker; yet those factories were operating by mechanical devices. Mechanical inventions have so displaced labor that if we were "back to normal" in some regards we still would have a great army of unemployed.

It is not enough to shrug our shoulders and say that these people can live; they will get along. How will they get along? Some say, "Balance the Budget." I should like to balance the Budget all right; but balancing the Budget will not give employment to persons who are out of jobs because of mechanical inventions.

There is enough of wealth in this country. The problem is to get it into circulation in the proper manner. This administration has undertaken to cut down the number of hours and distribute the work. This administration has undertaken to cut off labor unemployment at both ends by the youth program on the one hand and pensions for needy old people on the other. This administration has undertaken to set up Government force pumps that force money out to the forks of the creek, so that it will come back in the form of buying power.

It has been charged that we have a deficit. Indeed we have. I wish we could pay. I believe we can pay. We have $55,000,000,000 worth of tax-exempt bonds. There is $55,000,000,000 of wealth in this country which is not contributing to taxation, $55,000,000,000 that does not pay tax either as to income or as to principal; and then we are told that we cannot have an economy that will provide merely a buying power for the necessaries of life for all the people in this country. I believe we can.

There are those who have temporarily stymied this program, but I challenge them. There is no mistaking the issues. It is the same fight that was fought and the same group that marched under the banner of the Liberty League in 1936. There has been some attempt to confuse the issues. There is no confusing of the issues. It is the same invisible financial government that wrecked this country before by the concentration of wealth into the hands of the few with the accompanying poverty on the part of the many.

Money gravitates toward the hands of a few just as surely as heavy bodies fall, pulled by the law of gravity. Divide all the money equally tonight, and tomorrow night some persons would be rich and some would be broke. The second night the rich would be richer and fewer, and the poor would be poorer and more numerous; and that process continues. The poor cannot stop it, or they never would be poor. The rich will not stop it, because to do so does not square with human conduct. There is only one power that can stop it. There is only one power that can set up an offsetting pressure, bringing about a constant redistribution of purchasing power, and that is the Government. I understand that the purpose of Government is to protect the weak from the strong, to prevent the strong from exploiting the weak.

Some persons talk about the right to make money. One fellow's right is tempered by the other fellow's right. One man's right to make money is tempered by another man's right to make a living. When his children tug at his coat and beg for bread, he has a right for a day's labor to give them shelter and food and clothing and schooling.

Yes; we have made mistakes. We would be foolish to say that we have not. We have made mistakes; but we did not make the mistake of doing nothing when men were hungry and out of employment and could not get it. That is the one mistake we have not made. The trouble is, too many people, like the window washer, just see the dirt on the window in front of them—the little W. P. A. trouble down here, the rough spot over there somewhere—and they say, "Look at those things," and point them out to us. Yes; they are mistakes. The window washer up on the skyscraper sees the dirt on the window. That is all he sees. He does not see the great foundation stones that support the building. He does not see the great sweep of architectural beauty. He does not see the tiers of useful offices. All he sees is the dirt on the window in front of him.

Back away and take a panoramic view of this administration. Look at America today and look at her in 1932, and you will be impressed by the difference between what this administration has done for America and what the other administration did to America.

There is no mistaking the issue. The opponents of the administration are marching under the same banners. They shouted "Rugged individualism!" in 1932. They shouted "Save the Constitution!" in 1936; and that is just what we did. We took it off the shelf and made it a living, breathing, dynamic document.

They say, "Save the Constitution!" We say, "Save labor from economic slavery!"

They say to us, "Save the Constitution!" We say, "Save home owners from being driven out from under their shelter."

They say, "Save the Constitution!" We say, "Save children from going to bed at night hungry."

They say, "Save the Constitution!" We say, "Save the workers from sweatshops."

They say, "Save the Constitution!" We say, "Save the old people from the disgrace of a poorhouse!" and that is what we have done. It is the same battle. This program has been thwarted and stymied by the same forces which marched under the banner of "Save the Constitution from the Democrats!" and that is funny.

Out of 67 unconstitutional laws passed since the Government was organized down to this administration, 21 were

passed by Democratic Congresses and 42 were passed by Republican Congresses.

I think Abraham Lincoln was a great man, a great American, and a great constitutional lawyer; and yet in his administration Republican Congresses passed six unconstitutional laws.

I think Theodore Roosevelt was a great man and a great American, and yet under Theodore Roosevelt Republican Congresses passed seven unconstitutional laws.

Under the administration of Ulysses S. Grant 12 unconstitutional laws were passed, more than half as many as had been passed by all the Democrats from the organization of this Government down to this administration.

"Save the Constitution!" That is what we have done. We have saved it and made it a living, breathing document. We have made it a tower of strength, a haven of refuge for the weak; and that is what our opponents cannot stand. They have hamstrung the people's program. The wage earner has been thrown for a loss. The unemployed have been kicked in the teeth. This Congress has let the people down. But we are not discouraged. We will meet you at the polls, those of you who have stopped this program.

You say we have a debt. Why, the increase in the value of securities on the stock market alone would pay the increase in the public debt. The increase in the national income alone would pay much of that debt. Any man judges a balance sheet by both sides; not alone by the one side which simply shows the liabilities, but also by the side which shows the assets.

Look across America today, and you see a rising tide of prosperity. You see monuments of this administration; you see school buildings, libraries, public buildings, fine roads, everywhere standing as monuments.

Yes; the issues are drawn. They are clear. Those who are marching with the financial hierarchy that wants again to take control of the Government, I put you on notice: This is the people's program which has been temporarily thwarted, and the people will meet you at the polls.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. KING. I move the adoption of the report.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN]. I understand that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] and in his absence I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the necessary absence of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. Both of these Senators if present would vote "yea."

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily detained from the Senate. I am advised that if present and voting, these Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I announce that my colleague [Mr. TYDINGS] is unavoidably detained. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. STEWART. I have a general pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] and vote.

Mr. BURKE. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is unavoidably detained. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], and to announce that if he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am informed that if present he would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. My colleague, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SLATTERY], is unavoidably detained. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. MCKELLAR (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND] which I transfer to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] and allow my vote to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 4, as follows:

YEAS—59

Adams	Davis	Lodge	Sheppard
Andrews	George	Lucas	Shipstead
Ashurst	Gerry	Lundeen	Smith
Austin	Gibson	McCarran	Stewart
Bailey	Guffey	McKellar	Taft
Bankhead	Gurney	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Barkley	Hale	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Borah	Hatch	Minton	Truman
Bulow	Hayden	Murray	Vandenberg
Burke	Herring	Nye	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Johnson, Calif.	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Pittman	Walsh
Chavez	King	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	La Follette	Schwartz	White
Danaher	Lee	Schwellenbach	

NAYS—4

Connally	Ellender	Pepper	Russell

NOT VOTING—33

Barbour	Downey	Hughes	Slattery
Bilbo	Frazier	Logan	Smathers
Bone	Gillette	McNary	Tobey
Bridges	Glass	Maloney	Townsend
Brown	Green	Neely	Tydings
Byrd	Harrison	Norris	Wiley
Caraway	Hill	Overton	
Clark, Idaho	Holman	Reed	
Donahey	Holt	Reynolds	

So the report was agreed to.

SURVEY OF INDIAN CONDITIONS—EXPENSES

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1159, Senate Resolution 81, relative to a survey of Indian conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 81) submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma February 16, 1939, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, authorized by Resolution No. 79, agreed to February 2, 1928, and continued by subsequent resolutions, to make a general survey of the condition of the Indians in the United States, hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $10,000 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for such purposes.

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

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two House on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7462) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1939, and June 30, 1940, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 377. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of Harry Bryan and Alda Duffield Mullins, and others";

H. R. 5506. An act 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.;

H. R. 6099. An act for the relief of Mrs. S. F. Sewell; and

H. R. 7389. An act to provide for the presentation of a medal to Rev. Francis X. Quinn in recognition of his valor in saving the lives of two of his fellow citizens.

MILITARY AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 367) to authorize the Secretaries of War and of the Navy to assist the governments of American Republics to increase their military and naval establishments, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment, on page 3, line 7, after the name "United States," to insert "*And provided further*, That no contract shall be entered into under the terms of this joint resolution which shall interfere with or delay the United States in the full use of its shipyards, arsenals, munition plants, and other equipment for its own purposes", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That (a) the President may, in his discretion, authorize the Secretary of War to manufacture in factories and arsenals under his jurisdiction, or otherwise procure, coast-defense and antiaircraft matériel, including ammunition therefor, on behalf of the government of any American republic; to sell such matériel and ammunition to any such government; to test or prove such matériel and ammunition prior to sale or delivery to any such government; to repair such matériel on behalf of any such government; and to communicate to any such government plans, specifications, or other information relating to such matériel and ammunition as may be sold to any such government.

(b) The President may, in his discretion, authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct vessels of war on behalf of the government of any American republic in shipyards under his jurisdiction; to manufacture armament and equipment for such vessels on behalf of any such government in arsenals under his jurisdiction; to sell armament and equipment for such vessels to any such government; to manufacture antiaircraft artillery and ammunition therefor, on behalf of any such government in factories and arsenals under his jurisdiction; to sell antiaircraft artillery and ammunition therefor to any such government; to test or prove such vessels, armament, artillery, ammunition, or equipment prior to sale or delivery to any such government; to repair such vessels, armament, artillery, or equipment on behalf of any such government; and to communicate to any such government plans, specifications, and other information relating to such vessels of war and their armament and equipment or antiaircraft artillery and ammunition therefor, as may be sold to any such government or relating to any vessels of war which any such government may propose to construct or manufacture within its own jurisdiction: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall be construed as authorizing the violation of any of the provisions of any treaty to which the United States is or may become a party or of any established principles or precedents of international law: *And provided further*, That no transaction authorized herein shall result in expense to the United States, nor involve the extension of credits by the United States: *And provided further*, That no contract shall be entered into under the terms of this joint resolution which shall interfere with or delay the United States in the full use of its shipyards, arsenals, munition plants, and other equipment for its own purposes.

SEC. 2. In carrying out transactions authorized by section 1, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized, in their discretion and provided that it be not inconsistent with any defense requirements of the United States or of its possessions, to communicate or transmit to the government of any American republic or to any duly authorized person for the use of such government information pertaining to the arms, ammunition, or implements of war sold under the terms of that section or to any vessels of war constructed within the jurisdiction of any such government, and to export for the use of any such government coast defense and antiaircraft matériel and ammunition therefor, and vessels of war and their armament and equipment involving such information: *Provided*, That any information thus communicated or transmitted or involved in any such arms, ammunition, implements of war, or equipment when exported shall cease to be considered restricted after 1 year from the date that such communication or transmission has been authorized or such exportation made.

SEC. 3. All contracts or agreements made by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy for the sale to the government of any American republic of any of the arms, ammunition, or implements of war, the sale of which is authorized by this joint resolution, shall contain a clause by which the purchaser undertakes not to dispose of such arms, ammunition, or implements of war, or any plans, specifications, or information pertaining thereto, by gift, sale, or any mode of transfer in such manner that such arms, ammunition, implements of war, or plans, specifications, or information pertaining thereto, may become a part of the armament of any state other than an American republic.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, shall, when any arms, ammunition, implements of war, or equipment are exported pursuant to the provisions of this joint resolution, immediately inform the Secretary of State, Chairman of the National Munitions Control Board, of the quantities, character, value, terms of sale, and destination of the arms, ammunition, implements of war, or equipment so exported. Such information shall be included in the annual report of the Board.

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this joint resolution.

(b) All moneys which may be received from the government of any American republic, in payment for any article delivered or service rendered in compliance with the provisions of this joint resolution, shall revert to the respective appropriations or appropriations out of which funds were expended in carrying out the transaction for which money is received, and such moneys shall be available for expenditure for the purpose for which such expended funds were appropriated by law, during the fiscal year in which such funds are received and the ensuing fiscal year.

SEC. 6. The Secretaries of War and of the Navy are hereby authorized to purchase arms, ammunition, and implements of war produced within the jurisdiction of any American republic if such arms, ammunition, or implements of war cannot be produced in the United States.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, this is quite a simple measure, although we are assured by the State Department, by the Secretary of the Navy, by the Secretary of War, and by General Marshall, that it is of great value to the United States. The title itself does not quite suggest what it means. The title is:

To authorize the Secretaries of War and of the Navy to assist the governments of American republics to increase their military and naval establishments, and for other purposes.

I may say that the joint resolution deals solely with war vessels, antiaircraft guns, and coast-defense weapons. It does not deal with arms and ammunition, in the sense of rifles, and things of that kind. It deals purely with defensive materials.

Let me read the first paragraph of the joint resolution, with regard to antiaircraft matériel and coast-defense matériel:

That (a) the President may, in his discretion, authorize the Secretary of War to manufacture in factories and arsenals under his jurisdiction, or otherwise procure, coast-defense and antiaircraft matériel.

It will be noted that there are inserted the words "or otherwise procure." Those words were offered as an amendment in the House of Representatives, because the Secretary of War suggested that the private arsenals have this matériel, but under contracts with the United States Government they are not at liberty to sell them to any other government until a year after they deliver them to the United States. Therefore, unless this power to procure is granted to the Secretary of War, it will be impossible for the South American republics to obtain any of these materials by reason of contracts with the United States Government. So the word "procure" was inserted.

On page 2 it is provided:

The President may, in his discretion, authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct vessels of war on behalf of the government of any American republic in shipyards under his jurisdiction.

Let me say at the beginning that it is very probable that particular provision will not be used for some time to any great extent. Admiral Leahy, testifying before our committee, stated that our own requirements would practically monopolize the capacity of our navy yards for years, except

that there were certain characters of ships which might be constructed which would not interfere with or delay the operations of our navy yards for our own use. Yet there was a fear in the minds of some of the committee that the use of these words might interfere with or delay the use of some yards to carry out our own program. So the following amendment was offered in the Senate committee to the bill as it passed the House, and it will be submitted and passed on by the Senate:

And provided further, That no contract shall be entered into under the terms of this joint resolution which shall interfere with or delay the United States in the full use of its shipyards, arsenals, munition plants, and other equipment for its own purposes.

That answers that question.

Then another question was raised. When Admiral Leahy and General Marshall were before our committee they were asked whether or not this would involve any expense to the United States Government, and they said it would not. They were asked whether or not it would involve the extension of any credit on behalf of the United States, and they said it would not.

The question arose as to what benefit it would be to the South American republics to build ships or obtain antiaircraft guns from the United States Government. The answer was the Government of the United States would furnish them without profit, and no private plants can afford to do that.

They were asked again whether even then ships could not be constructed in foreign yards cheaper than in the United States, and they said they could be. But some of the South American republics, if not all of them, would rather pay more for American ships, and for American antiaircraft guns and coast-defense guns, than to buy them at a lower figure in foreign countries.

Mr. President, it was also stated that some of the South American countries which had had experience in buying antiaircraft guns, coast-defense guns, and so forth, in countries other than the United States, had found them quite inferior to those supplied from this country, and they desired to have them from the United States.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANAHER in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada a question. What would be the situation in the event the United States went to war, and certain vessels were being constructed in American shipyards at that time? Would the United States take them over? Was there not a precedent for such action established in the World War by England? I do not remember whether the ships which were taken over by England at the time of the outbreak of the war were being constructed in private yards or in government shipyards.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, contracts entered into by the Navy with regard to ships, and by the Army with regard to antiaircraft guns and coast defense guns, would undoubtedly take into consideration the event of war. I think the history of the World War in every case shows that contracts of that character which existed were canceled, even if they were with private industry, if it was in the interest of the United States to do so.

Mr. GERRY. In other words, if the vessels were being constructed in American yards, and were near completion, in the event of war we would get the advantage of them, if it was decided that we were justified in taking them over?

Mr. PITTMAN. Undoubtedly that would be the proper procedure, because it has been the procedure followed in the past.

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

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are a number of employees of the Federal Government who have patents on various inventions which are used in connection with antiaircraft guns, machine guns, tanks, and other implements of war. Under their patent rights they are not entitled to obtain a royalty when these guns or similar materials are manufactured for the use of the Government of the United States. When any such materials are manufactured in private munitions plants for sale in foreign countries they receive a royalty. It occurs to me that as the resolution is worded such persons would be deprived of their royalties on their inventions in connection with the sales which were made to South American republics.

Mr. PITTMAN. That is possibly true. I cannot pass on that legal question. Does the Senator desire to pursue that question?

Mr. RUSSELL. If that situation obtains, I shall ask to be recognized in my own right when the Senator shall have concluded.

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

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Is it understood, as clearly stated in the language of the bill, that these arms, ammunition, and vessels have to be sold at the exact cost to the Federal Government?

Mr. PITTMAN. It is not.

Mr. WALSH. Is a discount to be allowed?

Mr. PITTMAN. No discount is to be allowed. The matériels are supposed to be sold at cost, according to the testimony.

Mr. WALSH. The republics of South America that are to purchase a vessel or vessels constructed in the navy yards are to pay the exact cost of the construction of the vessels in the navy yards?

Mr. PITTMAN. That is the intention of the measure, as well as that of the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War.

Mr. WALSH. I call attention to section 3 on page 4, which was probably inserted in the bill in accordance with the suggestion I made to the State Department when they first submitted the matter to me for my opinion as chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. It prevents the disposition of—

Such arms, ammunition, or implements of war, or any plans, specifications, or information pertaining thereto, by gift, sale, or any mode of transfer in such manner that such arms, ammunition, implements of war, or plans, specifications, or information pertaining thereto, may become a part of the armament of any state other than an American republic.

I do not observe "vessels" in that language.

Mr. PITTMAN. Vessels are governed by treaties.

Mr. WALSH. Naval vessels?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I am glad to have that information.

Mr. PITTMAN. We have several treaties of limitation, and all those treaties provide that it shall be contrary to the treaties to transfer a war vessel to any other government.

Mr. WALSH. So that in the event we use navy yards to build one or more naval vessels for a South American republic, it could not under any existing treaty transfer that vessel to another country?

Mr. PITTMAN. It could not.

Mr. WALSH. Even to another South American republic?

Mr. PITTMAN. I am not sure about that, since the Senator has asked me the question. I would rather read the language:

SEC. 3. All contracts or agreements made by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy for the sale to the government of any American republic of any of the arms, ammunition, or implements of war, the sale of which is authorized by this joint resolution, shall contain a clause by which the purchaser undertakes not to dispose of such arms, ammunition, or implements of war—

And so forth.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator think the phrase "implements of war" includes naval vessels?

Mr. PITTMAN. No; it does not.

Mr. WALSH. It does not?

Mr. PITTMAN. No. Now, as to ships, I say that all the treaties which have been entered into in the last several years, even after the treaty of Washington in 1922, as a

part of the limitation of armaments, so as to govern the pro rata proportion of ships, have expressly provided against the transfer of any war vessels to any other governments.

Mr. WALSH. I am glad to have that information. I want to ask the Senator one other question.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, in that connection let me call attention to a proviso:

Provided, That nothing contained herein shall be construed as authorizing the violation of any of the provisions of any treaty to which the United States is or may become a party or of any established principles or precedents of international law.

It was stated to us by Mr. Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, that the proviso was inserted particularly for the purpose of excusing us from selling any war vessels to any of the Latin American republics.

Mr. WALSH. Briefly stated, the bill then provides for the building by our Government of naval vessels upon the order of or contract from any of the republics of South America, and the selling to them of any arms or implements of war at cost to the United States Government, and in addition a proviso is attached which would prevent such a government selling to any other government, except to a republic of South America?

Mr. PITTMAN. They could not even sell it to a republic of South America.

Mr. WALSH. But they could sell implements of war?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes; and arms, but not vessels, because we are bound by an agreement with respect to vessels.

Mr. WALSH. I am in accord with the position the Senator has taken. I see no reason why we should not render this service to our neighboring South American republics. But I should like to ask the Senator if he has thought of the wisdom of limiting section 3 to a given number of years.

Mr. PITTMAN. That was answered by Admiral Leahy and by General Marshall. They stated that with respect to war materials, and so forth, the local manufacturers who have knowledge of these inventions were required to preserve secrecy for the period of 1 year, and that at the end of a year the information would become public through other sources anyway. No other confidential information is given. And they would not give any confidential information except that which would be expected to be published at the end of the year anyway. That is all.

Let me state further that when this bill was first introduced and referred to the Committe on Foreign Relations—I introduced it at the request of the State Department—there was a question——

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield when he reaches a convenient point in order that a conference report may be presented?

Mr. PITTMAN. I will be through in 1 minute. I think it is quite appropriate, however, to read one more proviso which is a limitation on the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy in making contracts. I have read two. This is the third:

And provided further, That no transaction authorized herein shall result in expense to the United States, nor involve the extension of credits by the United States.

While that was the intention, as shown by the testimony of Admiral Leahy, General Marshall, and the Secretary of State, that amendment was offered in the House to make it absolutely certain that there should be no expense whatever to the Government; and the Senate committee, to make the intent absolutely certain, added:

And provided further, That no contract shall be entered into under the terms of this joint resolution which shall interfere with or delay the United States in the full use of its shipyards, arsenals, munition plants, and other equipment for its own purposes.

The situation is that these countries are today buying such materials abroad. They do not like to buy them abroad. They do not like to have commissions come over to show them how to use them, and they do not think the materials are as good as ours. It is to our interest to provide such materials so long as we are not interfered with or delayed.

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

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. And provided they are willing to pay the added cost of having the materials constructed in the United States.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. Sumner Welles testified that even though it cost more, they were glad to do it.

Mr. WALSH. I think the provision to which the Senator has referred, which was inserted in the House, removes any doubt as to whether or not these vessels or munitions are to be sold at less than the actual cost.

Mr. PITTMAN. I think so.

THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ADAMS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7462) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1939, and June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 15, 24, 26, 27, 56, 57, 58, and 59.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 37, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum "$2,500,000" named in said amendment insert "$1,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

"For an additional amount for five Commissioners and other personal services in the District of Columbia, and for all other authorized expenditures of the Securities and Exchange Commission in performing the duties imposed by or in pursuance of law, including the employment of experts when necessary, fiscal year 1940, $100,000, including the same objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of such sum shall be available for the conduct of a foreign office."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

"To complete the compilation and publication of a history of the formation, signing, ratification, and establishment of the Constitution, including such historical facts and data as the Commission may deem pertinent relative to the commencement of the First Congress of the United States under the Constitution; the proceedings and ceremonies in connection with the inauguration of George Washington as the first President of the United States under the Constitution; the adoption and ratification of the Bill

of Rights, and the first meeting of the Supreme Court of the United States; including therein also a final report of the activities of the Commission during the Nation-wide observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formation, ratification, and establishment of the Constitution, fiscal year 1940, $15,000, of which not to exceed $5,000 shall be available exclusively for personal services."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"AGRICULTURAL-MARKETING SERVICE

"United States Warehouse Act: For an additional amount to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Warehouse Act, fiscal year 1940, $17,500, of which not to exceed $3,200 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Defraying deficits in treasuries of municipal governments, Virgin Islands: For an additional amount for defraying the deficits in the treasuries of the municipal governments because of the excess of current expenses over current revenues for the fiscal year 1940, municipality of Saint Thomas and Saint John, $15,000, and municipality of Saint Croix, $20,000, in all, $35,000, to be paid to the said treasuries in monthly installments."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$18,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$272,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$915,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For expenditure, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, for chartering and commissioning the steamship *Bear* as a vessel of the United States Navy for the purposes of the survey of the Antarctic regions to be made by the United States Antarctic Service as authorized by the Urgent Deficiency and Supplemental Appropriation Act, fiscal years 1939 and 1940, approved June 30, 1939, Public, No. 160, Seventy-sixth Congress: *Provided*, That such expenditure shall be made from the amounts appropriated for this purpose for the Department of the Interior under the head of 'Expenses, Division of Territories and Island Possessions' in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1939, approved May 2, 1939, and the Urgent Deficiency and Supplemental Appropriation Act, fiscal years 1939 and 1940, approved June 30, 1939."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ALVA B. ADAMS,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
FREDERICK HALE,
JOHN G. TOWNSEND, Jr.,
GERALD P. NYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
C. A. WOODRUM,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Colorado intend to make a brief statement as to what the conference report provides?

Mr. ADAMS. I shall do so.

Mr. President, the conferees of the Senate and House have gone over the bill in great detail, of course. The Senate conferees obtained recessions on the part of the House with respect to some 50 Senate amendments. The Senate has receded from five of its amendments, one of which was made up of three parts. I assume that the Senate is particularly concerned in the Senate amendments from which the Senate conferees receded.

One of those was the Civil Aeronautics Authority item, with respect to which the House had provided an appropriation of $3,000,000, and the Senate had increased it to $5,675,000. The conference agreement was $4,000,000, which, I may say, is the figure submitted to us by the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] at the time of the hearing as an appropriate figure. It does not represent an agreement. In the situation the conferees felt it was not an inappropriate figure.

With respect to the Federal Housing Administration, the House had put in nothing for additional administrative expenses under titles I and II. The Senate had added $500,000 and $1,000,000, respectively. The conference agreement was the result of the Senate conferees receding on the $500,000 item, so that the amount is $450,000, and the recession on the $1,000,000 item was to $850,000.

With respect to the social-security items, there was considerable discussion. As Senators know, the information we have is not personal information, but comes from Budget estimates and statements made. On those items there was a compromise by reducing the amounts 50 percent, with the idea, as the House conferees said to us, that in January, if the development of the new program shows that larger amounts are needed, increased amounts can be made available. The Senate conferees acceded to that suggestion.

With respect to the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Senate had placed $110,000 in the bill. There was some complaint, and that item was reduced to $100,000, a reduction of only $10,000, with the understanding that it should be made clear in the report that we were not appropriating money for the maintenance of a London office. The original request provided for the maintenance of a London office, which the Senate had not included, but the House asked that the situation be made clear in the report.

The Senate had included an additional amount for warehousing in connection with the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation. The Senate had added $35,000. That was compromised, on a 50-percent basis, at $17,500. I am stating the detailed type of compromises with which Senators are familiar.

On the item for the Virgin Islands there was a 50-percent reduction in the amount, which did not seem unreasonable.

With respect to the Federal public-building item, the Senate will remember that there was some discussion of that item. The Senate conferees receded from the $1,000,000 item on that point.

There was an item of $6,500 for expenditures for the maintenance of a Mormon-cricket laboratory in Bozeman, Mont. A concession on the part of the Senate was made as to that.

The Senate had stricken out an item for the purchase of certain lands for the Colville Indians. We found upon investigation—and were corroborated by the House conferees—that the gentlemen who appeared before us, and who, we understood, represented the Indians generally, did not represent the tribe, and that the House was correct in its position. The Senate receded from that amendment.

With respect to reindeer, the House had included a provision for the purchase and operation of reindeer herds. Some members of the conference committee very reluctantly agreed to that item; so if the conference report is adopted, the United States Government will be the largest operator of reindeer herds in the world.

There were three provisions in reference to the consolidation of Coast Guard and Lighthouse Service funds. The House conferees insisted that we should await further development of the reorganization plans. There seemed to be no emergency, so the Senate receded on those items. They were merely accounting and administrative items.

Two items were the final items of contention among the conferees. One was the $119,000,000 item for the restoration of the Commodity Credit Corporation capital. The House conferees were quite insistent that the House had refused to increase the capital, and that they ought not to be asked to agree to the item. The Senate conferees, instructed not only by the action of the Senate in support of its committee, but by a roll-call vote, insisted that they could not and would not recede on that matter.

The other item under consideration at the same time was the wage and hour appropriation. The House Committee on Appropriations had made no appropriation for that item. On the floor of the House $1,000,000 was added. In the Senate committee that amount was increased by $500,000. On the floor of the Senate an additional $500,000 was added. The House conferees were very insistent that they could not and would not agree to any increase in the appropriations over the $1,000,000 which the House had included. They said to us that there was a very definite understanding in the House.

I shall ask the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] to make that part of the explanation, because he had some conversations on the subject.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, the situation with reference to this particular item as it developed in the conference was that the managers on the part of the House stated that during the consideration of the bill—and the committee was opposed to any appropriation at all—quite a number of Representatives, headed by the chairman of the Labor Committee [Mrs. NORTON] conferred with the committee on the floor of the House, and agreed that if the sum of $1,000,000 were included in the bill they would not seek any increase in the amount, and would be opposed to an increase. At first the managers on the part of the House were of the opinion that representatives of the Wage and Hour Administration were parties to the agreement. Upon inquiry it was found that that was not true; but the chairman of the House Committee [Mrs. NORTON] advised me that she and the Members of the House Committee were agreed on their own account and had formally entered into an agreement not to ask for any additional funds, and to support the committee. The Senate conferees were therefore in the position that if the bill were taken back to the House, under the agreement which existed in the House, both sides would have stood by their position, and there would have been no increase. By the compromise the Senate conferees effected, the appropriation is increased by $200,000 more than the House provided. The Senate added a million dollars; the conferees agreed upon $200,000, which is $200,000 more than we ever would have gotten had the matter gone back to the House.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to say that I have nothing but sympathy and understanding for the managers on the part of the Senate in the dilemma in which they were placed; but I think the Senate is not going to forget that it did vote for $1,000,000 additional, therefore providing the $2,000,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. I believe the Senate is keenly conscious of the necessity of affording this agency a reasonable amount of funds so as to make possible a substantial enforcement of the Wage and Hour Act. So I have hope that in January when, no doubt, a situation will exist which will still justify the consideration of a proposal to provide additional funds for the Wage and Hour Administration, the managers of the conference on the deficiency bill will recall the efforts they have put forth on this occasion.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the compromise which provided that of the amount which the Senate had added only $200,000 should go in is unsatisfactory to the Senate conferees, it is unsatisfactory to the Senate, and it is my own judgment that a larger sum of money would be needed for the proper enforcement. That was the statement I made to the Senate when the matter was before the Senate; that is my present judgment.

We were confronted with a series of problems. One was the Commodity Credit Corporation item, which was a major item, and the other was the wage and hour problem, and the $200,000 for the Wage and Hour Administration is all that the Senate conferees could secure from the House conferees.

Now it is entirely up to the Senate. If the Senate wishes to reject the conference report, that is for the Senate to decide. All the Senate conferees say is that they have exacted from the House $200,000, which the House conferees were extremely reluctant to grant, and which they said they would not grant. I think it is the judgment of the Senate conferees that had the bill gone to the House for a separate vote we would surely have lost the $200,000 and might have lost the Commodity Credit Corporation item as well.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to confirm the statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee. Owing to the agreement that was made in the House by the members of the Committee on Labor they were in honor bound to support their committee, and if the amendment went back there would have been no increase at all. So we are just $200,000 ahead.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely rise to say that no doubt the conferees did right in increasing, insofar as they could, the appropriation for the wage and hour administration. There are from 19,000 to 20,000 complaints now unexamined; and if the Wage and Hour Administrator puts into effect the 32½-cents-per-hour minimum under the Industries Committee's report for the textile industry and approximately 35 cents per hour as a minimum wage in the shoe industry, it will take from ten to twenty million dollars a year to enforce the Wage and Hour Act. Even then it will not be enforced, Mr. President, because under the act the minimum wage is not based upon the productive capacity or power of the laborer or worker; nor does it necessarily have any relation to the economic value of the services rendered. Therefore, it is just beginning another N. R. A., and it cannot be enforced. If the minimum wage in the textile industry is stepped up to 32½ cents an hour when under the law a minimum wage of 30 cents an hour goes into effect on October 24 next, and if the shoe industry committee steps up the minimum wage to 35 cents an hour when under the law the minimum of 30 cents an hour goes into effect next October, there will be 50,000 cases for the Wage and Hour Administrator to examine. Until we are willing to recognize the fact that it is impossible to make an industry pay a wage without regard to the productive capacity of the worker and of the minimum possibilities of the industry to meet that wage, we are going to have an impossible situation.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, these statements cover, I think, quite fully the details of the conference report. There was a recession by the House of the full amount for the Commodity Credit Corporation capital. We were confronted, as every conference committee is, by a variety of propositions. It was suggested to us that they might be willing to concede an increase in the borrowing capacity of the Commodity Corporation rather than an increase in its capital. It was suggested that we accept reductions in the capital increase in varying amounts. I think the Senate will agree that the conferees have done the best it was possible to be done under the circumstances. We are not satisfied, and I assume it is rare that a conference committee is satisfied. All I can say is that it is for the Senate to approve or to reject the report which we have submitted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, now will the Senator yield?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to corroborate everything the Senator from Colorado has so well expressed about the conference report. I think the Senate conferees have done exceedingly well. At any rate, we got everything for which the Senate stood that it was possible to get. I think there was nothing left undone or unsaid to represent the views of the Senate in the conference; and I hope that the conference report will be adopted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I cannot let this opportunity pass by, in the closing hours of the session, without sincerely commending the conferees upon the part of the Senate for persuading the House conferees to restore the $119,000,000 item to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Realizing to the full extent the problems that exist among the farm population in my section, especially the problem of the corn farmers, and knowing something about mandatory corn loans which have been written into the law and realizing that every cooperating farmer in the corn commercial production areas of America fully understood when he entered into the contract with the Government that mandatory corn loans would be accessible to him, I am constrained to say at this hour that the conferees have done a remarkable job for the farmers of America as well as for the Nation itself. Had not the Senate and the House agreed to the $119,000,000 restoration of the capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation, I say, without fear of successful contradiction, that we would have been repudiating an honest obligation that we owed to the farmers of America, for every individual representing Uncle Sam in the Farm Belt, when he talked to a farmer about his contract, gave the farmer to understand that mandatory corn loans would be given to him in the event he became a cooperator in the program. Again I congratulate the conferees, and the Senator of Illinois is certain that they will have the everlasting gratitude of every farmer in America whether he be a cooperator of the program or otherwise.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I have concluded all I wish to say unless it is desired to ask me questions.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 878) to amend the act of August 26, 1937.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5515) for the relief of Mrs. Virgie B. Weaver.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1540. An act to adjust the compensation of the members of the National Advisory Health Council not in the regular employment of the Government;

S. 1802. An act authorizing construction of water conservation and utilization projects in the Great Plains and arid and semiarid areas of the United States;

H. R. 1648. An act to provide for the refund or credit of the internal-revenue tax paid on spirits lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the floods of 1936 and 1937 where such spirits were in the possession of the original taxpayer or rectifier for bottling or use in rectification under Government supervision as provided by law and regulations;

H. R. 5405. An act authorizing the installation of parking meters and other devices on the streets of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5515. An act for the relief of Mrs. Virgie B. Weaver;

H. R. 5681. An act to authorize the Federal Surplus Commodies Corporation to purchase and distribute surplus products of the fishing industry;

H. R. 5685. An act to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to define, regulate, and license real-estate brokers, business-chance brokers, and real-estate salesmen; to create a Real Estate Commission in the District of Columbia; to protect the public against fraud in real-estate transactions; and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1937;

H. R. 6635. An act to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 185. Joint resolution to authorize the Assistant Secretary of the Navy to continue to serve as Acting Secretary of the Navy until the appointment of a Secretary, and for other purposes.

PAYMENT OF ATTORNEY'S FEES FROM OSAGE TRIBAL FUNDS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4117) to provide for the payment of attorney's fees from Osage tribal funds, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

ELMER THOMAS,
B. K. WHEELER,
HENRIK SHIPSTEAD,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

WILL ROGERS,
JAS. F. O'CONNOR,
USHER L. BURDICK,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

SALE OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

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

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, there is upon the calendar of the Senate a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 375) which has reference to the sale of 150,000 bales of cotton to Switzerland and France. When the Senate bill relative to that matter was called up during the present week the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] desired to look into the measure. I understand they have now no objection to it, with an agreement that two amendments shall be offered which are acceptable to them.

I ask unanimous consent at this time for the consideration of the House joint resolution, because if it is not considered now it cannot be passed at the present session.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I inquire if the joint resolution has been referred to a Senate committee?

Mr. BYRNES. The Senate bill was reported unanimously, but it would be useless to offer the Senate bill because of the near approach of adjournment. This joint resolution unanimously passed the House and is on the Senate calendar. It is a House measure. It provides for the sale by the Commodity Credit Corporation, for cash, of 175,000 bales of cotton.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I recall it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I desire to say that with the amendments which have been agreed upon by the Senator from South Carolina and myself and others interested in the matter I have no objection, and I hope the Senate will pass the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have no objection, of course, but I wish to make an inquiry after the joint resolution is taken up.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 375) to authorize the sale of surplus agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I desire to make an inquiry. If the joint resolution is now before us, all right.

What is the design for the rest of this day? Is the calendar to be called? Are we to take up bills? Are we to determine what bills shall be taken up and proceed with them?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is my intention, as soon as the pending joint resolution is disposed of, to seek consent of the Senate to call the calendar for the consideration of House bills alone to which there is no objection. It is useless to pass any Senate bills now; they cannot be considered by the House; but on the calendar there are several House bills which should be passed. This joint resolution, though, is of a peculiarly emergent character, and I hope there will be no objection to its consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am not objecting to this joint resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the pending business can soon be disposed of, and we can proceed to consider other House bills on the calendar before adjournment.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It depends on what the Senator means by "soon be disposed of."

Mr. BARKLEY. That is, of course, a relative term.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes. Has the Senator the resolution of final adjournment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have it, but I have not introduced it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I understand that. Will the Senator produce it?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not at this moment. I will say to the Senator that I will produce it at an appropriate time, and I think that will not be long delayed.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I simply want to know "where we are at." Then we are going to hear the calendar, are we?

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope so.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. All right. We will proceed with the hearing of the calendar. I am willing to stay here. I am not objecting to that course.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand. I am trying to facilitate the orderly consideration of some matters that ought to be disposed of before we adjourn. It may require us to stay here 2 or 3 hours longer, but I do not think that ought to be a matter of great inconvenience.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What is the House doing?

Mr. BARKLEY. The House is waiting on us.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And it is going to wait for the bills that we consider?

Mr. BARKLEY. The bills that I have in mind are bills which probably will require no amendment on the part of the Senate, or only formal amendments which will be agreed to by the House, so that there will be no delay on account of them.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what is the use, then, of finishing the unfinished business, which has in it amendments which must go to the House for action?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senate has made it the unfinished business, and it will remain the unfinished business until it is disposed of, unless it is set aside, and I do not want to see that done. I think it will be disposed of without great delay.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Let me make a suggestion, so that we will not delay the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN]. Here is a joint resolution which, because it has an amendment of the Senate, cannot be acted upon at this session. Is not that correct?

Mr. PITTMAN. I have not information of that character. I assume that if a conference should be required, it could not be acted upon; but if a message went over from the Senate transmitting the joint resolution with an amendment, I do not know whether or not the House would act on it as we are acting on House messages. I am not prepared to say.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am not asking these questions with a desire to be at all obstreperous. I am simply asking so that we shall know what we are doing. Here is a joint resolution which has one amendment on it, and may have other amendments. Is it possible for that measure to be acted upon by the House?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it is, if the Senate sends it back to the House. I think it is possible and probable that speedy action will be taken on the amendment; but, of course, if it were not taken by the House, then both Houses would determine whether or not they would remain in session any longer for the consideration of any amendment sent over on a House bill. What I am trying to do is to have such House bills as we do pass with any amendments sent back to the House as soon as possible, so as to see whether they can take action on our amendments. The matter immediately before the Senate is the joint resolution presented by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Very well. My question remains unanswered. I do not know "where I am at," but I am perfectly willing to proceed in any way that is desired.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have done my best to enlighten the Senator. I have said that as soon as this joint resolution is disposed of—and I cannot say just when that will be—I am going to ask unanimous consent to have all House bills on the calendar called for consideration, if there is no objection. If there are no amendments to them, that ends the matter. If there are any amendments, they take their chances on going back to the House and getting action on the amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What are the chances?

Mr. BARKLEY. How do I know?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thought the Senator would with his experience.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not know what the House will do about any of the amendments, but I hope they will be agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Will they act?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think they will. I cannot guarantee it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Very well, we will proceed on that basis. Pardon me for delaying the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "upon terms, conditions, and in quantities prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and approved by" and insert "with the approval of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 19, after the word "selected", it is proposed to insert a colon and the words "*Provided further*, That in case of a sale, settlement must be made within 60 days after delivery, and not more than 500,000 bales of cotton shall be sold upon the terms and conditions provided in this joint resolution."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation, with the approval of the President, is authorized to sell surplus agricultural commodities, acquired by such Corporation through its loan operations, to foreign governments on the condition that, except for rotation to prevent deterioration, such commodities shall be held in reserve by such governments for a period of not less than 5 years from the date of acquisition, and shall not be disposed of unless a war or war emergency results in a serious interruption of normal supplies of such commodities: *Provided*, That under this joint resolution no concession below the prevailing world market price for the unrestricted use of such commodities, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, shall be granted, in consideration of the obligation assumed by such governments to hold such commodities in reserve as required hereinbefore, in excess of a maximum amount equal to the average carrying charges, as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture, that would be incurred if such commodities should be held for an additional 18 months' period by the Commodity Credit Corporation. In determining specific cotton to be sold under this act, the determination shall be made by sampling and selection at the place where the cotton is stored on the date of signing any sales agreement or contract under this

act, and no cotton shall be sold under any such sales agreement or contract which, after such date, is transported to any other place and there sampled and selected: *Provided further*, That in case of a sale, settlement must be made within 60 days after delivery, and not more than 500,000 bales of cotton shall be sold upon the terms and conditions provided in this joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2904, dealing with the same subject, will be indefinitely postponed.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF UNITED STATES COURTS

Mr. HATCH obtained the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HATCH. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee. I know what the Senator from Tennessee wants.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a few days ago, as Senators will all remember, the Congress passed a bill providing for the establishment of an administrative office of the United States courts. The House has passed a joint resolution providing that as much as $150,000 of the funds already in the hands of the courts may be used for the purpose of establishing the administrative office. The act goes into effect, under the terms thereof, on November 1, 1939. The joint resolution has been thought by many to be of sufficient importance for the Appropriations Committee to be polled. The committee has been polled, and a majority of the committee is in favor of the joint resolution. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration without interfering with the measure that is now pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution from the House of Representatives which will be read.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 381) to provide funds for the maintenance and operation of the administrative office of the United States courts for the fiscal year 1940 was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PERNICIOUS POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have been asked repeatedly by many people to interpret section 9 of Senate bill 1871, which recently passed the Senate, and is now the law. I have refused to give my own interpretation of that section, because I believe that after a measure becomes law, the interpretation of the law belongs to another branch of the Government. However, that section is an exact duplication of the present civil-service rule relating to employees in the classified service.

I have taken the interpretation and rules of the Civil Service Commission almost in their exact language, and have digested the language, setting forth in part what the Civil Service Commission says may or may not be done under the rule. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the matter to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL ACTIVITY UNDER SECTION 9—SENATE BILL 1871

The law applies to officials and employees in the executive branch of the Government.

In addition to the President and Vice President, the following are excepted from the prohibitions of the law:

(a) Heads and assistant heads of executive departments.

(b) Officials who determine policies of the Government.

(c) Officials and employees of the legislative branch of the Government.

The pertinent language in section 9 is practically a duplication of the civil-service rule prohibiting political activity of employees under the classified civil service.

The section provides in substance, among other things, that no such officer or employee shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns.

The same language of the civil-service rule has been construed as follows:

1. Rule prohibits participation not only in national politics, but also in State, county, and municipal politics.

2. Temporary employees, substitutes, and persons on furlough or leave of absence with or without pay are subject to the regulation.

3. Whatever an official or employee may not do directly he may not do indirectly or through another.

4. Candidacy for or service as delegate, alternate, or proxy in any political convention is prohibited.

5. Service for or on any political committee is prohibited.

6. Organizing or conducting political rallies or meetings or taking any part therein except as a spectator is prohibited.

7. Employees may express their opinions on all subjects but they may not make political speeches.

8. Employees may vote as they please, but they must not solicit votes; mark ballots for others; help to get out votes; act as checkers, marker, or challenger for any party or engage in other activity at the polls except the casting of his own ballot.

9. An employee may not serve as election official unless his failure or refusal so to do would be a violation of State laws.

10. It is political activity for an employee to publish or be connected editorially, managerially, or financially with any political newspaper. An employee may not write for publication or publish any letter or article signed or unsigned in favor of or against any political party, candidate, or faction.

11. Betting or wagering upon the results of a primary or general election is political activity.

12. Organization or leadership of political parades is prohibited but marching in such parades is not prohibited.

13. Among other forms of political activity which are prohibited are distribution of campaign literature, assuming political leadership, and becoming prominently identified with political movements, parties, or factions or with the success or failure of supporting any candidate for public office.

14. Candidacy for nomination or for the election to any national, State, county, or municipal office is within the prohibition.

15. Attending conventions as spectators is permitted.

16. An employee may attend a mass convention or caucus and cast his vote but he may not pass this point.

17. Membership in a political club is permitted, but employees may not be officers of the club nor act as such.

18. Voluntary contributions to campaign committees and organizations are permitted. An employee may not solicit, collect, or receive contributions. Contributions by persons receiving remuneration from funds appropriated for relief purposes are not permitted.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in this connection, I have a letter from the President of the Civil Service Commission further interpreting the matters, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point also.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., July 28, 1939.

Hon. CARL A. HATCH,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: I am pleased to acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 26, 1939, regarding the interpretation of Senate bill 1871, to prevent pernicious political activities, which has passed both branches of Congress and is now awaiting action by the President.

Section 9 of the enactment reads substantially the same as section 1 of civil-service rule I, and your interpretation of section 9 appears to be the same as the interpretation which the Commission has placed on civil-service rule I. I am enclosing a copy of a pamphlet published by the Commission giving detailed information regarding the civil-service rules, Executive orders, and statutes concerning political activity and political assessments of Federal officeholders and employees, and am indicating below for your convenience the page and section of this pamphlet in which the particular types of political activity are discussed.

Section 1 of civil-service rule I is interpreted to prohibit the following types of political activities on the part of employees in the classified civil service:

1. The holding of office in political party organizations (p. 4, secs. 14 and 15).

2. Attendance at caucuses or conventions as delegates (p. 4, sec. 12).

3. Holding office or other activity at political conventions or caucuses (p. 4, sec. 13).

4. Soliciting campaign contributions (p. 5, sec. 16). The solicitation of political contributions by any person who is in the service of the United States or who is receiving compensation for services from money derived from the Treasury of the United States, regardless of whether such person is in the classified civil service or not, from any other such officer or person is a violation of section 118 of the Criminal Code (p. 17, sec. 39, et seq.).

5. Making political speeches or soliciting votes or support in behalf of candidates or parties in primaries or general elections (p. 5, secs. 18 and 19).

6. Becoming a candidate for office or nomination in primary conventions or general elections.

Such activity on the part of a classified employee is prohibited under section 1 of Civil Service rule I, except in such cases where special permission has been extended by Executive order, such as in the case of employees residing in municipalities adjacent to the District of Columbia and in the case of employees at navy yards or arsenals and military establishments of the War Department (p. 7, sec. 29; pp. 12 and 13).

Section 1 of Civil Service rule I has been construed to permit classified employees to engage in the following types of activity:

1. Membership in clubs or organizations formed for purely partisan political purposes (p. 4, secs. 13 and 14), provided the employee is not an active member, an officer, or a member of any committee.

2. The making of a voluntary contribution to political parties (p. 5, sec. 16). It is a violation of section 121 of the Criminal Code, however, for an employee to make such a contribution to another Government employee, regardless of whether or not either employee is in the classified civil service (p. 19, sec. 46).

3. The private expression of political opinions (p. 5, sec. 18).

As you point out, the Civil Service Rules confine classified employees to a private expression of opinion, whereas the word "privately" has been omitted from section 9 of S. 1871. It is believed, however, that even under S. 1871 an expression of opinion which so far exceeds the limits of a private expression of opinion and assumes the aspect of a campaign speech or a canvass for votes, would be in violation of the general prohibition against taking an active part in political management or in political campaigns.

4. Attendance at political meetings as a spectator (p. 5, sec. 17; p. 4, secs. 12 and 13).

5. Attendance at social functions where political speeches may be made and the proceeds from the sale of dinner tickets may be used for political purposes, such as at Jackson Day dinners.

The Commission construes attendance at such functions as in the same light as attendance at political meetings, and a classified employee may therefore attend such functions as an inactive participant. Although the contributions made at such functions purport to be the purchase price of the dinner tickets, they are in actuality political contributions and must not be made or solicited in violation of the statutes which I have already mentioned prohibiting the solicitation or receipt of political contributions between Federal employees.

I trust the information herein will serve your purposes. If there is any further way in which I can be of assistance, I shall be happy to do so.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL, *President*.

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

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. I noticed today a newspaper article bearing on the matter the Senator has just been discussing, and I ask for his opinion in reference to it. This newspaper article, of recent date, from one of the Pittsburgh papers, outlines a plan to revive the Black News. It is as follows:

PLAN TO REVIVE BLACK NEWS TOLD AT SOUTH PARK RALLY—DOUDS, N. L. R. B. OFFICIAL, INDICATES C. I. O. AND A. F. OF L. HAVE AGREED TO MOVE

A move to revive the Black News, a publication which in the past has served for bitter attack on legislators who have opposed the wishes of organized labor as regards State laws, was begun last night at a small gathering in South Park, addressed by Charles T. Douds, regional director of the National Labor Relations Board.

Invitations to the meeting had been sent out by the Progressive League of Allegheny County, signed by B. J. Hovde, now connected with the National Housing Authority and last year county chairman of the Guffey-Kennedy campaign here, and by Sarah Limbach, secretary.

The principal speaker at the meeting, at which less than 50 were present, was Dr. John H. Ferguson, professor of economics at Penn State, who said it was proposed to get union backing for the Black News, so that the unions would purchase and distribute copies.

Douds said this proposal had been discussed with both A. F. of L. and C. I. O. groups here, and indicated that such an agreement had been reached. Douds credited the Black News of several years ago with having been largely responsible for Democratic control of the legislature on labor issues. Hovde was not present. Mrs. Limbach, supervisor, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, presided.

The Black News of 1934 and 1935 listed legislators as voting "wrong" or "right," or with having been absent when a vote was taken on the legislation in which its sponsors, then the Pennsylvania Security League, were interested. Douds said the paper had attained a circulation approaching 1,000,000.

This appeared the day before the bill was signed, I believe:

Douds expressed fear that the Hatch bill, if signed, might prevent the participation of Federal employees in the movement, but doubted that this activity could be regarded as political.

Would the Senator be able to tell us, for the benefit of Mr. Douds and others similarly situated, whether that kind of an activity would be political, and therefore come within the prohibitions of the Hatch law?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Nebraska, I must say that there was so much confusion I did not understand all the Senator read, but I think I understand the question. Is it whether or not a Federal employee may engage in the publishing of a political paper or magazine?

Mr. BURKE. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. I will not answer that in my own language. As I have stated, I have refused to state my own interpretation of the law, because I do not think that is my province, as a member of the legislative branch of the Government. In the matter I have just sent to the desk, however, there is a paragraph taken from the Civil Service Commission's interpretation, which reads as follows:

It is political activity for an employee to publish or be connected editorially, managerially, or financially with any political newspaper. An employee may not write for publication or publish any letter or article signed or unsigned in favor of or against any political party, candidate, or faction.

As I stated, those are not my words. That is the rule which has been governing civil-service employees throughout the years.

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

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I fully appreciate and agree with the position of the Senator that it is not his function, as a Member of this body, despite the fact that he is the author of the legislation to interpret it. However, I submit this situation, which indicates that interpretations are going to be made repeatedly in reference to this act.

I call attention to a letter I received this morning from a young man in the State of Washington who was an officer of an organization, a Slovak society, which is not a political organization but is a social organization. However, the organization in the past has seen fit from time to time to endorse candidates of both political parties who were on the ticket. This young man is employed by the Works Progress Administration in the State of Washington. He was informed a few days ago that unless he would sever his connection with this organization he would have to resign his position with the Works Progress Administration. It seems to me that, unless very soon a general understanding is given of the act, it is going to result in discrimination and result in hardship to certain individuals.

I cannot conceive by what stretch of the imagination a man connected with a purely social organization which happens to have its membership limited to people of the Slovak race should be compelled to resign from his activity in that organization, because it happens that upon occasions, perhaps every 2 years, the organization would make endorsement of political candidates. I do not think that was within the conception of the act or the conception of the author of the act.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I can say, I think, with all propriety, that such a situation was not within the conception of at least one of the authors of the act.

I hold in my hand, if Senators are interested, a pamphlet issued by the United States Civil Service Commission, form 1236, entitled "Political Activities and Political Assessments of Federal Office Holders and Employees," printed at the Government Printing Office. The pamphlet can be obtained by any Senator, and in it will be found an answer to almost every question which can be raised in regard to the law. It is from that pamphlet that I have made this condensed statement I have asked to have printed in the RECORD today, and in it will be found an answer to the question the Senator from Washington has propounded.

Even if it were a political club, the Senator would find that throughout the years the rule has been construed, as to civil-service employees, to be that membership in a political club is permitted, but employees may not be officers

of the club, and they must not act as such. That is the rule which has guided civil-service employees, and I think the same rule applies under the law, because the law is almost an exact duplication of the civil-service rule, and it was intended to put employees under the classified civil service and those in the nonclassified service under exactly the same rule.

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

Mr. HATCH. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. ADAMS. Does the Senator feel that the regulations and interpretations of the Civil Service Commission or their rules are to be accepted as a final interpretation of the Hatch law?

Mr. HATCH. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing for them to be.

Mr. ADAMS. I was asking whether or not their interpretation would be binding upon the Federal employee who is affected by the Hatch law, which a Senator is not.

Mr. HATCH. Does the Senator mean whether the interpretation given by the Civil Service Commission is binding on Federal employees?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. Not necessarily, but I will say to the Senator from Colorado that I think it is quite likely that if this law is ever construed by the courts, the courts will adopt and follow the construction of the rules which the authors of the bill followed in drafting the legislation, and the same interpretation put on the law as was given it by the President of the United States in his message to the Congress. It is not an unknown rule of law that when we adopt language, statute, or rule knowingly, then the courts will follow the interpretation which has been theretofore placed upon the language or statute. That is a well-known rule of law.

Mr. ADAMS. If the State of New Mexico adopted a statute such as existed in Colorado, it would be presumed that it was adopted in the light of the decisions of the Colorado courts as to their statute. But here there is no parallel, that is, we are dealing here with an administrative body, the Civil Service Commission, and I am inquiring whether they could have final jurisdiction over interpretation, not being a judicial body.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator did not have to ask me whether they would have a final, arbitrary, last action and say. Of course they would not.

Mr. ADAMS. Let me cite one instance to show the Senator what is the prevalent situation. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] was going to my city of Denver to make one speech, and he was asked whether he might make a political speech, and we discovered that a substantial number of Federal employees thought it would be improper, in view of the Hatch law, for them to attend a political meeting. Of course there is no basis for that, but I am saying that that is the extent to which misinformation has gone abroad, and I think it would be very valuable if the author of the law could see to it that a correct interpretation is sent forth.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, that is exactly what I am trying to do in inserting this material in the RECORD at this time. Much of what has gone abroad is entirely misinformation. I think it is wise and well that the RECORD be made straight, and for that reason I have gone to the trouble of condensing the Civil Service interpretation.

PRINTING OF SPEECHES IN APPENDIX BY MR. GUFFEY

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after adjournment I may put into the Appendix of the RECORD an address I am going to deliver in Pittsburgh on August 11, and one on August 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not intend to object, I know the Senator will make a very delightful speech, but I have been a Member of the Senate for some years, and I have never yet heard of any addresses being entered in the RECORD which were to be delivered in the future.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield. But before I do so I wish to say that I am not raising any objection. The request strikes me as being a bit unusual. However, I have no objection.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Requests of this kind have been granted heretofore. I recall that, especially in Presidential years, consent has always been given in advance to the printing in the RECORD of speeches to be delivered at a national convention, either Democratic or Republican, and it has always been granted. Usually the Senate has consented that in the final edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD matters may be printed that have not actually transpired on the floor prior to adjournment. I submitted such a request as that yesterday, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] objected to it.

I had myself intended to ask unanimous consent to put into the RECORD a summary prepared by me of legislation at this session, which cannot be ready by the time we adjourn tonight, and probably one or two other items of that sort. It has been done previously, and there is nothing particularly unusual about it. But I can appreciate the Senator's viewpoint, that it might not always be a good idea to do it.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not making objection. I want to say to the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Kentucky——

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, may I ask what is the nature of the speech?

Mr. GUFFEY. One of the speeches I expect to deliver is a political speech, and the other is a historical speech concerning my native county.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. GUFFEY. I consulted the minority leader, and he said he would have no objection provided I fixed the date, the time, and the place of the speech.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. How long is it to be before the speech shall be made?

Mr. GUFFEY. One is to be made next Thursday, and one a week from next Thursday.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I should like to ask consent, and we will agree with each other then that it shall be done, to put six political speeches in the RECORD which I shall make in the next 4 months. [Laughter.]

Mr. GUFFEY. I was following a custom, and I consulted——

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, no speeches or other material can be put in the RECORD later than the final edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which will be about 10 days after we adjourn, as always.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The Senator from Pennsylvania is going to make two speeches, which he proposes to put in the RECORD, and they are not contemplated to be made within the next 10 days, are they?

Mr. BARKLEY. In that event they could not be put in the RECORD, unless there was a volume of the RECORD printed after next week.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We might extend the printing of the RECORD, then, and instead of having it conclude its edification of the public in the next 10 days, we might make it a monument to Senators who desire to put speeches in the RECORD in the next 6 months. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let us dispose of this request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Pennsylvania has requested that he be permitted to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two speeches not to be made in connection with any transaction of business here in the Senate, but, I presume, political speeches. I think that is a very extraordinary precedent to establish. I do not think the Senator from Pennsylvania should urge such a request. There will be a number of speeches delivered this

summer and fall upon a subject which is indirectly, if not directly, connected with the transactions of this body. I should feel that I ought to be permitted to have those speeches printed in the RECORD under the precedent which the Senator is about to establish. But where will we stop?

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I was simply following the custom——

Mr. BORAH. I do not want to draw the line with respect to the action of any particular Senator, and it ought not to be drawn as against any particular Senator, but I certainly should ask for permission to print a certain line of speeches upon the subject of foreign affairs during this summer and fall if it is to be established as a precedent here that speeches may be published after Congress shall have adjourned.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I remember distinctly that in 1912, 1916, 1932, and 1936 speeches made at the national conventions were placed in the RECORD, and I thought that was a common practice. I consulted the Senator from Vermont today. He said he would offer no objection provided I fixed the dates. I am perfectly willing to withdraw the motion. I do not want to establish a precedent. I thought I was following what had been the custom heretofore.

Mr. BORAH. I think some political speeches which should not have been placed there have been printed in the RECORD heretofore.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I withdraw my request. But I hope the Senator from Idaho will be able to have his speeches printed in the RECORD.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask the cooperation of Senators on both sides of the Chamber, that at this juncture, in the last day of the session, they not inject extraneous matters into the deliberations of the Senate until we shall have disposed, in an orderly way, of the matter pending before us. The bill pending before the Senate now is in charge of the Senator from Nevada. It ought to be disposed of as speedily as possible one way or the other. There are other bills which ought to be disposed of before we adjourn, and I ask the cooperation of Senators not to delay the disposal of these bills by the introduction of extraneous matter, or requests for unanimous consent, or discussions on other subjects. Otherwise we will not finish our work today. After we shall have adopted the adjournment resolution providing that when we finish today we adjourn sine die, there will be plenty of time to attend to all these extraneous matters, but while there is legislation awaiting the consideration of the Senate I think extraneous matters should wait.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the floor leader of the majority if he can specify what bills will be taken up, so that we ourselves may make some calculation as to the situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator from Vermont and other Senators that as soon as the unfinished business is disposed of it is my purpose to ask unanimous consent to call the calendar for House bills only, to which there is no objection. That would include also House bills at the desk which have not been printed in the calendar, although I realize the difficulties of considering bills when there are no reports on the calendar. But it seems to me that is the only way to give everyone a fair chance. If I or any other Senator should try to pick out half a dozen bills which we thought ought to be considered first, it might be unfair to some Senator who was interested in a bill that he thought should be considered, or some bill that had come over from the House. Of course, any Senator can object to any of those bills. So, if they are taken up later, they will have to be taken up on motion.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. As I view this problem immediately, the method suggested by the floor leader of the majority would not be a fair transaction of business, for I know of cases of House bills, exactly identical in every respect with Senate bills that are now on the calendar, having been reported favorably by standing committees of the Senate, while other House bills, in committees or on the table, have not been passed upon by Senate committees, and in view of the lateness of the hour cannot be passed upon by Senate committees. In some cases committees will not permit the release of those House bills. Therefore they cannot be acted upon here by the Senate. But in other cases a committee may be more liberal in its attitude, and be willing to proceed less formally as the House bills come over to the Senate. The result is an inequality and an unfairness which ought not to obtain.

We have had a very busy time closing up the legislative business of this session, and I venture the opinion that it is time that the Senate adjourn. There is no conference action awaiting consideration, and I ask the leader of the majority if he will not consider a limitation, so that we may know definitely the procedure for the remainder of the session. I would suggest this for a limitation, that we consider only those House bills which have been favorably reported by standing committees of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that is all I have in contemplation.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am besieged by Senators with requests for action on House bills which have never been referred to a standing committee of the Senate, but merely endorsed and sent here for immediate consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator knows that now and then in an emergency a committee is polled on the floor of the Senate for a favorable report on a bill. But the request which I had in mind to make, and which I will not make until the pending matter shall have been disposed of—that is, I have no present intention of making it until then—only contemplated the calling of House bills which have been referred to a committee or have been acted on by a Senate committee and are now awaiting action at the desk.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I shall not object to that request.

PERNICIOUS POLITICAL ACTIVITIES IN COLORADO

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, it is gratifying to me that the Senate Civil Service Committee has acted so promptly upon the Presidential suggestion to apply the principles of the Hatch bill to State employees expending Federal funds, and has accordingly reported out favorably for that purpose the so-called Neely bill, Senate bill 282.

Yesterday the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] stated on the floor of the Senate that while he would not press his bill in the closing hours of this session, he was certain that it would pass early next year, and would effectively keep out of the 1940 political campaign State employees whose departments expend Federal funds. The Senator's assurance was indeed good news to me, for I know the desperate necessity in Colorado for a curb on pernicious political manipulation aided and abetted by Federal revenues.

Unfortunately in that State we have a political boss at the head of the highway department who openly tries to dominate the politics of the State. This State agency spends literally millions of dollars of Federal funds every year. I refer to Charles D. Vail, State highway engineer. He is under civil service, but with the great power supplied in part by Federal money he has debauched the State civil service commission. That commission recently held a "kangaroo court" in which he was the defendant. It was no surprise to Colorado that one of the commissioners sitting as a trial judge was more active in his defense than was his own attorney.

Mr. Vail, the highway engineer, using the power of the allocation of highway projects and highway funds, which include Federal funds, has favored, threatened, or bulldozed county officials for the one purpose of controlling their political action. He has shaken down contractors on

Federal-aid highways to raise funds for political purposes. No contractor dares to admit it, however, because that would result in his immediate and utter ruin. He also has shaken down oil companies from whom the State has purchased highway-surfacing oil. These companies dare not admit it, either. Following the last election, a well known, responsible Colorado citizen of unquestioned integrity and intelligence gave me the following data on this official's connection with political shake-downs in Colorado:

Husby Oil Co., of Cody, Wyo.: $1,000 to Charles D. Vail, W. G. Burke, 1340 Corona Street, the Denver agent.

Gilmore Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif.: $6,000 to Mr. Vail through an agent named Bill Julian.

Texas Oil Co. to Mr. Vail by Ted Ellis: $4,000.

Road contractors handling State highway jobs—an aggregate of over $30,000. Individual projects were tied up on three or four occasions until they had made their contributions.

I find that the Department of Justice is powerless to stop such flagrant abuses because in these instances no Federal law has been directly violated. I want a law enacted by Congress which will specifically stop the outrageous violations of political decency now indulged in by State officials who are spending Federal funds.

Mr. President, I should like to point out that when we passed the Hatch bill we only made a start. If it is our purpose completely to clean up everything insofar as pernicious political activities are concerned, we must go beyond the provisions of the Hatch bill.

The Colorado official to whom I refer has highway employees in every county and in every district in the State who do his political bidding; and through them he directs the vilest kind of a pernicious political machine.

Mr. Thomas H. MacDonald, commissioner of public roads, recently stated that Colorado is the only one of the 48 States headed by a highway official whose word is not valid.

Whenever a State accepts Federal highway aid on a cooperative basis the Neely bill as amended will stop pernicious political activity, intimidation of voters, favoritism to county officials, and solicitation and acceptance of political contributions from highway contractors and oil companies and persons furnishing other highway material. The Neely bill, so far as Colorado and political decency are concerned, is "must" legislation since the Hatch bill has been passed.

MILITARY AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 367) to authorize the Secretaries of War and of the Navy to assist the governments of American republics to increase their military and naval establishments, and for other purposes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add a new section 6, as follows:

The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall in all contracts or agreements for the sale of such matériel fully protect the rights of all citizens of the United States who have patent rights in and to any such matériel, which is hereby authorized to be sold, and the funds collected for royalties on such patents shall be paid to the owners and holders of such patents.

And to renumber the next section as section 7.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not know that I have any objection, if I fully understand the purpose of the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, under existing law employees of the Government of the United States who have patents on matériel of war, such as antiaircraft guns, tanks, searchlights, and other such implements of warfare are not allowed to collect any royalties from the Government of the United States when any such articles are manufactured for the Government of the United States. However, if any of those articles are manufactured in a private corporation's plant with the consent of the Government of the United States, the holder of the patent rights is entitled to collect a royalty thereon. My amendment merely protects the rights of the holder of a patent on any attachment to antiaircraft guns, tanks, or other implements of war.

Under the provisions of the joint resolution as it stands at present, all moneys collected from the sale of the various implements of war are covered into the Treasury of the United States; and the holder of a patent would be absolutely unprotected unless the Congress were to adopt some such amendment as the one I have proposed, to which the Senator from Nevada states he has no objection.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am curious to know just how the amendment would work. Inasmuch as the Government of the United States pays no royalty upon any of these things, if under the new arrangement it takes an order to furnish some of this equipment to a South American republic, it then is required, as I understand, to charge a royalty against the buyer in South America. How does it know what royalty to charge, inasmuch as no standard of royalties is fixed in our Government's relationships on the subject?

Mr. RUSSELL. How does the Senator from Michigan think the Government will arrive at the cost of the guns and munitions which are sold to South American countries? No prices are provided in the joint resolution. The royalty would be subject to agreement and negotiation in arriving at the contract which the joint resolution says the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy shall enter into with the South American republic. When guns are purchased by the Government of the United States and then go to South American countries, my amendment merely gives the American citizen who holds a patent the same protection that that citizen would have if the guns were purchased in the first instance by some munitions manufacturer within the United States.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I completely sympathize with the Senator's objective, and I am not quarreling at all with his purpose to protect American inventors. I am merely trying to find out how it would ultimately work in furtherance of the good-neighbor purposes which the proposed legislation is alleged to facilitate. In the name of good neighborliness we will now charge our neighbors some agreed-upon royalty upon the matériel which we ourselves do not pay when we purchase it. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The amount will have to be stipulated by barter and agreement when the contract is made.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be subject to negotiation. I might say to the Senator from Michigan that there is nothing complex or complicated about the question. When guns are manufactured in the Government arsenals today, many of them are manufactured at a great loss to our Government; yet we cannot take a loss, if I correctly understand the measure, on guns sold to South American republics. The Government of the United States, in manufacturing some of the highly intricate antiaircraft guns today, takes an enormous loss; but under the provisions of the joint resolution we must require to be paid by the South American governments the full cost of the matériel, because as I understand the joint resolution no loss may be involved to the Treasury of the United States. The amendment merely makes subject to negotiation the royalty rights of American citizens in and to such implements of war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendment on page 3 be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 7, after the words "United States", it is proposed to insert:

And provided further, That no contract shall be entered into under the terms of this joint resolution which shall interfere with or delay the United States in the full use of its shipyards, arsenals, munition plants, and other equipment for its own purposes.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, several Senators who are very much interested in the joint resolution are absent from the Chamber. If we are to proceed with it, I must suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	Lodge	Shipstead
Andrews	Downey	Lucas	Smith
Ashurst	Ellender	Lundeen	Stewart
Austin	George	McCarran	Taft
Bailey	Gerry	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Bankhead	Gibson	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Barkley	Guffey	Miller	Townsend
Borah	Gurney	Minton	Truman
Bulow	Hale	Murray	Tydings
Burke	Harrison	Nye	Vandenberg
Byrd	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Hayden	Pepper	Wagner
Capper	Herring	Pittman	Walsh
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Colo.	Russell	White
Clark, Mo.	King	Schwartz	
Connally	La Follette	Schwellenbach	
Danaher	Lee	Sheppard	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, there is a very substantial opposition to this joint resolution. I desire to make a preliminary statement about it.

I think all of us are in complete sympathy with the purposes of the State Department to encourage the closest possible relationships throughout Pan America and the Western Hemisphere, but there is frequently a great difference of opinion as to the best means of promoting this highly worthy objective. The pending joint resolution proposes to do it by making what the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], if he were here, would call an arms huckster out of Uncle Sam. There are many of us who do not believe that by putting the Government of the United States into the arms-huckstering business we can promote good will anywhere, at any time, or in any way.

A few years ago the Senate had a special select committee which investigated the munitions industry. The able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] was the chairman of the committee. I was permitted the privilege of serving as a member of it; likewise the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the former Senator from Idaho, Mr. Pope. We went particularly into many of the relationships and contacts that were involved in the sale of American arms in South America; and, to our amazement, we found that there were many malignant repercussions from that trade. We found that even governmental influence itself—and I speak about the governmental influence of our own Government here in Washington—frequently was available for the promotion of very doubtful purposes. So far as the private sale of arms in South America was concerned, we discovered upon more than one occasion that these sales were used actually to incite one good neighbor against another good neighbor.

The private sale of arms under these unfortunate circumstances is now rather well limited by law. I very much doubt whether the Government of the United States can make itself the successor of the private-arms huckster in South America any more successfully, relatively speaking, than was the result heretofore.

The language in line 5 on page 1 of the joint resolution states, I remind you, that the Secretary of War is not confined to the manufacture of these commodities in arsenals and factories under the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States. These supplies do not necessarily come from Government plants. They may be "otherwise procured." In other words, Uncle Sam becomes a procurer for the munitions makers of America.

I am not speaking invidiously of the munitions makers of America. Thank Heaven, we have munitions makers. They are utterly essential to the development and maintenance of our national defense; and so far as the representative munitions makers of this country are concerned, they scrupulously undertake to maintain their operations on a basis of highest integrity and honor and fair play, and with complete subservience to the patriotic obligation they owe to the foreign policy of the United States itself. The fact remains, Mr. President, that when we go into the business of arming South American countries on the theory that we are arming them against some foreign foe in some other land, we are nevertheless arming them against each other; and that was the precise result which flowed from the American arms traffic which the Munitions Committee explored and exploded. I submit that we cannot insulate ourselves against that net result simply by making the Government of the United States the intervening procurer of these war materials. Uncle Sam is officially and legally the procurer, but he may find himself not only the procurer but unwittingly the agent provocateur of actual trouble among those whom we are theoretically binding closer together as so-called good neighbors.

Mr. President, that is the first objection I have to the joint resolution; and I submit the objection in the greatest good faith. I submit that it puts the Government of the United States into a business that it has no right whatever to be in, and that, far from encouraging the notable objective to which the joint resolution is presumably addressed, the net result may well be something totally otherwise.

This is no isolated objection that I am submitting. I think it will be amply apparent, before the debate is concluded later in the evening, that there is a very substantial objection on the Foreign Relations Committee itself. I might submit parenthetically that when a joint resolution of this importance is opposed by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], by the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and by the senior Senator from Michigan, speaking only of those who are on the Foreign Relations Committee itself, it is neither wise nor fair to attempt to press it to passage under the circumstances which surround us at the present time, and, so far as I am concerned, it will not pass if passage can be prevented.

Now let us proceed with the analysis. I have submitted the first reason, which I think all by itself suffices to defend the position of those who resist the passage of this joint resolution. I concede that the able Under Secretary of State, Mr. Welles, has presented a very persuasive argument to the Committee on Foreign Relations upon the subject. I concede that in their anxiety, for some reason which passes my understanding, to get this measure upon the books, the State Department has during the last few months communicated time and time again with the various so-called South American republics for the purpose of demonstrating to us, or attempting to demonstrate to us, that there is a great accord throughout the two continents upon the subject. But none of the evidence which has been submitted has been impressive or conclusive in the slightest degree, from my point of view; and, much as I dislike to stand in such determined opposition, on a matter of such relatively minor importance, to the distinguished Secretary of State and his Department, I feel it very necessary that the Senate should fully know

why many of us consider that it would be a profound error in sound foreign policy for the United States to proceed down this road.

Mr. President, I have given the first reason; namely, that it is utterly doubtful activity for the United States to go into the business of being an arms huckster in South America, because our experience with arms hucksters in South America heretofore, and our observations of armed hucksters in South America heretofore, have clearly warned us that that way lies involvement and trouble, not only for ourselves but for these neighbors of ours for whom we are presumably trying to be so solicitous.

In the second place, Mr. President, let us see how it would work; let us see the practical effect from the standpoint of this so-called good neighborliness, which is the highly laudible objective.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am asking purely for information, so that I may be governed in other matters. Does the Senator feel that he can conclude his remarks within 30 minutes?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; the Senator cannot, because, in his very earnest judgment, the subject merits the extended consideration which some of us intend it shall have, and, with great respect, I submit to the Senator that our good faith purpose is to explore the subject as we deem its necessities require.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield further, that I may propound an inquiry to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of what the Senator has stated, and the notice which has been served on the Senate practically that the joint resolution cannot be passed without some delay, and in view of the further circumstance that the leader of the House of Representatives has advised me that they will not be in a position to consider any House bill which comes back to the House with an amendment on it before adjournment, does the Senator from Nevada feel that it is worth while to proceed further with the pending measure?

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. I think that the Senator from Michigan has made his intent quite clear. He has not used the obnoxious word "filibuster"; in fact, I have never heard him use it. Personally, I should enjoy hearing him speak for an hour or two; I always enjoy hearing him speak; but I must realize, of course, that there are a number of Senators who are interested in House bills which are either on the table or on the calendar, and naturally I would not want to engage in a futile undertaking; nor would I, in an effort to get a vote this evening, which apparently, I may say, is obviously impossible, interfere with other Senators attempting to have measures enacted. Therefore I voluntarily am willing to consent that the joint resolution go to the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield the floor. That is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be set aside, and that the joint resolution be returned to the calendar; and that thereupon the Senate shall proceed to the consideration only of House bills which have been acted upon by Senate committees, and are now on the calendar or at the desk, pursuant to such committee's action, to which bills there would be no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky, who asks unanimous consent that the pending joint resolution be laid aside and returned to the calendar, and that thereafter the Senate proceed to the consideration of unobjected-to House bills on the calendar or at the desk which have been acted upon by standing committees of the Senate?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I wish to be heard for only a moment.

I believe that one of the reasons for the superb success which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] has achieved as a statesman is due in no small degree to the fact that he is a realist; he knows a fact when he faces it. I think he has done a proper and a handsome thing, in appreciating, earnest and able as his efforts have been in connection with the measure which was the unfinished business, that it could not be passed. I am glad he has asked that it be laid aside, and I know with what regret he did so.

However, Mr. President, the able Senator from Kentucky has now asked that the Senate give unanimous consent to a proposal which I think contains a phrase which would shut out and preclude the Senate from considering at least two bills which I believe should be considered. I have no personal interest in them. They are House bills. I had nothing to do with their draftsmanship. I endorse them. I believe they should pass, for I am anxious at all times, as is every other Senator, to urge measures which will promote the efficiency, the supremacy, and the progress of this country.

I refer first to the House bill which we call the protection-of-witnesses bill. I have several times vexed the ears of the Senate by reading the bill. It provides that the same protection thrown around witnesses in Federal courts shall be accorded witnesses who appear before congressional committees or before boards, commissions, or other agencies of the Federal Government. That is the first bill. It is House bill 6832; it has passed the House, and is on the desk.

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

Mr. ASHURST. Of course, I yield.

Mr. BURKE. I believe that if the Senator will consult his calendar he will find that the bill is on the calendar, Calender No. 1156, and within the rule laid down by the majority leader.

Mr. ASHURST. The able Senator from Nebraska is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. That bill will be one coming under the program.

Mr. ASHURST. The bill will be one to come under the program.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The second one is not.

Mr. ASHURST. The second one—and I solicit the support and criticism of other Senators—is not, and, for several reasons, I have a reluctance about pressing the second one. It is the so-called ship-gambling bill. I need not enter into a long explanation of what it is more than to say that floating palaces are anchored off the coast of southern California, beyond the 3-mile limit; that so-called motor taxis take citizens out to them to gamble, and upon those floating palaces, as I suggested last night, may be heard at all times the thud of the dice, the rattle of the ivory poker chips, and the whirr of the roulette wheel. Citizens anxious to engage in a tilt with Madame La Chance go to these palaces.

Mr. President, the Attorney General of the United States has solicited the passage of this bill, and the attorney general of California has urged its enactment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator, what is the status of the bill?

Mr. ASHURST. The bill has been passed by the House, and is on the desk. It has not been referred to a committee, so far as I know.

Mr. President, I believe the bill should be considered. One objection would send it back to the calendar, and I have no argument to make more than to ask for a reading of the bill, because within their four corners each of these bills carry their own argument, if they carry any.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may say to the Senator that the second bill, of course, not being on the calendar, and not having been considered by a Senate committee, would not come within my unanimous consent request.

Mr. ASHURST. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. But at the conclusion of the call of the calendar for House bills under my unanimous consent request, the Senator of course would be at liberty to make an effort to secure consideration for the bill. Whether the effort would succeed of course I cannot now say.

Mr. ASHURST. My reason for showing this solicitude is that, by the evolution of time, and the partiality of my constituents, I have been here sufficiently long to become chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and it falls to my lot to try to secure the passage of bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Arizona asking unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASHURST. No; I was calling attention to the fact that one phrase in the request made by the Senator from Kentucky might preclude consideration of these two bills. But the Senator from Nebraska corrected me, and now I ask that when the Senate shall have concluded the consideration of the House bills on the calendar, the Senate recur to such bills as are on the desk which have not been considered by committees.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wonder whether the Senator would be willing to defer that request until we have finished with the call of House bills on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is the request of the Senator from Kentucky for unanimous consent.

Mr. ASHURST. If the Chair will pardon me, that is debatable, and we are trying to reach an agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will recognize Senators who desire to debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that the gambling-ship bill has been considered by the Committee on the Judiciary, but the Committee on the Judiciary has rendered no report upon it, so it is in peculiarly unique position. I am correct in that, am I not?

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator is correct; it has been discussed by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It is an emergency bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that, and I am for the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The ships are defying the authorities at the present time, and if the authorities do not obtain relief——

Mr. BARKLEY. The difficulty I am in is that if I include in the request all House bills which have been messaged over to the Senate and have not been reported by Senate committees, I cannot get consent for the consideration of even those on the calendar which have been considered by committees.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I do not perceive why we could not exclude the phrase from the Senator's request to which I have referred, and he need have no fear, because when a bill is called at yon desk the objection of one Senator of course would send it back to the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the universal rule, when the calendar is called, is to call only the bills that are on the calendar.

Mr. ASHURST. That is true, sir.

Mr. BARKLEY. I included in my request not only all bills on the calendar from the House but bills at the desk which have been acted upon by Senate committees.

I do not like to couple any other requests with that, because I may not get any of them agreed to, but after the conclusion of the call of the calendar for House bills which are legitimately on the calendar and at the desk by reason of the action of committees, I shall certainly not only ask, if there is no objection, but shall urge that the Senator's maritime gambling bill, whatever it is, be taken up. But I am afraid if I include that in my request now there will be objection.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I will say in connection with the bill which was described by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], that two bills were filed concurrently in the Senate and the House, and the Senate bill was referred to a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] was chairman. That committee about a month ago unanimously reported the bill favorably to the full committee. It was there discussed on a number of occasions, but chiefly on my objection went over.

When it was under discussion in the full committee, I will be frank to say that I was one of those who urged that there were objectionable features in the bill, and that it should be passed over and considered more at length. It was under discussion on two or three different occasions in the full committee, and largely because of my objection it was not acted upon by the committee. After the bill had passed the House and I had ascertained that the senior Senator from California was heartily in favor of it, I took occasion to examine the bill as it came from the House, and found that certain amendments had been made in the House which largely removed certain objections I have. Because of the fact that the senior Senator from California feels it is a meritorious measure, and the fact that it had been considered by the Senate committee, and has unanimously been supported by a subcommittee, I believe this bill could be added to the list.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I will modify my request in this way, that the calendar be called for the consideration of unobjected to House bills on the calendar and at the desk, which have been reported by Senate committees. That at the conclusion of that call the bill referred to by the Senator from Arizona be then taken up for consideration.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I give notice now that, because of a sense of responsibility and a belief that the Senate should not hastily pass legislation which deserves deliberation and care, I shall object to the proposal, however great respect and regard I have for the proponents of the measure—and certainly I know everyone realizes my affection and respect for the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, with whom I have served, and that my attitude is, therefore, taken reluctantly. However, in the interest of the public good and of the public welfare, and so that we may not do things now hastily, I give notice that I shall object to every bill that has not had at least the consideration of a standing committee and been reported to the Senate. For that reason I object to the request which has been made.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I renew the request as I made it originally, to call the calendar for consideration only of House bills that have been reported from standing committees of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request of the Senator from Kentucky is that the pending business be laid aside and returned to the calendar, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of unobjected-to House bills which are on the calendar and at the desk, but which have been passed upon by standing committees of the Senate.

Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does that include a report by a committee?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not hear the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I ask, Does that include a report by a committee of the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It does not. A standing committee may act on a bill without a formal report.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I hope that we will not consider bills that have not been passed upon by committees.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; but there are certain bills on the desk which have been reported by committees on which no report has been made. There may not have been written formal reports even in connection with bills that are on the calendar itself, but there will be considered no bills at the desk which have not been favorably reported by a standing committee of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Kentucky a question if I may. Does this agreement mean that if a bill is objected to it goes to the foot of the calendar, regardless of a motion?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not think it means that a bill goes to the foot of the calendar. It would simply be passed over.

Mr. CONNALLY. I mean if a bill is objected to when it is called, then would it be in order to move to consider that bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is a very important House bill here, H. R. 7171, which has been thoroughly considered by the Committee on Finance. It proposes highly necessary legislation. It is an administration measure to aid the Secretary of Agriculture and the Tariff Commission in regard to the exportation of agricultural commodities under the bounty system. It provides for increasing the tariff duties and tariff rates to offset the increased price of commodities which no doubt would return to this country after being exported on the subsidy system. I think that bill should be considered.

I make a motion to take it up.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to say to the Senator that under the unanimous-consent agreement I am seeking it would not be in order, when a bill on the calendar is objected to, to move to take it up. But at the conclusion of the call any Senator could move to take up a bill that has been objected to during the call of the calendar.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. If that is the meaning of the unanimous-consent agreement, I object to the unanimous-consent agreement, because we will be here all night on the bill to which the Senator from Texas refers. I am willing to take up other bills on the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, of course my answer to the Senator from Texas was an obvious and truthful answer, because it is always true that a Senator can move to take up a bill which has been objected to. Whether the motion prevails is a matter for the Senate to determine.

Mr. GEORGE. I thought the object of the unanimous-consent agreement was to bring the session of the Congress to a close.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. I withdraw my objection, but I give notice that I will have to spend the remainder of the night and Sunday on the bill to which the Senator from Texas has referred. Other Senators are also interested in it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I want to say to the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Georgia and to other Senators that at this time it will be futile to act on any House bill to which the Senate attaches an amendment, because I have been definitely informed by the House leaders that no House bill that comes back there with a Senate amendment will receive consideration during the remainder of this session. So we might as well be practical and realistic. If we cannot act upon a bill without amending it, it is futile to act upon it at this time.

Mr. GEORGE. I withdraw my objection, but I will say that I thought we were trying to bring the session of the Senate to a close.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, in connection with the bill H. R. 7171 to which the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has referred, I desire to place in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture with reference to the bill and strongly urging its passage. I am in favor of the enactment of this proposed legislation and I regret that it is impossible to bring it up for consideration and vote on it before adjournment. I had hoped very much that the bill could be passed, and I am extremely sorry that our efforts to bring it up have not been successful.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, August 5, 1939.

Hon. PAT HARRISON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HARRISON: This is in response to your request for certain information concerning H. R. 7171, which was passed by the House of Representatives to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

As you know, one of the objectives of several of the existing farm programs is to support the domestic price of certain agricultural commodities at levels above those that would make the export portion of the crops fully competitive in the low-priced world market. Another objective is to maintain our fair share of the world's exports. Taken together these effects of the farm programs are protecting American farmers against the full fury of the storms now raging in the world markets. The successful operation of such programs requires, of course, that some means be available to prevent a backwash of low-priced exports from coming into, and breaking, the higher-priced domestic market. The purpose of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 is to provide this kind of protection. It does so by vesting in the President the authority, upon investigation and recommendation by the United States Tariff Commission, to impose such quotas as may be necessary to prevent importations that are found to render ineffective certain farm programs.

The amendments contained in H. R. 7171 would remove the five following shortcomings of section 22 in its present form:

(1) It does not apply to all farm programs.

(2) It can be applied only after excessively large or low-priced importations are actually coming into the United States.

(3) It provides only for quota, and not for import duty, control of imports.

(4) Its provisions cannot be made effective in less than 15 days after proclamation by the President.

(5) It fixes minimum quotas on the basis of imports during a historical period composed of fiscal rather than calendar years.

The manner in which H. R. 7171 would remove each of these defects may be explained briefly, as follows:

(1) Originally the protection afforded by section 22 applied only to programs carried out under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933. Later the protection afforded by section 22 was extended to farm programs carried out under the provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. Under the provisions of H. R. 7171 the protection under section 22 could also be applied to the farm programs authorized by the provisions of section 32 of Public, No. 320, approved August 24, 1935. This extension of the protection of the provisions of section 22 is clearly desirable because several farm programs being carried out under the provisions of section 32 undertake to support a level of domestic prices higher than those prevailing in the world market.

(2) Under the provisions of H. R. 7171 the restrictions against foreign importations under section 22 could be applied whenever it becomes practically certain that such importations would defeat the purposes of the farm program. Briefly, it would no longer be necessary to permit increased importations to injure a group of farmers before they could be given the protection provided under the provisions of section 22. This amendment of section 22 is an important improvement because in some instances it is demonstrable beforehand to a point of overwhelming certainty that certain farm programs would be ineffective in the presence of increased foreign importations.

(3) H. R. 7171 would make it possible to restrict imports by the imposition of duties as well as quotas. This amendment to section 22 is highly desirable because in certain cases quotas are not a practical means of controlling imports. It is often difficult to arrive at a satifactory method of allocating a quota among various countries, yet such allocation is necessary in order to prevent a chaotic situation in which each country would be obliged to rush shipments to the United States in order to utilize a maximum part of the total quota available for all countries. Moreover, the imposition of a quota on the imports from any one country places a burden upon that country of allocating its quota among its individual producers and exporters. Such a task often proves burdensome because of the difficulty of developing an equitable and satisfactory method of allocation among many different categories of producers. Consequently, the amendment contained in H. R. 7171 which would permit the imposition of either an import fee or an import quota, whichever was found to be best adapted to the particular purpose, would constitute a highly desirable improvement.

(4) Under certain circumstances it may be imperative that the protection afforded under the provisions of section 22 be invoked promptly upon the initiation of a farm program. For this reason it is believed that the effective date for the imposition of a quota or import fee should be left to the discretion of the President, as would be possible under one of the amendments contained in H. R. 7171.

(5) In its present form section 22 fixes minimum quotas on the basis of the imports into the United States during the 5-year fiscal period 1928–33. The official records of imports, however, are kept on the calendar year basis. Consequently, needless administrative expense is incurred in making the recalculations required to convert official data from the calendar year to a fiscal year basis. H. R. 7171 would eliminate this anomaly by adopting as a basis for minimum quotas the imports during a historical period composed of 5 calendar years.

H. R. 7171 contains no provisions other than the five improvements which have been described above. Although the bill is of a technical nature, it is of great importance to the welfare of agriculture which requires in certain instances that an administratively practical means be provided for preventing low-priced imports from breaking a higher structure of domestic prices.

I am advised that some persons who oppose export subsidies have criticized the provisions of H. R. 7171 as a means of facilitating the expanded use of subsidy programs. In this connection it may be important to note that export subsidy programs can be adequately protected by the provisions of section 22 in their present form. The amendments contained in H. R. 7171 would

serve primarily to make that control more practical administratively. Moreover, it should be pointed out that export subsidies were employed in the case of both cotton and wheat only as a temporary and last resort to maintain our normal and fair share of the world export market, pending the adoption of satisfactory long-term programs. I believe that this was made clear in a statement that I made on July 13, 1939, to a conference of representatives of all branches of the cotton industry.

"We sincerely hope that the need for making payments on exports will be only temporary. Such payments can be discontinued without sacrifice as soon as two long-term measures have been adopted. In the first place, there is an obvious and great need for an international agreement not only assuring each exporting country its fair share of the world market but also supporting a reasonable level of world prices. A successful international agreement would furnish an admirable supplement to the reciprocal trade agreement program. In the second place, we need an administratively practical and economical method, such as the old tax-and-payment plan or the proposed certificate plan, for maintaining domestic prices at an adequate level, while at the same time permitting American cotton to be offered on the world market at fully competitive prices at all times.

"As a primary step in placing ourselves in a position in which payments on exports may at some time in the future be abandoned, we have taken the initiative in arranging for a preliminary meeting of representatives of the various cotton-exporting countries. It will be convened here in Washington early in September."

I am advised that some persons have opposed the provisions of H. R. 7171 on the ground that it could be used in connection with programs to increase the price of farm products in the United States substantially above the prevailing prices in the world markets. The answer to this objection is twofold: In the first place, American agriculture has approximately 24 percent of the population and 30 percent of the children, but only about 11 percent of the national income. In the interest of the general welfare, the income of agriculture should be increased. In the second place, the disrupted and disorganized condition of world markets and certain new and highly effective methods of competition make it necessary not only to protect the farmers against ruinously low prices but also against the loss of their fair share of the world markets—either of which obviously would have seriously damaging repercussions on the economy of the entire Nation.

H. R. 7171 will expedite the operation of farm programs designed to bolster the incomes of farmers producing the export commodities. I believe it deserves the support of those interested in farm welfare and general welfare.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. WALLACE, *Secretary*.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I have been accustomed for many years to rely on the sagacity and judgment of the senior Senator from Nevada, and I think I would now best serve the Senate and the country by being realistic enough to realize and know that I cannot get up the ship-gambling bill. Without any irritation or bad temper I recognize the situation. But I am consoled and much comforted by the reflection that the other bill, H. R. 6832, for the protection of witnesses would come within the rule.

Mr. BARKLEY. Undoubtedly.

Mr. ASHURST. Before I sit down, as a Roland for the Oliver of my dear friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—not in the Appendix, please, but at this juncture in my remarks—an article from the Times-Herald of Friday, August 4, 1939, Washington Daily Merry-Go-Round, by Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen, which contains a just compliment to the Senator from Vermont.

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

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. If the Senator from Arizona will take occasion to read that article now to the Senate and to the galleries, I am sure the Senator from Vermont would withdraw his objection to the passage of the bill.

Mr. ASHURST. No, Mr. President; his State produces granite, and I presume he grew up with that adamantine granite determination, which would cause him to continue to object.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the compliment.

There being no objection, the article referred to was ordered to be pritned in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 4, 1939]

WASHINGTON DAILY MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen)

Behind the headlines of turbulent wind-up battles on Capitol Hill are political developments of great significance.

One was the emergence of a Republican leader—courtly, square-shooting Senator WARREN R. AUSTIN, of Vermont.

In Acting Floor Leader AUSTIN the G. O. P. has a sturdy conservative and loyal party supporter, but a man who also believes that principles come before partisan interest. Illustrating his attitude were his votes to confirm Justice Felix Frankfurter and Attorney General Frank Murphy, and his vigorous defense of the sale of warplanes to the French.

Other Republicans raged against the two appointments and rushed to make political capital out of the plane deal. But AUSTIN, who would never have named Frankfurter and Murphy himself, readily conceded their ability and integrity. And regarding the sale of planes to France, he said, "I will not allow partisanship to influence me in a stand that might be construed as detrimental to my country."

Sixty-two, stocky, and well-dressed, AUSTIN is a hard fighter but always a fair one. This quality has won him a host of warm friends in all quarters.

One of his intimates was the late Senate Democratic floor leader, Joe Robinson, of Arkansas. Another is Postmaster General Jim Farley, whom he vigorously assailed for canceling the air-mail contracts but who later sent him a photograph with this inscription: "To a real fellow whose friendship I prize."

Note: AUSTIN's closest friend is his 91-year-old mother, to whom he writes every day he is away from his Vermont home.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, recently the Senate passed certain bills, among which were two bills which I introduced, which the administration favors. Then the House, instead of taking up the Senate bills, passed two House bills and sent them to the Senate. The House bills are almost identical with the Senate bills, and those of us who are interested in the bills are willing to accept the House bills.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think to all intents and purposes it might be said that a bill of that sort has had a report from a standing committee of the Senate and would come within the request.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, if that is to be the interpretation which the distinguished leader makes of his request, I would be obliged to object.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 181), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate, to join a similar committee appointed by the House of Representatives, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses, having completed the business of the present session, are ready to adjourn unless the President has some further communication to make to them.

Under the foregoing resolution the President pro tempore appointed the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] the committee on the part of the Senate.

PROTECTION OF WITNESSES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1156, House bill 6832, which is the bill to which the Senator from Arizona referred a few moments ago. It is not the bill having to do with gambling off the coast of California, but the bill having to do with the protection of witnesses. The bill was presented to the Senate a few days ago. Objection was made by the senior Senator from California, which has since been withdrawn; and I understand that there is now no objection to that bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Chair hear objection?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I object.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations of postmasters, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

[For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.]

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR. From the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, I report back favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of S. L. Stolte to be Work Projects administrator for Minnesota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Linus C. Glotzbach to be regional director, district No. VII, Work Projects Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I could not hear because of the confusion in the Chamber. Were the first two nominations on page 1 of the Calendar, S. L. Stolte and Linus C. Glotzbach, confirmed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They were confirmed without objection.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there is an objection. The junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN] asked that those nominations go over until January. Under the circumstances it seems to me that they should. I therefore ask that the votes by which the nominations were confirmed be reconsidered, and that the nominations be recommitted to the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The votes by which the nominations were confirmed are reconsidered, and the nominations are recommitted to the committee.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters on the calendar are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

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

POSTMASTERS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the nominations of a large number of postmasters have been favorably reported and are on the desk. No nominations of postmasters have been reported which do not have the endorsement of the Senators of the particular States in which the nominees reside. Therefore, I do not ask that they be confirmed en bloc, but that they be read for the information of the Senate and confirmed one by one, so that every Senator may see whether or not the nominations should be confirmed. I ask that Senators pay some attention, so that no mistake may be made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and the nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry further nominations of postmasters.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I should like to interrogate the Senator from Tennessee, who is in charge of the nominations, and ask him if at this time we cannot conclude the remainder of the nominations by confirming them en bloc.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that might be done. My secretary has taken every care and caution possible to see that Senators from the particular States in which the post offices are located have been consulted and have approved the nominations. So I modify my request by asking that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Calloway, one of its clerks, announced that a committee of two Members had been appointed by the House, to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses had completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless the President has some further communication to make to them.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a privileged resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Con. Res. 29), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, the 5th day of August, 1939, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned *sine die*.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution. It is not debatable.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

FELICITATIONS FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 5, 1939.

The honorable the VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: At this time of the adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, will you be good enough to express to the Members of the Senate my good wishes for a pleasant vacation?

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

INEZ GILLESPIE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I ask to have placed in the RECORD a letter sent to me from the State Department.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I suggest that the letter be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 5, 1939.

The Honorable MORRIS SHEPPARD,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR SHEPPARD: I acknowledge your oral request for a report from this Department with respect to a bill pending before your committee for the relief of the widow of the late Julian E. Gillespie, who died on June 23, 1939, while serving as Commercial Attaché of the American Embassy at Istanbul, Turkey. You state that the pending bill is to grant the widow the equivalent of the annual salary which Mr. Gillespie was receiving at the time of his death, that is, $7,200.

If Mr. Gillespie had lived until July 1, 1939, he would have become an officer of the Foreign Service of the United States under the administration of this Department, in accordance with the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. II, but as his death

occurred on June 23, 1939, he never became an officer of this Department and was an officer of the Foreign Commerce Service of the Department of Commerce at the time he died. In these circumstances, I regret to inform you that Mr. Gillespie's widow is not eligible to any benefits under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system (act of Apr. 24, 1939).

The late Julian E. Gillespie rendered distinguished service to this Government over a period of many years, during which he was assigned as a commercial attaché to a diplomatic mission under the administration of this Department and I would be gratified if the President and Congress should enact the pending legislation in behalf of his widow.

Very sincerely yours,

SUMNER WELLES,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, earlier in the day I introduced Senate bill 2973, for the relief of Inez Gillespie. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

This is one of the usual routine measures, giving the widow of a deceased member of the Foreign Service his salary for a year. I have consulted the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the State Department, and there is no objection.

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

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2973) for the relief of Inez Gillespie was read twice by its title, considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Inez Gillespie, widow of Julian E. Gillespie, late American commercial attaché at Istanbul, Turkey, the sum of $7,200, such sum representing 1 year's salary of her deceased husband, who died June 23, 1939, while in the Foreign Service of the United States of America.

PROTECTION OF WITNESSES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was on my feet at the time the Chair declared the Senate in executive session. I rose at that time for the purpose of moving that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1156, House bill 6832.

Of course, I sense the desire of the Senate to proceed immediately without any undue delay. If I may have the attention of the distinguished and able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], I shall make a brief statement. I shall withhold the motion to proceed to consider the bill; but I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered and passed. I do that for the reason that a moment ago the Senator from Vermont made objection when I asked for a similar unanimous-consent agreement. I think that objection must have been made under a misapprehension, because 2 days ago, when the bill was called up, I spoke to the Senator from Vermont with respect to it, and he stated to me that he then had no objection to the passage of the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. That was true 2 days ago.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask whether or not the Senator has changed his mind since that time?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the situation is wholly different at this moment. My objection to the consideration of any legislation at all is based not on the ground of opposition to any of the legislation but on the ground that I consider it in the public interest that Congress adjourn.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall not press the matter.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. AUSTIN appeared, and Mr. BARKLEY said: Mr. President, as chairman of the committee appointed a few moments ago to communicate with the President and to report back to the Senate, I wish to report that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and I have performed the arduous duty imposed upon us under that appointment, and that I am prepared to announce that the President has no further communication to make to the Congress before its adjournment.

OPPOSITION TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S POLICIES

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah, who has been attempting for several minutes to obtain the floor?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator from Utah that I shall not consume as much as 10 minutes if he will allow me to proceed.

Mr. President, I am unwilling to let this session of the Congress end without lifting my voice to decry the unrighteous partnership of those who have been willing to scuttle the American Government and the American people and jeopardize the peace of the world because they hate Roosevelt and what Roosevelt stands for. I accuse that alliance of putting personal grudge and party feeling above the welfare and the safety of the American people.

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

Mr. PEPPER. Just as soon as I shall have concluded.

Mr. BURKE. For a question?

Mr. PEPPER. As soon as I shall have concluded.

Mr. BURKE. Not even for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. As soon as I shall have concluded.

I accuse that willful alliance of a designed attempt to withhold aid and meager succor from the unemployed and the aged of America, in the hope that in their mad misery they might raise their hand against a President and an administration who have tried to restore them to the dignity and the opportunity of American citizens.

I accuse that designing alliance of a deliberate attempt to sabotage the first real effort ever made in this Nation to secure for the workers of America industrial democracy and economic emancipation.

I accuse them of having prostituted their power to serve the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Manufacturers' Association, and the beneficiaries of special privilege, who hate in their hearts the man who has tried to lighten the burden of toil on the back of labor.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BURKE. I challenge the statement of the Senator from Florida as being in violation of rule XIX, in that it makes a direct and positive charge of improper conduct against Members of the United States Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule, the Senator from Florida will have to take his seat until the Senate acts upon a motion that he be permitted to proceed in order.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senator from Florida be permitted to proceed in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. RUSSELL, and other Senators demanded the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DANAHER (when his name was called). Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry: In exactly what form is this question pending, please?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the regular form of a motion that the Senator may proceed in order.

Mr. DANAHER. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is this motion to allow the Senator from Florida to proceed in order or out of order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As it is prescribed in the rules, to proceed in order.

Mr. CONNALLY. In order? I vote "yea."

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator

from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from Minnestota [Mr. LUNDEEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SLATTERY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], are unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—34

Adams	Danaher	Lee	Schwartz
Andrews	Downey	Lucas	Schwellenbach
Ashurst	Ellender	Mead	Sheppard
Barkley	Guffey	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Borah	Hatch	Minton	Truman
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Murray	Walsh
Byrnes	Johnson, Colo.	Pittman	Wheeler
Chavez	King	Radcliffe	
Connally	La Follette	Russell	

NAYS—15

Austin	George	Hale	Taft
Bailey	Gerry	Nye	Vandenberg
Burke	Gibson	Smith	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Gurney	Stewart	

NOT VOTING—47

Bankhead	Frazier	Logan	Reynolds
Barbour	Gillette	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bilbo	Glass	McCarran	Slattery
Bone	Green	McKellar	Smathers
Bridges	Harrison	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Hayden	Maloney	Tobey
Byrd	Herring	Neely	Townsend
Capper	Hill	Norris	Tydings
Caraway	Holman	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Overton	White
Davis	Hughes	Pepper	Wiley
Donahey	Lodge	Reed	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this question the yeas are 34, the nays are 15; so the Senator from Florida may proceed in order.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I accuse them of having prostituted their power to serve the United States Chamber of Commerce——

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska will state it.

Mr. BURKE. Is it permissible, under the rules of the Senate, for a Senator who doubts whether the Senator from Florida will be able to proceed in order, to retire to the cloakroom? [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not think the question is a proper parliamentary inquiry. The Senatory from Florida will proceed.

Mr. PEPPER. I accuse them of having prostituted their power to serve the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Manufacturers' Association, and the beneficiaries of special privilege, who hate in their hearts the man who has tried to lighten the burden of toil on the back of labor.

I accuse that intriguing alliance of trying to strike down by emasculation and assassination the Fair Labor Standards Act, to preserve intact the unhampered power of the unconscionable employers who would sweat their fortunes out of the nonresisting bodies of men, women, and children, and wring their dirty dividends from the misery of their fellow citizens even in their own communities.

I accuse this Machiavellian alliance of fostering and encouraging unhappy division in the ranks of labor, not because they love one side more than the other, but because they want to keep the working man helpless and supine, so that they shall continue to hold him in the tight clutches of economic bondage.

I accuse this scheming alliance of infidelity to their own Government by endeavoring to destroy the competence of that Government to fulfill its international monetary commitments to serve a handful of Wall Street speculators and the little conniving clique of international money changers who know no flag and no cause but money.

I accuse that conniving alliance of giving aid and comfort to the enemy of all their country stands for, by strangling the constitutional power of the President to conduct our foreign policy, which has proved itself by twice being a principal factor in preserving the peace of the world. I accuse them of deceiving the American people in a time of international tension as to the issues involved, and playing upon the credulity of the American people for partisan profit and power.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for a question to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask the Senator if he will name those whom he places in such an alliance as he is describing, if he is referring to any one in the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Florida is referring to those who, in the opinion of the Senator from Florida, come within the category he has described.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator be good enough to name them?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I can make no more explicit or more direct answer than the one I have previously given, except to say that if Senators will scrutinize the remarks I have made they will find that I have not enumerated any particular class and designated them, unless they designate themselves in the categories to which I refer.

Mr. GEORGE. Has the Senator the courage to name anybody?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Florida has the courage to express his opinions whenever and wherever the occasion may be appropriate.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma will state it.

Mr. LEE. Would it not be unparliamentary and a violation of the rules of the Senate if the Senator from Florida should name any person?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there are many persons in the United States who are not upon the floor of the United States Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask the Senator whether he is referring to any one in the United States Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. I have not designated anybody in the United States Senate, I will say to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Is the Senator referring to any one in the United States Senate?

Mr. PEPPER. I have not designated any one in the United States Senate, I will say to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. All right.

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

Mr. PEPPER. Not now.

I accuse this premediated alliance of crucifying the lending program, which they knew would have given jobs to the unemployed and profit to the business of the country without a burden to the Nation's taxpayers, because they hated Roosevelt and the faith the people have in him, and they wanted him to fail in his efforts to improve the conditions of the masses of America, so that from their unhappy discontent they might be molded into an angry army to give the government of this Nation back to those who have always been the champions of special privilege. I accuse them of setting fire to the barn for the insurance, and of burning the horses along with the hay.

I accuse this pharisaical alliance of hypocritical lip-service to the cause of constitutional government, while they used the lives, the fortunes, and the futures of the men, women,

and children of America as a pawn in a vicious game of petty, personal, partisan politics.

I accuse this heartless alliance of having sacrificed humanity and human value to reaction, property, and Hooverism. I accuse them of having repudiated the obligations they owed to America's present and America's future. I accuse them of having levied political war against the best interests of those whom they should serve.

I accuse this alliance for profit of having sacrificed the best interests of their States, their regions, their businesses, their professions, and their country in order to kill this administration and carve up its corpse for personal, political aggrandizement. I accuse them of undermining their Government from within, of trying to throttle the democratic process to defeat the will of the people and perpetuate the dictatorship of a privileged class.

I have fought these reactionists, these witting or unwitting champions of the uncommon people of America, all my life. I have fought them in my own State and in my own party. I have fought them in the forum and on the platform. I shall continue to fight them by words and deeds until the people of America have shorn them of their destructive power and what they stand for has been repudiated and forbidden by the American people.

I shall fight them because I am a young man, and they work to destroy young men's inheritance. The spirit of America, too, is young and vital; and that indomitable spirit will not be held down by spiderwebs and Liliputians, whatever the artistry of their deceit. I will fight what these men stand for because I think it endangers the security of the country both at home and abroad, and that we stand dishonored before posterity if we do not preserve by every possible effort their heritage, handed to our stewardship by the sacrifice of our fathers.

I shall fight the spirit of that combination because I am a southerner, and because what they stand for harms the South I love. I charge that they would rather turn the efforts of the Government to the aid of the organized money power of the Nation than to make it possible for the people of my State and the South, where I was born, to get an education, to be healthy, and to make a living like honorable men.

In the midst of one of their Nation's greatest crises, confronting problems challenging all that head or heart could offer, when the hungry mouths and heavy hearts of millions of Americans looked to them for relief, they have spurned their cry and castigated them with the unsympathetic bitterness of a tyrant as being unworthy of their Nation's help.

Now the pall of futility hangs over the heads of a sad Nation. Their last and only hope, their Government, has been strangled into the helplessness of the impotent man at the Springs of Bethesda. Into the cavities of their hearts, where but a little while ago hope lingered, one can now hear the trickling drops of despair. Soon a brew of bitterness will begin to corrode the thin walls which hold back the pulsing floods of anger. First from one spot and another, from the heartsick and the heartsore all over this Nation, will rise the rumbling tones of a righteous indignation against what has been done to them, and who has done it, and why it was done.

Men who sink into restless sleep with the muffled sobs of a disconsolate wife dinning their ears, and open their eyes to see the gaunt faces of emaciated and sick children, do not understand the chess game which the ambitious and the designing make out of government, and the cold heartlessness with which bitter men make the helpless suffer when they war for power and the Presidency of the United States.

Even Napoleon could not look without compassion upon the familiar scene of dying men upon the battlefield. Sometimes men need to bend their knees and humble themselves before their God before they can see their wrong, and be ashamed of what they have done and what they have not done.

This great Nation was never more distressed, more sorely pressed by her affliction, than now. If the prayers of the people of America shall be answered, I know that in the mysterious way by which it moves the spirit of right and righteousness shall so touch the hearts and unite the wills of the leaders of America that they shall be emptied of the acid of hate, and filled with a love and determination which shall resurrect a Nation's dead hope and revive her faltering faith to the high and unselfish patriotism of our forefathers.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I rise to say just a word before making the final motion that will close this session of the Senate, and as soon as the message comes from the House advising that the House has agreed to the concurrent resolution for adjournment sine die, I shall make the motion.

Mr. President, this has been a hard session of Congress. It has been a hard-working session, and it has accomplished many things which cannot be obscured by any failures which have occurred within the last week or two. In some respects it has accomplished more than it was expected to accomplish when it assembled in January.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I want to say to the Senator from Kentucky that I desired to make a few remarks in relation to the statement which has just been delivered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. As I understand the procedure, when the Senator concludes, he will move an adjournment, and prevent those remarks from being made.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not know the Senator from California desired to speak.

Mr. DOWNEY. I endeavored to secure the floor, but the Chair recognized the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator desires to speak, I will yield to him now.

Mr. DOWNEY. I will appreciate it. I desire to speak for only 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot make the motion I have in mind until the concurrent resolution comes back from the House. I yield to the Senator from California. I did not anticipate that he wanted to make some remarks.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, reverting to the statement which was just made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], I wish to preface my remarks by saying that I have a very deep affection for him, and very high respect for his devotion to public service, and his intelligence. But I must myself express my dissent in a very great measure from what he has said.

I suppose that perhaps among all the Senators in this body my own economic policy is opposed to a greater extent than that of any other Senator; yet I desire to say that I recognize not only the sincerity of the Senators opposing me, but their very high ability and devotion to the public service.

I believe they are wrong, just as they believe I am wrong. But I recognize that in this tremendous crisis, and in the great complications which confront us, men must necessarily differ in their views, and they can and should differ with an appreciation of each other's sincerity, unless they know and recognize some particular indictment they desire to bring against some particular Senator. I believe that we are at the beginning of this crisis. I think that the next 10 years will test to the very limit the enduring strength of Democracy and of Republicanism, and God help us in America is we cannot meet these problems not only with intelligence, but likewise with tolerance and understanding, and a clear admission of the righteousness of the opposition, and of the right of the opposition to have its own views.

My own views have been expressed here at length upon the expanding public debt and the lending program of the United States Government. I recognize that reasonable men may honestly and sincerely differ upon that issue. Some men may honestly believe—and time alone can prove them right—that an ever-increasing debt will destroy us. The

man who believes increasing the debt is correct as an emergency and ephemeral program may be right, and the man who sees virtue in a continually expanding program of debt may be right. We should all struggle among ourselves to express our own ideas, but it is my hope and prayer that in the days to come we move forward with tolerance and fair understanding, and an admission of the sincerity of the man who is against our views.

Mr. BAILEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BAILEY. Would it be in order for a Senator to characterize the remarks of another Senator, insofar as they relate to himself or his friends in the Senate, as cowardly and mendacious? Would that be in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Any Senator would have a right, if he thought the remarks were out of order, to call the Senator who used the expression to order, and the Senator would have to take his seat until allowed to proceed in order.

Mr. BAILEY. I will just say this, whether in order or not: I shall say it to him privately.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. I wish to take this occasion to compliment the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] upon his tolerance, intelligence, and statesmanlike attitude toward the matter now under discussion. Contrast is the most illuminating and effective means of bringing out the strength in an argument, and we have before us the extremes in that respect.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I was about to say [laughter]——

GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH BUSINESS

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. I wish to say a word—and this is going to be very brief.

Mr. President, private business enterprise has been clamoring for an opportunity to expand without Government competition. With the appropriations by the Government to make what I believe necessary supplements to economic problems, private business contended that that was an interference, and that they were hindered in their enterprise. While I have maintained and believed that the effort of the administration to pass what is known as the lending-spending bill, introduced by our distinguished leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Congress, because of the refusal of the House, failed to pass that legislation.

Big business has put on what I have designated, and what has been editorially commented upon, as a "sit-down strike," claiming that initiative and individual enterprise were deterred by governmental appropriations.

Now that the lending-spending bill will not be enacted, may we not call attention to the fact that if there was sincerity in the statements of some of the leaders of business, they do not now have any legitimate reason for not giving their best efforts for a full return to activity by the toiling millions. There is a definite and substantial economic upturn now. I hope there will be a further increase.

I offer for the RECORD, and ask that it be included in my remarks, an editorial from the Washington Daily News of August 3, 1939, along the lines I have just spoken.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UP TO BUSINESS

When Congress tossed the big spend-lend bill out the window, it flung a major challenge to private business enterprise. Or, rather, accepted a challenge which business has repeatedly tendered.

Again and again business spokesmen have contended that private industry could not return to normal functioning until it had some evidence that the pump-priming-for-prosperity policy was abating.

Give us, said they, some assurance that the Government has abandoned the fallacy of deficits-for-recovery. Give us some positive proof that Washington powers have given up the spending philosophy in favor of a balanced Budget. Do that, said these business spokesmen, and then we'll demonstrate how the driving force of private investment can take hold and create real jobs at real wages.

Business now has the assurance for which it has waited. Congress has spoken decisively and emphatically. And Congress is once more the power in Washington. It dramatically refused the spend-lend scheme to give jobs to 500,000 workers because it believed such refusal would encourage private investors and entrepreneurs to create better jobs for many more hundreds of thousands of idle men.

Congress will return in January and ask how business is delivering on its promises.

WORK OF THE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, when we began this session of Congress, in January, we began it in a period of uncertainty, chaos, and danger to the international relations of the world because of certain conditions which we all understand and appreciate. At the beginning of the session I daresay none of us could have prophesied that we would do more than merely pass the appropriation bills and amend, strengthen, and expand certain important legislation which had been adopted in recent years by the Congress of the United States.

During the 7 months of our deliberations we have been passing not only through serious international situations, we have not only been required to sail our ship between Scylla and Charybdis in such a way as not to wreck it, but we have also been confronted with very serious internal economic conditions.

We have enacted legislation further benefiting agriculture, we have done what probably none of us thought might be done at the beginning of the session, we have modified the taxes of the United States in the interest of business, and I think we have set in motion, at least I hope we have, by discussion, at any rate, an investigation of our entire tax system, which may result ultimately in its simplification and its improvement so as to eliminate injustices where they may be found, keeping in mind always the needs of the Treasury.

We have recognized the international conditions to such an extent as to put our own house in order. Whatever may be our individual opinions as to the duty and obligation of the United States as one of the great nations of the world, whatever may be our desires, and ambitions, and aspirations, and our prayers concerning the future welfare of our country, not only at home, but in its dealings with other nations, I think we all realize that we cannot exist in a world of conflagration without ourselves running the danger of being scorched or burned. So we have strengthened our defenses, not only from a military and naval standpoint, but I think we have strengthened our defenses from a moral, intellectual, and patriotic standpoint.

Mr. President, we have done many things during the last 7 months which I regard of a constructive and far-reaching and fundamental nature. We have attempted to do some things which have not been consummated as yet, but practically all the things which were attempted during the session have been consummated by the Congress of the United States. I believe that when we shall have returned to our homes and shall have assessed the value of public opinion, and have found the reaction among the people to what we have done and what we have failed to do, we will come back at the next session prepared to finish the work which we have begun, which may remain uncompleted at this time.

In a period such as this we all have our differences. It would be a monotonous world if everyone thought alike on all subjects. We have had our individual opinions. We have expressed them with vigor. We have had our individual disappointments, and we have had our disappointments as a group.

Mr. President, I have faith in the American Republic. I have faith in the American people. I have faith in their representatives. When I lose faith in them I will lose faith in democracy and in the processes by which elected representatives are chosen by the American people.

We have been a nation for 150 years. We have passed through bloodshed and panic and depression and wars. We have come out of those conflicts and situations stronger than

ever before, and I believe that fundamentally in the hearts of the American people today we are more united as an American Nation than we have ever been in our entire history. I have had my difficulties. I have had my disappointments.

Mr. President, before the Senate finally adjourns I wish to express my gratitude and appreciation for all the courtesies which I have received at the hands of my colleagues in the Senate. We have not all agreed about public issues. We have fought them out in the open. We have done the best we could. We have given blow for blow in a parliamentary way, abiding the result, whatever it may have been. I wish for every Member of the Senate, without regard to party, without regard to his attitude toward matters which have been of transcendent importance here, a joyful recess. I wish for you strengthening in body and mind and heart. I wish for you, as I wish for myself, that our association with the people, who are after all the foundation of our strength as a nation, may bring us back here happier, prouder, and stronger in our love of our country and in our faith in its destiny.

I wish also for the Vice President and all the officers of the Senate, down to the smallest of the page boys, a happy recess and vacation.

I am satisfied that those of you who return—and I hope that you may all return—will come back prouder that you are Americans, because you will be like that old mythological character whose name I do not recall, but I think it was——

Mr. KING. Antaeus. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Antaeus. I thank the Senator from Utah for his suggestion. I was going to say "Andreas," but it is "Antaeus."

Mr. KING. No; he was Greek and not Scandinavian.

Mr. BARKLEY. At any rate, when he returned to earth and put his feet on the ground he found renewed strength of mind and body. And during my long years' service in the House and Senate, covering a quarter of a century, whatever noises I have heard in Washington, whatever artificial atmosphere there may have been, whatever fright I have felt now and then because of raging storms around us, I have always found that when I returned to my people and put my feet on the ground again my strength was renewed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, the 5th day of August 1939, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4540) authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Oreg., and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 375) to authorize the sale of surplus agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 796. An act for the relief of Mato, Miljenko, Bozo, and Augustin Cibilic, or Zibilich;

S. 1269. An act for the relief of Emil Friedrich Dischleit;

S. 1538. An act for the relief of Konstantinos Dionysiou Antiohos (or Gus Pappas);

S. 1654. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pacios Pijuan; and

S. 1911. An act for the relief of Daumit Tannaus Saleah (Dave Thomas).

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in compliance with the terms of Senate Concurrent Resolution 29, I now move that the Senate adjourn sine die.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned sine die.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Under authority of House Concurrent Resolution 35, on August 7, 1939, the President pro tempore signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 878. An act to amend the act of August 26, 1937;

S. 2046. An act to change the designations of the Abraham Lincoln National Park, in the State of Kentucky, and the Fort McHenry National Park, in the State of Maryland;

S. 2141. An act to authorize acquisition of complete title to the Puyallup Indian tribal school property at Tacoma, Wash., for Indian sanatorium purposes;

S. 2745. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases;

S. 2778. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924;

S. 2779. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," known as the "Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928," approved February 27, 1929;

H. R. 4117. An act to provide for the payment of attorney's fees from Osage tribal funds;

H. R. 4540. An act authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Oreg., and for other purposes;

H. R. 7462. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1939, and June 30, 1940, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution to amend Public Resolution No. 112, Seventy-fifth Congress;

H. J. Res. 375. Joint resolution to authorize the sale of surplus agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 381. Joint resolution to provide funds for the maintenance and operation of the administrative office of the United States courts for the fiscal year 1940.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Committee on Enrolled Bills presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

On August 5, 1939:

S. 796. An act for the relief of Mato, Miljenko, Bozo, and Augustin Cibilic, or Zibilich;

S. 1042. An act for the relief of the Epes Transportation Corporation;

S. 1269. An act for the relief of Emil Friedrich Dischleit;

S. 1538. An act for the relief of Konstantinos Dionysiou Antiohos (or Gus Pappas);

S. 1540. An act to adjust the compensation of the members of the National Advisory Health Council not in the regular employment of the Government;

S. 1654. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pacios Pijuan;

S. 1708. An act to amend the Employers' Liability Act;

S. 1802. An act authorizing construction of water conservation and utilization projects in the Great Plains and arid and semiarid areas of the United States;

S. 1815. An act for the relief of Evelyn Mary Locke;

S. 1911. An act for the relief of Daumit Tannaus Saleah (Dave Thomas);

S. 2240. An act to provide for a national census of housing;

S. 2271. An act for the relief of Barnet Warren;

S. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution readmitting Mary Cohen Bienvenu to citizenship; and

S. J. Res. 185. Joint resolution to authorize The Assistant Secretary of the Navy to continue to serve as Acting Secretary of the Navy until the appointment of a Secretary, and for other purposes.

On August 7, 1939:

S. 878. An act to amend the act of August 26, 1937;

S. 2046. An act to change the designations of the Abraham Lincoln National Park, in the State of Kentucky, and the Fort McHenry National Park, in the State of Maryland;

S. 2141. An act to authorize acquisition of complete title to the Puyallup Indian tribal school property at Tacoma, Wash., for Indian sanatorium purposes;

S. 2745. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases;

S. 2778. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924;

S. 2779. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," known as the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, approved February 27, 1929; and

S. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution to amend Public Resolution No. 112, Seventy-fifth Congress.

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The President of the United States, subsequent to the final adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, notified the Secretary of the Senate that he had approved bills and joint resolutions of the Senate, as follows:

On August 5, 1939:

S. 185. An act to amend section 224 of the Criminal Code so as to penalize the making of false claims for the loss of insured mail matter;

S. 190. An act to authorize the temporary appointment of a special judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands;

S. 432. An act to provide for the public auction of certain town lots within the city of Parker, Ariz.;

S. 809. An act for the relief of Jessie M. Durst;

S. 1081. An act for the relief of John B. Jones;

S. 1156. An act to authorize the transfer to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Treasury of portions of the property within the military reservation known as the Morehead City Target Range, N. C., for the construction of improvements thereon, and for other purposes;

S. 1211. An act for the relief of Jesse Claud Branson;

S. 1229. An act for the relief of Ernest Clinton and Frederick P. Deragisch;

S. 1258. An act for the relief of the Rent-A-Car Co.;

S. 1282. An act to extend the privilege of retirement for disability to judges appointed to hold office during good behavior;

S. 1339. An act for the relief of Grace S. Taylor;

S. 1414. An act for the relief of Allie Holsomback and Lonnie Taylor;

S. 1429. An act for the relief of Earl J. Reed and Giles J. Gentry;

S. 1874. An act to amend the Criminal Code in regard to obtaining money by false pretenses on the high seas;

S. 1901. An act to extend to Sgt. Maj. Leonard E. Browning, United States Marine Corps, the benefits of the act of May 7, 1932, providing highest World War rank to retired enlisted men;

S. 1996. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg.;

S. 2067. An act for the relief of Leslie J. Frane and Charles Frane;

S. 2082. An act for the relief of Hugh A. Smith;

S. 2114. An act for the relief of Virginia Pearson;

S. 2188. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Providence, Warren & Bristol Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Warren River at or near Barrington, R. I.;

S. 2275. An act for the relief of Floyd M. Dunscomb;

S. 2366. An act for the relief of Franklin C. Richardson;

S. 2370. An act for the relief of Corinne W. Bienvenu (nee Corinne Wells);

S. 2407. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Valley and McCone, Mont., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Frazer, Mont.;

S. 2484. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Arrow Rock, Mo.;

S. 2513. An act for the relief of certain persons whose property was damaged or destroyed as a result of the crashes of two airplanes of the United States Navy at East Braintree, Mass., on April 4, 1939;

S. 2526. An act to authorize Leonhard Stejneger, of the United States National Museum, to accept certain decoration from the Norwegian Government;

S. 2563. An act to legalize a free highway bridge now being constructed across the Des Moines River at Levy, Iowa;

S. 2564. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Iowa State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Des Moines River at or near Red Rock, Iowa;

S. 2634. An act to reserve to the United States for the Bonneville project a right-of-way across certain Indian lands in the State of Washington, subject to the consent of the individual allottees and the payment of compensation, and for other purposes;

S. 2788. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor," approved February 23, 1931, as amended;

S. J. Res. 176. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the celebration to be held at Fort McHenry on September 14, 1939, in celebration of the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the writing of The Star-Spangled Banner; and

S. J. Res. 185. Joint resolution to authorize The Assistant Secretary of the Navy to continue to serve as Acting Secretary of the Navy until the appointment of a Secretary, and for other purposes.

On August 7, 1939:

S. 188. An act to provide for the administration of the United States courts, and for other purposes;

S. 474. An act to amend section 92 of the Judicial Code to provide for a term of court at Kalispell, Mont., and, subject to the recommendation of the Attorney General of the United States, to permit the provision of rooms and accommodations for holding court at Livingston and Kalispell, Mont.;

S. 765. An act for the relief of Hugh McGuire;

S. 803. An act for the relief of Calliope Minaca Pilavakis;

S. 891. An act for the relief of J. C. Grice;

S. 1092. An act for the relief of Sigvard C. Foro;

S. 1394. An act for the relief of Johannes, or John, Julia, Michael, William, and Anna Kostiuk;

S. 1448. An act for the relief of Anna H. Rosa;

S. 1527. An act for the relief of Joseph Lopez Ramos;

S. 1688. An act for the relief of Joseph W. Parse;

S. 1816. An act for the relief of Montie S. Carlisle;

S. 1821. An act for the relief of Harry K. Snyder;

S. 1905. An act for the relief of Elizabeth E. Burke;

S. 1954. An act for the relief of Joannes Josephus Citron;

S. 2023. An act for the relief of C. L. Herren;

S. 2054. An act for the relief of Joseph Alder, E. G. Allen, and E. G. Allen and By Hanchett jointly;

S. 2133. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the State of Nevada;

S. 2179. An act for the relief of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department;

S. 2392. An act to legalize a bridge across Bayou La Fourche at Cut Off, La.;

S. 2408. An act for the relief of Russell B. Hendrix;

S. 2410. An act relating to the development of farm units on public lands under Federal reclamation projects with funds furnished by the Farm Security Administration;

S. 2427. An act authorizing the naturalization of John Ullmann, Jr.;

S. 2454. An act to relieve disbursing officers and certifying officers of the Veterans' Administration from liability for payment where recovery of such payment is waived under existing laws administered by the Veterans' Administration;

S. 2478. An act to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases;

S. 2502. An act authorizing the county of Howard, State of Missouri, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Petersburg, Mo.;

S. 2562. An act to facilitate certain construction work for the Army, and for other purposes;

S. 2574. An act authorizing the construction of a highway bridge across the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal at St. Georges, Del.;

S. 2589. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Mauckport, Harrison County, Ind.;

S. 2738. An act to ratify and confirm Act 58 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1939, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935;

S. 2784. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for the Virgin Islands of the United States," approved June 22, 1936; and

S. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to accept the invitation of the Government of Norway to the Government of the United States to participate in an International Exhibition of Polar Exploration, which will be held at Bergen, Norway, in 1940; and authorizing an appropriation to cover the expenses of such participation.

On August 9, 1939:

S. 1234. An act to amend section 13 (a) of the act approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1069), entitled "Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938";

S. 1430. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Dorothy Elizabeth Sisson, a minor;

S. 1815. An act for the relief of Evelyn Mary Locke; and

S. 1899. An act to provide for the detail of a commissioned medical officer of the Public Health Service to serve as assistant to the Surgeon General.

On August 10, 1939:

S. 28. An act to provide for the erection of a public historical museum in the Custer Battlefield National Cemetery, Mont.;

S. 882. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 1540. An act to adjust the compensation of the members of the National Advisory Health Council not in the regular employment of the Government;

S. 1654. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pacios Pijuan;

S. 1812. An act for the relief of A. E. Bostrom;

S. 1911. An act for the relief of Daumit Tannaus Saleah (Dave Thomas);

S. 2239. An act for the relief of Dorothy Clair, G. F. Allen, and Earl Wooldridge;

S. 2242. An act creating the Memphis and Arkansas 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 Memphis, Tenn.; and for other purposes;

S. 2245. An act to prohibit the use of the mails for the solicitation of the procurement of divorces in foreign countries;

S. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution readmitting Mary Cohen Bienvenu to citizenship;

S. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution giving the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the States of Iowa and Missouri establishing a boundary between said States; and

S. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution to amend Public Resolution No. 112, Seventy-fifth Congress. (Note: This increases duties and extends life of Joint Committee to Investigate the Adequacy and Use of Phosphate Resources of the United States.)

On August 11, 1939:

S. 628. An act to allow the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to extend the period of amortization of home loans from 15 to 25 years;

S. 796. An act for the relief of Mato, Miljenko, Bozo, and Augustin Cibilic, or Zibilich;

S. 878. An act to amend the act of August 26, 1937;

S. 1269. An act for the relief of Emil Friedrich Dischleit;

S. 1538. An act for the relief of Konstantinos Dionysiou Antiohos (or Gus Pappas);

S. 1708. An act to amend the Employers' Liability Act;

S. 1802. An act authorizing construction of water conservation and utilization projects in the Great Plains and arid and semiarid areas of the United States;

S. 1823. An act for the relief of William E. Cowen;

S. 2046. An act to change the designations of the Abraham Lincoln National Park, in the State of Kentucky, and the Fort McHenry National Park, in the State of Maryland;

S. 2056. An act for the relief of N. F. Clower and Elijah Williams;

S. 2141. An act to authorize acquisition of complete title to the Puyallup Indian tribal school property at Tacoma, Wash., for Indian sanatorium purposes;

S. 2240. An act to provide for a national census of housing;

S. 2654. An act to amend subsection (n) section 77, of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, concerning payment of preferred claims;

S. 2697. An act to facilitate the execution of arrangements for the exchange of surplus agriculture commodities produced in the United States for reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials produced abroad;

S. 2745. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases;

S. 2778. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924; and

S. 2779. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," known as the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, approved February 27, 1929.

DISAPPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

The President of the United States, subsequent to the final adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate a list of bills and joint resolutions of the Senate disapproved by him, with his reasons for such action, as follows:

On August 7, 1939:

I have withheld approval of S. 6, entitled "An act to return a portion of the Grand Canyon National Monument to the public domain."

I am constrained to veto this legislation, which proposes to return approximately 148,159 acres within the monument to the public domain, because it appears that insufficient consideration has been given to the matter.

While appreciating the needs of the stockmen, and the desirability of affording them range facilities on the public domain when it can be done without unnecessary damage, I think that the stockmen will not be harmed by the delay necessary for full consideration of this subject. Grazing can be continued under special permits of the Department of the Interior while a further survey on the ground is being made of the lands proposed to be eliminated from the national monument.

Before approving any measure which would eliminate lands from any national monument, I would want to receive a report from representatives of the National Park Service based upon a thorough investigation of the lands proposed for elimination from the monument.

For the foregoing reasons, I am compelled to withhold my approval of the bill. I seek especially a report on the possibilities of this area for tree growth.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 7, 1939.*

On August 9, 1939:

I have withheld approval of Senate bill No. 5, entitled "An act to grant certain lands to the Arizona State Elks Association Hospital."

It appears that through error by the association authorities the hospital building of the Arizona State Elks Association, which was supposed to be placed on the SW¼SW¼ sec. 3, T. 14 S., R. 13 E., Gila and Salt River meridian, Arizona, was actually built so as to extend into the north 200 feet of the NW¼NW¼ sec. 10 of the township, or upon Government land included in a rifle range. Merely on account of such mistake the bill proposes that a patent issue to the Arizona State Elks Association for the north 200 feet of the NW¼NW¼ of section 10.

Because of the favorable report that was made on this measure by the Secretary of the Interior, it is with some reluctance that I disapprove it. However, to grant public land without compensation, even in the circumstances set forth in the report on the bill, is not in the public interest.

I am confident that at another session of the Congress the matter can be reconsidered and more suitable legislation enacted.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 9, 1939.*

I have withheld my approval of Senate bill No. 555, entitled "An act for the relief of Addison B. Hampel."

The indebtedness to the United States represented in this bill resulted from the payment to Mr. Hampel of the compensation of two positions, covering the same periods of time, in contravention of the act of May 10, 1916, as amended, notice of which act had been repeatedly given throughout the Postal Service by published bulletins of that Service. Mr. Hampel has already been relieved under the General Relief Act for the Postal Service, approved March 1, 1929, of $3,453.69 theretofore illegally paid to himself in his accounts as postmaster, and the amount which the enrolled enactment would authorize to be refunded to him represents the amount of collections made from him to apply against indebtedness, representing payments illegally made to himself thereafter. It would seem that as to these later payments even if not as to the earlier ones he could not plead ignorance of the law regarding dual compensation. Such disregard of the law in this case if condoned by the relief here sought would result in the establishing of a precedent tending to induce disregard of this and other laws enacted for the purpose of limiting and restricting the expenditure of public funds.

For these reasons I do not feel justified in approving this bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 9, 1939.*

I have withheld approval of Senate Joint Resolution 160, providing for the maintenance for public use of certain highways in the Shenandoah National Park.

The primary objection to this legislation is that it would subordinate national parks standards to local considerations. National parks are created for the benefit of the Nation as a whole, and for the preservation of specific areas in their natural condition, with a minimum of development. Such developments as may be required in national parks are undertaken for general public use, as distinguished from local use. The approval of Senate Joint Resolution 160 would encourage local communities to request the opening of minor roads in national park areas solely for the purpose of conferring local benefits upon adjacent communities, and would establish a dangerous precedent. Both the Congress and the executive agencies have in the past rejected similar attempts on the part of local interests to force construction of roads within the Yellowstone and other national parks. This proposed legislation for Shenandoah National Park would, therefore, be in direct conflict with an established precedent.

I am informed that these roads are in bad condition, and that they are narrow and have excessive grades and hairpin curves. It has been estimated that it would cost over $1,000,000 to put these roads in safe condition. In addition, their annual maintenance cost would be approximately $10,000.

The act of the General Assembly of Virginia ceding to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over the Shenandoah National Park in the State of Virginia, approved March 22, 1928, exempted from that cession only the Lee Highway and Spotswood Trail, thereby indicating that these were to be the only roads to remain free from Federal regulation.

If it can be later shown that the opening of the roads in question would be to the benefit of the Nation, that the large expenditures involved would be justified, and that a precedent contrary to national park policies would not be established thereby, the problem can then be solved administratively.

For the foregoing reasons, I am compelled to withhold my approval of the joint resolution.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 9, 1939.*

On August 10, 1939:

I am withholding my approval of S. 2, a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the State of Nevada to be used for the purposes of a public park and recreation site and other public purposes.

This bill provides for the granting of more than 8,000 acres of federally owned land in the Boulder Dam-Lake Mead area to the State of Nevada. Eighty percent of this land is located within the boundaries of the Boulder Dam national recreational area, and the residue is immediately adjacent thereto. The entire tract is of national interest and value, both for the protection from pollution of the waters impounded in Lake Mead and for the enhancement of the recreational and scenic values created through the building of Boulder Dam.

Since the lands proposed to be conveyed are appurtenant to a project of national importance, their ownership and administration should be retained by the Federal Government. The transfer of control over these lands to a non-Federal agency necessarily would open the door to uses which might be at variance with the national interest in the Boulder Dam-Lake Mead region. All of the people of the United States have a paramount interest in Boulder Dam and its related facilities for water conservation and utilization. Likewise they have a paramount interest in the outstanding recreational and scenic attractions of Lake Mead and the surrounding territory. The expenditure of Federal funds was the chief if not the only factor in producing these values, and the lands proposed to be conveyed are an integral part of them. In the light of these facts, I firmly believe the Boulder Dam-Lake Mead region in its entirety should continue to be administered uniformly by the Federal Government in the interest of the Nation as a whole.

The area from which the proposed grant would be carved is endowed with many features that appear to make it worthy of consideration as a possible national park or monument site. Independently of this, the area is one which has been definitely set apart for Federal purposes and which is actively being used for these purposes. Not only is the control of Lake Mead essential to the operation of Boulder Dam but also the recreational values of the region have attracted to the lake thousands of visitors from all parts of the Union. The recreational use of this area is truly national in character. A grant of the reserved lands would consequently set an undesirable precedent for the grant of other public lands already in actual utilization by the Federal Government, as well as for the grant

of lands which should be retained in Federal ownership because of their potential value to fill anticipated future needs. Were this grant to be made, involving as it does a region of national significance, the denial of other grants affecting lands reserved for national uses would be difficult.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 10, 1939.*

On August 10, 1939:

I am withholding my approval of S. 68, entitled "A bill for the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.," for the following reasons:

The purpose of this measure is to compensate the company in part for the value of a road constructed on Government property under a permit which has been revoked because of the inability of the company to complete its project.

Although the measure does not appear to be wholly devoid of merit, the facts cited in its support do not, in my opinion, import or establish any obligation on the Government to award compensation. No obligation would rest upon a private landowner under like circumstances.

To award compensation in this case would serve as a precedent in other cases involving much larger sums and would imply a moral obligation on the Government that might easily become embarrassing and very burdensome, if not a source of frequent scandal.

Furthermore, if the public interest was not sufficiently involved in the first place to move the Government to undertake such a project, the mere circumstances that private interests have attempted it and failed after making a valuable improvement on Government property is not sufficient reason to justify the expenditure from the public funds.

For these reasons I believe the practice of making compensation in such cases is improvident and unwise.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 10, 1939.*

I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill (S. 821) for the relief of Charles L. Kee, of Portsmouth, Va.

The bill proposes to provide for the payment of the sum of $9,000 to Charles L. Kee as a reimbursement for a loss that he sustained while demonstrating to representatives of the Navy Department a mine invented by him. It appears that during the demonstration the mine was lost at sea.

The purpose of the demonstration was to interest officials of the Navy Department in Mr. Kee's invention. His loss was not caused by any act or neglect on the part of any Government officer, but was apparently an unavoidable accident. At the time that it occurred no Government officer or employee was in control of the apparatus which disappeared at sea.

While it is to be regretted that Mr. Kee sustained this financial loss, no reason appears discernible why he should be compensated by the Government.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 10, 1939.*

I have withheld my approval of S. 2893, an act to provide for the local delivery rate on certain first-class mail matter. It is understood that the purpose of this bill is to apply the local 2-cent letter rate to the entire county of Queens, N. Y.

I withheld my approval of a similar bill, H. R. 2716, passed by the Seventy-fifth Congress, and set forth my reasons therefor in a memorandum dated June 25, 1938, reading as follows:

I have withheld my approval of H. R. 2716, an act to provide for the local delivery rate on certain first-class mail matter.

It is understood the purpose of this bill is to make the 2-cent letter rate apply within the entire county of Queens, N. Y. This county is now served by four separate and independent post offices, namely, Long Island City, Jamaica, Flushing, and Far Rockaway.

Under existing law the local rate on first-class matter applies only to such matter addressed for delivery within the postal district of the mailing office. To extend it to the matter addressed to postal districts of other offices would mark a departure from the long-established basis for the application of the local rate and constitute a precedent upon which other communities served by separate post offices would justly base requests for a similar concession. It would be difficult, if not wholly impracticable, to apply the local rate under the proposed bill, for it would be an almost hopeless task to educate the public with respect to the territory entitled to the local rate.

In addition to the foregoing objections, the extension of the local rate as proposed would result in a considerable loss in revenue. The purpose of the 3-cent rate is to provide additional revenue in order to balance the postal budget, and as long as the continuance of the 3-cent rate for nonlocal first-class matter is necessary, it is felt there should be no piecemeal legislation making exceptions to its application.

For the above reasons and because of adverse recommendation of the Post Office Department, I do not feel justified in approving this bill, but I hope that in a few years the growth of Queens County and the development of consolidated postal facilities will justify applying the same rates as now exists in Kings County.

My objections and observations respecting H. R. 2716, Seventy-fifth Congress, have equal application to this bill, S. 2893.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 10, 1939.*

On August 11, 1939:

I have withheld my approval of S. 839, "An act to amend the Retirement Act of April 23, 1904."

Briefly stated, this bill would extend the act of April 23, 1904, authorizing the advancement by one grade of certain officers of the United States Army who served in the Civil War to include those officers not above the grade of colonel who served in the War with Spain between April 21, 1898, and April 11, 1899, with provision that such advance in grade shall be without any additional pay above that of the grade held by them at the date of retirement. It also amends the act of April 23, 1904, to include cadet service, and officers retired after 30 years' service, including cadet service.

S. 839 would benefit a group of officers who are old enough to have served in the Spanish-American War, excluding those who entered military service after April 11, 1899, and served in later wars. It would also grant advanced rank on the retired list as a reward for war service, and thus utilize the retirement system of the Regular Establishment for a purpose for which it was not intended.

The act of June 21, 1930, advanced officers on the retired list to grades in which they actually rendered service in the World War. The retirement system has been designed and maintained primarily to promote the efficiency of the officers' corps, and its use for other purposes is deemed contrary to sound policy. While not unmindful of the services rendered by these officers during the Spanish-American War, it is felt that any exception to the policy should be made only for the accomplishment of some larger purpose of improving the efficiency of the active officers' corps.

In view of the foregoing I am unable to approve this measure.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1939.*

I have withheld my approval of S. 1042, an act for the relief of the Epes Transportation Corporation.

This bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Epes Transportation Corporation the sum of $6,537.95 in full satisfaction of all claims of such corporation against the United States, such sum (it is alleged) representing taxes (with interest and penalty) paid to the United States by such corporation on account of certain cigarettes and tobacco products which were withdrawn from bonded warehouse in Winston-Salem, N. C., by such corporation (it is alleged) for export to foreign consignees, but which were not exported due to the fact that such cigarettes and tobacco products were stolen from the trucks of such corporation en route to the intended exportation point.

The facts are that no such tax was paid by the Epes Transportation Corporation, nor did it withdraw the cigarettes and tobacco products for exportation. The cigarettes and tobacco products were in fact withdrawn without payment of tax by the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. from its factories for exportation and were delivered to the Epes Transportation Corporation, a common carrier, under contracts for transportation in its trucks to Norfolk, Va. During transit the trucks were hijacked and such cigarettes and tobacco products were stolen. As the products were not in fact exported, the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. paid the internal-revenue tax due on such products and through litigation it has been finally established that such tax was legally due. The transportation corporation, apparently because of its liability as a common carrier for hire, has reimbursed the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. for the amount of the tax and penalties paid by such company and now seeks reimbursement from the United States.

No evidence has been produced to show that the United States was in any way negligent in failing to prevent the theft or that it was in any way responsible for the failure to deliver the tobacco products to the port of exportation. Furthermore, no evidence has been produced to show that the transportation corporation has any just claim against the United States. I do not believe that under the circumstances of this case there is any justification for the use of Federal funds to reimburse the transportation corporation on account of its liability as a common carrier for hire and believe that to do so would establish a bad precedent.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1939.*

I have withheld my approval of S. 1164, a bill for the relief of Nadine Sanders.

It is the purpose of the bill to pay to Nadine Sanders the amount of $1,096.40 in settlement of her claim against the United States for damages sustained on account of personal injuries received on February 13, 1937, when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a Soil Conservation Service truck.

The record in this case shows that the expenses of the claimant by reason of this accident aggregated $96.40, and that she has no permanent injury other than the loss of two teeth, which were extracted and a bridge constructed to replace them. It appears, therefore, that the injury sustained does not justify the payment of the amount proposed by the bill.

I would not object to the enactment of a bill to pay the claimant an amount more commensurate with the injury sustained.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1939.*

I have withheld my approval of S. 1467, a bill for the relief of the Standard Oil Co., Inc., in Kentucky.

This bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the company out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $941.59, an amount alleged to be due by reason of error in making settlement for gasoline furnished the War Department under contract W-535-AC-8868, dated June 13, 1936. The price of the gasoline furnished under this contract was not to exceed the net (tax excluded) posted tank-wagon price on the dates of deliveries. The asserted error, clerical in nature, is said to be attributable to the fact that an entry was made in the company records of a reduction in the price of gasoline of the type called for in the contract when no reduction had in fact been made or authorized, the result being that the company billed the Government and received payment at less than the correct tank-wagon price.

The prices to be charged the Government under the contract were not a matter of public information but were peculiarly within the knowledge of the contractor. The invoices submitted by the company to cover the gasoline delivered were regular on their face, were certified as correct and just, and were paid under circumstances which led the Government to believe that the amounts shown thereon represented the entire sum due. Where invoices of this nature, prepared on the basis of price information which is peculiarly within the knowledge of the one making claim, are paid from public funds in good faith, the presumption arises that the payment completely liquidates the obligation. The granting of relief to a claimant who, after requesting and accepting payment in full satisfaction of an obligation on the basis of its own certified invoices, alleges in a self-serving statement not substantiated by any conclusive evidence in support thereof that due to the negligence or inadvertence of one of its employees the invoices and certifications were incorrect, would in my judgment be entirely unjustified and establish a dangerous precedent. Furthermore, there is no clear authority under existing law, statutory or general, for the allowance of claims of other claimants under such circumstances, and after consideration of the record in this case I am not convinced that there are here present such elements of equitable merit as would justify the according of preferential treatment to this claimant.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1939.*

I am withholding approval of the bill S. 1617, entitled "An act for the relief of John Nicholas Chicouras."

The bill proposes to legalize the entry into the United States for permanent residence as of November 25, 1925, of John Nicholas Chicouras.

The records show that the above-named alien, a citizen of Greece, resided in the United States from 1915 to 1923, when he departed for Greece. He reentered this country in 1925 as a seaman and remained unlawfully beyond the period of time for which he was temporarily admitted to pursue his calling as a seaman. He was naturalized in 1928, but his certificate of naturalization was canceled on July 7, 1938, because of false statements made under oath in his petition for naturalization. He was permitted and did voluntarily leave this country on December 16, 1938, for the purpose of obtaining a quota immigration visa and is not now in the United States.

I am withholding my approval of this bill because of my conviction that it represents an unjustified condonation of violations of law on the part of the proposed beneficiary, namely illegally remaining in the United States in 1925 beyond the period of his immigration permit at that time and perjury committed in connection with fraudulent securing of a certificate of naturalization in 1928.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1939.*

I have withheld approval of S. 1989, an act to provide for the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters of the United States, for the apportionment of the cost of such alterations between the United States and the owners of such bridges, and for other purposes.

The bill proposes to set up a new procedure whereby the United States would be required to bear a part of the cost of alterations or changes in bridges over navigable waters used and operated for the purpose of carrying railroad traffic, or both railroad and highway traffic, which are found to be necessary by the Secretary of War for free and unobstructed navigation. It provides that the Secretary of War shall determine in such cases the proportionate part of the total cost of alterations or changes to be borne by the bridge owner and by the United States. The bridge owner would be required to pay the cost of such part of the changes as may be attributable to the direct and special benefits which will accrue to him. The United States would be required to pay the remainder of the cost.

The General Bridge Act of March 3, 1906 (34 Stat. 84), authorizes the Secretary of War to require the alteration of any bridge which, in his opinion, may at any time unreasonably obstruct navigation, the cost of such alteration to be borne entirely by the owner. This has been a condition

precedent to the construction of bridges over the navigable waters of the United States, and the owners are fully apprized of the condition before the construction work is undertaken. The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that where a bridge is an unreasonable obstruction to navigation the removal of such obstruction may be required without compensation from the United States, and such removal cannot be regarded as a taking of private property within the meaning of the Constitution. To require the Federal Government to pay the cost of alterations which do not directly benefit the bridge owners would impose upon it heavy financial liabilities. It is the duty of the Government to preserve and protect the navigability of our navigable waters, and when any person, association, corporation, or other body is authorized to build a structure over any such stream, the United States should not be required to bear any part of the cost of alterations which are necessary to avoid obstructions to navigation.

I have, therefore, withheld my approval of the bill, as it does not appear that any valid reason exists for the assumption of this additional burden by the Federal Government.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1939.*

I am withholding my approval from the bill (S. 2061) for the relief of William Hillock.

Mr. Hillock was employed by the Office of Indian Affairs as a carpenter, in charge of a water and sewer system project at Pine Ridge, S. Dak. It appears that in the course of his employment he was required to perform 90 hours of overtime work, because quicksand was being encountered in the excavation. The bill proposes to recompense him in the sum of $90 for the services so rendered.

The policy of passing special legislation to compensate an individual employee of the Government for overtime services performed by him seems highly questionable. In view of the fact that Government employees frequently, in the course of the performance of their duties, either because so requested by their superiors or of their own accord, feel obliged to work overtime, no reason is perceived why a particular employee should receive special preferential treatment under such circumstances, and be awarded additional compensation not paid to others under parallel conditions.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1939.*

I am withholding my approval of S. 2271, a bill for the relief of Barnet Warren.

It is the purpose of the bill to pay to Barnet Warren the amount of $2,459.34 for medical services and hospital expenses, and the additional sum of $100 per month in an amount not to exceed $5,000 for permanent injury and pain and suffering, in settlement of his claim against the United States growing out of any damages or personal injuries suffered by him when a Civilian Conservation Corps truck operated by the National Park Service collided with the said Barnet Warren on March 17, 1939.

While some question might be raised as to the extent of the negligence of the driver of the Government truck, my principal objection to the bill is that the payments proposed appear to me to be excessive. I would not object to the enactment of a bill which would provide payments in this case of a more reasonable amount for expenses, and for an amount more commensurate with the injuries sustained.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1939.*

I have withheld my approval of S. 2306, a bill entitled "An act relating to the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between the towns of Decatur, Nebr., and Onawa, Iowa."

The bill would amend subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 29 of the act approved August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1072), to authorize the counties of Burt, Nebr., and Monona, Iowa, singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River between Decatur, Nebr., and Onawa, Iowa. Said counties would be authorized to charge tolls for transit over such bridge. Subsection (d) of section 29 of said act of August 30, 1935, provides that the rates of toll shall be so fixed as to yield a fund sufficient to meet maintenance, repair, and operation costs, and create a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of construction of such bridge and its approaches within not to exceed 20 years from the date of completion thereof. Subsection (d) also provides that after a sinking fund sufficient for its amortization, the bridge shall be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to yield an annual revenue sufficient only for maintenance, repair, and operation costs.

As drafted, the bill gives no assurance that the proposed bridge would be made free after the tolls shall have provided sufficient funds to amortize its cost of construction in addition to meeting the annual maintenance, repair, and operation costs during the toll period. I do not recall the enactment into law of any bridge bills in recent years that have not contained such an assurance; and it seems to me that this is a wise policy to follow.

I am, therefore, disapproving this bill in its present form and suggest that it be revised so as to require definitely that the bridge shall be maintained and operated free of tolls after recovery of the specified costs.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1939.*

I have withheld my approval of Senate Joint Resolution 139, "to authorize compacts or agreements between or among the States bordering on the Atlantic Ocean with respect to fishing in the territorial waters and the bays and inlets of the Atlantic Ocean on which such States border, and for other purposes."

This joint resolution is not in conformity with the usual and accepted method of granting the consent of the Congress to the execution of interstate compacts or agreements, in that it lacks a provision requiring the approval by the Congress of such compact or agreement as may be entered into before it shall become effective. I believe that it would be unwise to establish the policy of granting in advance the consent of the Congress to interstate compacts or agreements in connection with subjects described only in broad outline as in Senate Joint Resolution 139.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1939.*

CELEBRATION OF ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF WRITING OF THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER

Subsequent to final adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, the Vice President, pursuant to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 176) providing for participation by the United States in the celebration to be held at Fort McHenry on September 14, 1939, in celebration of the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the writing of The Star-Spangled Banner, approved August 5, 1939, appointed the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] members of the commission provided for to formulate and carry out plans for participation by the United States in the celebration above referred to.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received August 5 (legislative day of August 2), 1939

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Gordon G. Stimpson to be postmaster at Daphne, Ala., in place of G. G. Stimpson. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1939.

Jesse B. Robinson, Jr., to be postmaster at Waverly, Ala., in place of J. B. Robinson, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1939.

CALIFORNIA

Ada McIntire to be postmaster at Azusa, Calif., in place of Ada McIntire. Incumbent's commission expired July 24, 1939.

Thomas J. Durfee to be postmaster at Bieber, Calif., in place of T. J. Durfee. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1939.

Loyal E. Crosby to be postmaster at Del Rey, Calif., in place of L. E. Crosby. Incumbent's commission expired May 13, 1939.

Hazel M. McFarland to be postmaster at Folsom, Calif., in place of H. M. McFarland. Incumbent's commission expired March 19, 1939.

Denny J. McChristy to be postmaster at Imperial, Calif., in place of D. J. McChristy. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1939.

William T. Martin to be postmaster at Montague, Calif., in place of W. T. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired March 19, 1939.

Lela Opal Houghton to be postmaster at Newhall, Calif., in place of L. O. Houghton. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1939.

Walter A. Oxford to be postmaster at Orosi, Calif., in place of W. A. Oxford. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1939.

Ellis T. Tanner to be postmaster at San Jacinto, Calif., in place of E. T. Tanner. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1939.

COLORADO

George French Springston to be postmaster at Eaton, Colo., in place of French Springston. Incumbent's commission expires August 27, 1939.

GEORGIA

Charles E. Benns to be postmaster at Butler, Ga., in place of C. E. Benns. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1938.

ILLINOIS

Grace Hiller to be postmaster at Ogden, Ill., in place of Grace Hiller. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1939.

INDIANA

Audley Dildine to be postmaster at Gaston, Ind., in place of Audley Dildine. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1939.

Luther M. Shoemaker to be postmaster at Kewanna, Ind., in place of L. M. Shoemaker. Incumbent's commission expires August 27, 1939.

Reginald W. Cook to be postmaster at Montpelier, Ind., in place of R. W. Cook. Incumbent's commission expires August 27, 1939.

IOWA

Lynn O. Smith to be postmaster at Rockford, Iowa, in place of L. O. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 20, 1939.

KANSAS

Edward H. Malleis to be postmaster at Halstead, Kans., in place of E. H. Malleis. Incumbent's commission expires August 14, 1939.

Lindsey S. Haile to be postmaster at Howard, Kans., in place of L. S. Haile. Incumbent's commission expired July 19, 1939.

Albert W. Balzer to be postmaster at Inman, Kans., in place of A. W. Balzer. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1939.

KENTUCKY

Emily Bell Ison to be postmaster at Benham, Ky., in place of E. B. Ison. Incumbent's commission expires August 14, 1939.

Addie F. Owens to be postmaster at Russell Springs, Ky., in place of A. F. Owens. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1939.

Murray Swindler to be postmaster at Valley Station, Ky., in place of Murray Swindler. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1939.

Verna A. Applegate to be postmaster at West Point, Ky., in place of V. A. Applegate. Incumbent's commission expired July 18, 1939.

Joe C. Cantrell to be postmaster at Wheelwright, Ky., in place of J. C. Cantrell. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1939.

MAINE

Eugene E. Ross to be postmaster at Guilford, Maine, in place of E. E. Ross. Incumbent's commission expires August 13, 1939.

MASSACHUSETTS

Francis H. Nolan to be postmaster at Avon, Mass., in place of F. H. Nolan. Incumbent's commission expired July 18, 1939.

Leo B. Corcoran to be postmaster at Hudson, Mass., in place of L. B. Corcoran. Incumbent's commission expires August 26, 1939.

William H. Cabral to be postmaster at Provincetown, Mass., in place of W. H. Cabral. Incumbent's commission expires August 27, 1939.

William F. Ring to be postmaster at Sharon, Mass., in place of W. F. Ring. Incumbent's commission expired July 18, 1939.

Robert H. Howes to be postmaster at Southboro, Mass., in place of R. H. Howes. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1939.

Franklin F. Collins to be postmaster at South Yarmouth, Mass., in place of F. F. Collins. Incumbent's commission expired July 31, 1939.

MICHIGAN

Walter W. Webber to be postmaster at Caspian, Mich., in place of W. W. Webber. Incumbent's commission expires August 21, 1939.

Roscius G. Southworth to be postmaster at Galesburg, Mich., in place of R. G. Southworth. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1939.

H. Marr Byington to be postmaster at Grand Ledge, Mich., in place of H. M. Byington. Incumbent's commission expires August 21, 1939.

Jessie M. Stackhouse to be postmaster at Rochester, Mich., in place of J. M. Stackhouse. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1939.

MINNESOTA

Charles C. Young to be postmaster at Aitkin, Minn., in place of C. C. Young. Incumbent's commission expired July 11, 1939.

LeRoy M. Schwantz to be postmaster at Evansville, Minn., in place of L. M. Schwantz. Incumbent's commission expired March 12, 1939.

Arthur J. Suel to be postmaster at New Prague, Minn., in place of A. J. Suel. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1939.

Lloyd A. Hakes to be postmaster at Stewart, Minn., in place of L. A. Hakes. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1939.

Elizabeth A. McCormick to be postmaster at Wilmont, Minn., in place of E. A. McCormick. Incumbent's commission expires August 26, 1939.

MISSISSIPPI

David E. Nabors to be postmaster at Indianola, Miss., in place of D. R. Nabors. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1939.

Arthur V. Smith to be postmaster at Pascagoula, Miss., in place of A. V. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1939.

MISSOURI

Phillip S. Cohen to be postmaster at Fredericktown, Mo., in place of P. S. Cohen. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1939.

Henry F. Stapel to be postmaster at Rockport, Mo., in place of H. F. Stapel. Incumbent's commission expires August 26, 1939.

MONTANA

Ben Wholf to be postmaster at Opheim, Mont., in place of Ben Wholf. Incumbent's commission expired May 16, 1939.

NEBRASKA

Halford J. Mayes to be postmaster at Rushville, Nebr., in place of H. J. Mayes. Incumbent's commission expired August 1, 1939.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Hadley B. Worthen to be postmaster at Bristol, N. H., in place of H. B. Worthen. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1939.

William J. Neal to be postmaster at Meredith, N. H., in place of W. J. Neal. Incumbent's commission expired July 19, 1939.

NEW JERSEY

Charles F. Haussermann to be postmaster at South River, N. J., in place of C. F. Haussermann. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1939.

NEW MEXICO

Anna R. Scott to be postmaster at Logan, N. Mex., in place of A. R. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired April 23, 1939.

John C. Leonard to be postmaster at Raton, N. Mex., in place of J. C. Leonard. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1939.

Frank O. Papen to be postmaster at Tererro, N. Mex., in place of F. O. Papen. Incumbent's commission expired April 23, 1939.

NEW YORK

William L. Brown to be postmaster at Canisteo, N. Y., in place of W. L. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1939.

Mary F. Villamil to be postmaster at Florida, N. Y., in place of M. F. Villamil. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1939.

Leo P. Cass to be postmaster at Huntington Station, N. Y., in place of L. P. Cass. Incumbent's commission expires August 21, 1939.

Percy C. Tatem to be postmaster at Old Westbury, N. Y., in place of P. C. Tatem. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1939.

Fred Burns to be postmaster at Walden, N. Y., in place of Fred Burns. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1939.

NORTH CAROLINA

Alexander E. Waller to be postmaster at Fairbluff, N. C., in place of A. E. Waller. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

NORTH DAKOTA

Catherine F. Ross to be postmaster at Arthur, N. Dak., in place of Catherine Ross. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1939.

Carl F. Brandes to be postmaster at La Moure, N. Dak., in place of C. F. Brandes. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1939.

Edward M. Keller to be postmaster at Sherwood, N. Dak., in place of C. H. Budke, removed.

OHIO

Lee B. Milligan to be postmaster at Lowellville, Ohio, in place of L. B. Milligan. Incumbent's commission expired March 19, 1939.

OKLAHOMA

James H. Sellars, Jr., to be postmaster at Binger, Okla., in place of J. H. Sellars, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1939.

Frank J. Kamphaus to be postmaster at Canute, Okla., in place of F. J. Kamphaus. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1939.

William H. Mouser to be postmaster at Cheyenne, Okla., in place of W. H. Mouser. Incumbent's commission expires August 22, 1939.

Ralph M. Peach to be postmaster at Foss, Okla., in place of R. M. Peach. Incumbent's commission expires August 26, 1939.

Thomas F. Green to be postmaster at Meeker, Okla., in place of T. F. Green. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1939.

Alvin A. Powell to be postmaster at Ramona, Okla., in place of A. A. Powell. Incumbent's commission expires August 21, 1939.

Eugene P. Estes to be postmaster at Reydon, Okla., in place of E. P. Estes. Incumbent's commission expired July 26, 1939.

OREGON

Marcus A. Hill to be postmaster at Bay City, Oreg., in place of M. A. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired July 18, 1939.

PENNSYLVANIA

Charles A. Sieg to be postmaster at Newfoundland, Pa., in place of C. A. Sieg. Incumbent's commission expires August 27, 1939.

Adam D. Swartz to be postmaster at New Freedom, Pa., in place of A. D. Swartz. Incumbent's commission expired August 2, 1939.

Fred D. Weiss to be postmaster at New Tripoli, Pa., in place of F. D. Weiss. Incumbent's commission expires August 27, 1939.

Robert M. Graham to be postmaster at Newville, Pa., in place of R. M. Graham. Incumbent's commission expired July 3, 1939.

James E. Dereich to be postmaster at Perrysville, Pa., in place of J. E. Dereich. Incumbent's commission expires August 22, 1939.

Philip B. Thompson to be postmaster at Rutledge, Pa., in place of P. B. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expires August 22, 1939.

James S. Fennell to be postmaster at Salina, Pa., in place of J. S. Fennell. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1939.

Frederick A. Phoenix to be postmaster at Shinglehouse, Pa., in place of F. A. Phoenix. Incumbent's commission expires August 22, 1939.

Joseph M. Gilliland to be postmaster at Snow Shoe, Pa., in place of J. M. Gilliland. Incumbent's commission expired July 3, 1939.

Edmund P. Lawlor to be postmaster at Terrace, Pa., in place of E. P. Lawlor. Incumbent's commission expired July 22, 1939.

Lillie B. Atkin to be postmaster at Tidioute, Pa., in place of L. B. Atkin. Incumbent's commission expires August 22, 1939.

Ruth B. Walter to be postmaster at Unity, Pa., in place of R. B. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1939.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Olin J. Salley to be postmaster at Salley, S. C., in place of O. J. Salley. Incumbent's commission expired July 9, 1939.

DeWitt T. Latimer to be postmaster at West Columbia, S. C., in place of D. T. Latimer. Incumbent's commission expires August 6, 1939.

VIRGINIA

Florence E. Priest to be postmaster at Scottsburg, Va., in place of F. E. Priest. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1939.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 5 (legislative day of August 2), 1939.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

To be major

Clarence J. Chappell, Jr.

To be captain

James M. Masters, Jr.

To be first lieutenant

William F. Kramer

To be second lieutenants

Claude J. Carlson Jr.
Morris E. Flater

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

John D. Means, Boligee.
Frank A. Bryan, Columbia.
Gordon G. Stimpson, Daphne.
John T. Cooper, Hartselle.
Jesse B. Robinson, Jr., Waverly.

ARKANSAS

Robert E. Pace, Jr., Marked Tree.
Ralph McNiel, Piggott.

CALIFORNIA

Ada McIntire, Azusa.
Thomas J. Durfee, Bieber.
Loyal E. Crosby, Del Rey.
Josephine M. Costa, Downieville.
Hazel M. McFarland, Folsom.
Denny J. McChristy, Imperial.
Bessie L. Dunn, Isleton.
Clara M. Scott, Kerman.
Alice E. Tate, Lone Pine.
William T. Martin, Montague.
Lela Opal Houghton, Newhall.
Walter A. Oxford, Orosi.
Ellis T. Tanner, San Jacinto.

COLORADO

Faye P. Steffen, Bennett.
Floyd C. Bradfield, Cortez.
George French Springston, Eaton.
Anna May Durham, Mount Morrison.

CONNECTICUT

William K. Buggie, Cromwell.
William J. Collamore, Essex.
Francis L. Bibeault, Moosup.
Carlos C. Peck, Old Lyme.
Pauline I. Olie, Pequabuck.
Frank R. Stevens, Rowayton.
Robert A. Dunning, Thompson.
George H. Tetreault, Jr., Versailles.
Edward J. Bradley, West Willington.
Inez V. Lawson, Wilton.

FLORIDA

Mark L. Calder, Titusville.
Jesse E. Franklin, Glen Saint Mary.

GEORGIA

Charles E. Benns, Butler.
Blanche L. Marshall, Reynolds.

ILLINOIS

Benjamin H. Gardner, Ava.
John T. Lustig, Bradley.
Herschel Victor Lynn, Byron.
Robert L. Graham, Dieterich.
Earl Grimm, Fairview.
Helen E. Goodell, Loda.
Wayman R. Presley, Makanda.
Harry J. Young, Marissa.
Arden O. Murray, Mazon.
Howard M. Fox, Nashville.
John L. Anheuser, O'Fallon.
Grace Hiller, Ogden.
Pauline White, St. Joseph.
Otto F. Young, Stonington.
James F. Boyle, Sycamore.
George H. Widmayer, Virginia.

INDIANA

Noel A. Booher, Albany.
Clarence E. Steward, Bainbridge.
Reuben S. Stwalley, Cloverdale.
Earle C. Stewart, Daleville.
Robert R. Saunders, Eaton.
Merle F. Shepard, Edwardsport.
Audley Dildine, Gaston.
Luther M. Shoemaker, Kewanna.
Reginald W. Cook, Montpelier.
Orlin F. Reinhardt, New Salisbury.
Edward P. Donnar, Oaktown.
Rolla E. Pinaire, Ramsey.
Grover T. Van Ness, Summitville.

IOWA

Marjorie M. Sherman, Bancroft.
Mabel Kinney, Elliott.
William Stover, Hospers.
Sophia Hood, Mallard.
Joshia H. Clayton, Paullina.
Lynn O. Smith, Rockford.
John Hynek, Tama.
Clarence P. Lietsch, West Burlington.

KANSAS

John H. Eckhart, Almena.
Arthur E. Biberstein, Attica.
John H. Jessee, Axtell.
Elmer E. Howerton, Blue Mound.
Elsie J. Callahan, Burr Oak.
Lee A. Perry, Jr., Caldwell.
Ivan L. Farris, Cheney.
Harriet M. Mayo, Claflin.
Thomas Lloyd Lozier, Edna.
James Oscar Warren, Eskridge.
Clayton J. Connell, Fall River.
Max H. Dyck, Fowler.
John T. McGrath, Greenleaf.
William F. Varvel, Gridley.
John C. Patterson, Haddam.
Edward H. Malleis, Halstead.
John L. A. Wainscott, Hazelton.
N. Pearl Helvern, Hiawatha.
Lindsey S. Haile, Howard.
Mary E. McCreery, Hugoton.
Albert W. Balzer, Inman.
Orville K. McQueen, Kirwin.
Helen M. Collins, Lenexa.
Erwin E. Lewerenz, Lincolnville.
Donald L. McGregor, Linn.
Agnes L. O'Leary, Luray.
Henry W. Behrens, Lyndon.
Moses P. Davis, Madison.
Edward W. Shiney, McCracken.
Ernest W. McHenry, McLouth.
Joseph S. Dooty, Melvern.
Hubert A. Morain, Minneola.
Walter B. Ford, Oskaloosa.
Charles A. Mardick, Richmond.
James A. Wiley, Sedgwick.
Michael J. Baier, Shawnee.
Alfred L. Hastings, Thayer.
George F. Popkess, Toronto.
John H. Pennebaker, Virgil.
Charles P. Gates, Wakefield.
Robert E. Berner, Waterville.
Minnie J. Meidinger, Wathena.
Verne A. Miller, Weir.
John W. Vancil, White Water.

KENTUCKY

George W. Abbott, Bedford.
Emily Bell Ison, Benham.
Virginia L. Stigall, Burnside.
William H. Pettus, Crab Orchard.
Mary Rogers, Guthrie.
William R. Sizemore, Hyden.
Oscar D. Smith, Jamestown.
Harry Greene, Milburn.
Eugene Kelley, Pembroke.
Addie F. Owens, Russell Springs.
Victor B. Stephens, Stanton.
Murray Swindler, Valley Station.
Rolla M. Chafin, Weeksbury.

Verna A. Applegate, West Point.
Joe C. Cantrell, Wheelwright.
Thomas J. Stevenson, Winchester.

LOUISIANA

Harry G. Simoneaux, Golden Meadow.

MAINE

Raymond S. Joy, Addison.
Eugene E. Ross, Guilford.
John H. Gilbert, Monson.
Don Owen Cate, Richmond.
Donald P. George, Thomaston.

MARYLAND

Howard Raymond Hamilton, Cardiff.
Maude L. Shives, Hancock.

MASSACHUSETTS

George W. Seymour, Ashby.
Francis H. Nolan, Avon.
Alfred A. Averill, Edgartown.
Bartholomew C. Downing, Hanover.
Leo B. Corcoran, Hudson.
William H. Cabral, Provincetown.
William F. Ring, Sharon.
Robert H. Howes, Southboro.
Franklin F. Collins, South Yarmouth.
Helen K. Hoxie, Sunderland.
Enlo A. Perham, Tyngsboro.

MICHIGAN

Charles W. Holt, Athens.
William A. Young, Bellevue.
Walter W. Webber, Caspian.
Edward Kott, Center Line.
Roscius G. Southworth, Galesburg.
H. Marr Byington, Grand Ledge.
Frances A. Buerker, Pigeon.
Jessie M. Stackhouse, Rochester.
Glenn P. Adgate, Saranac.
Bert Shedd, Tekonsha.
Isla M. Messmore, Utica.
Olive E. Bergey, Vanderbilt.

MINNESOTA

Charles C. Young, Aitkin.
Harold E. Otterstein, Amboy.
Harriett M. Eleeson, Beaver Creek.
Percy L. Hakes, Brownton.
Nettie Layng, Bruno.
Mary E. Gilbert, Carlton.
Clifford Bergland, Clearbrook.
LeRoy M. Schwantz, Evansville.
Clyde H. Hiatt, Granada.
Carl Von Ohlen, Henning.
Alfred H. Smith, Heron Lake.
Ralph Michael Sheppard, Hoffman.
Oliver A. Matson, Kiester.
Hattie G. Haas, Lamberton.
William Pennar, Laporte.
Nels E. Fedson, Lyle.
Warren B. Lievan, Mapleton.
Arthur J. Suel, New Prague.
Mamie A. Sondergaard, New York Mills.
George H. Tome, Pine Island.
Linus E. Dougherty, Pine River.
Robert S. Cowie, Rothsay.
Wallace Oscar Merrill, Silver Lake.
Lloyd A. Hakes, Stewart.
Andrew C. Peterson, Waubun.
Elizabeth A. McCormick, Wilmont.

MISSISSIPPI

Samuel N. Shelton, Alcorn.
William M. Ferrell, Ashland.
Charlie J. Moore, Jr., Bentonia.
George D. Myers, Byhalia.
Shelton M. Thomas, Jr., Ellisville.
Martha B. Lowe, Glendora.
David E. Nabors, Indianola.
Luther H. Birdsong, Lulu.
Alfred H. Jones, McComb.
William O. Yeates, Moorhead.
John T. Miller, Myrtle.
Thomas J. Barnes, Noxapater.
Marie J. Sandlin, Parchman.
Arthur V. Smith, Pascagoula.
Abner W. Flurry, Perkinston.
Faye V. Peel, Potts Camp.
Ruby W. Bacon, Schlater.
Lellie M. Ferriss, Shaw.
John Auburn Bethany, Shuqualak
Henry E. Wamsley, State College.
Mrs. Tommie A. Hamill, Sturgis.
Blanche M. Sledge, Sunflower.
Augustus Ferdinand Fleck, Terry.
Curtis E. Morgan, University.
William W. Milner, Vaiden.
Will S. Black, Weir.
Oliver W. Catchings, Woodville.

MISSOURI

John E. Thomasson, Bolivar.
David Fitzwater, Creve Coeur.
Ella B. Newman, Desloge.
Carl E. Latimer, Frankford.
Phillip S. Cohen, Fredericktown.
Chester M. Eoff, Knox City.
Chester T. Hoover, Laclede.
Fred J. Jacobi, Jr., Martinsburg.
Henry F. Stapel, Rockport.
William E. Murphy, Sumner.

MONTANA

Ira G. Nichols, Alberton.
Charles C. Nicholson, Bigtimber.
Ben Wholf, Opheim.

NEBRASKA

Harold M. Knapp, Ansley.
Fred B. Householder, Bladen.
Henry A. Georgi, Dawson.
Julius J. Weidner, Humphrey.
Fred C. Johnson, Merriman.
Catherine Childs, Oakdale.
Mable A. Foreman, Palmyra.
Effie E. Adams, Ralston.
Halford J. Mayes, Rushville.
Justus H. LaMunyon, Shelby.
Christopher A. Weber, Spalding.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Earl X. Cutter, Antrim.
Hadley B. Worthen, Bristol.
William J. Neal, Meredith.
Caroline W. Southworth, North Haverhill.
David E. Stevens, Salem Depot.

NEW JERSEY

John J. Kelly, Allendale.
Whitehurst M. Carner, Livingston.
Theodore H. Reed, Pennington.
Charles F. Haussermann, South River.
Alger H. Alpaugh, Succasunna.
Monroe H. Bea, Westville.

NEW MEXICO

Margaret I. Daniels, Cloudcroft.
Anna R. Scott, Logan.
Bertha R. Yessler, Nara Vissa.
John C. Leonard, Raton.
Frank O. Papen, Tererro.

NEW YORK

Daniel Grant, Afton.
Joseph J. Wienand, Alden.
Joseph T. Norton, Allegany.

Lewis H. Sears, Ballston Lake.
Ruth M. Marleau, Big Moose.
Helen F. Hallahan, Brasher Falls.
William L. Brown, Canisteo.
Morgan Crapser, Central Bridge.
Howard L. Akin, Chautauqua.
Andrew R. Schmitt, Sr., Cheektowaga.
Chester A. Field, Cold Water.
Thomas J. McManus, Jr., Corfu.
Lee M. Meldrim, Edwards.
Sam Rosenberg, Fallsburgh.
Mary F. Villamil, Florida.
Harold F. Garrison, Fort Montgomery.
James E. Robinson, Hermon.
Edson S. Miller, Highland Mills.
James H. Mulligan, Hillburn.
Leo P. Cass, Huntington Station.
Clarence M. Magee, Kinderhook.
John Joseph Fox, King Ferry.
William R. Kraft, Kingston.
John G. Winans, Leeds.
Frances S. Murphy, Lisbon.
Della M. Rexford, Loch Sheldrake.
George S. Mackey, Locke.
Henry F. McCall, Madrid.
Ella M. Hickey, Mechanicville.
Robert S. Pearson, Newfield.
John S. VanKennen, Norfolk.
Harold E. Bollier, North Tonawanda.
Percy C. Tatem, Old Westbury.
Thomas J. Conmy, Port Jervis.
Eva W. Wheat, Rose Hill.
Cornelius Edward Conroy, Stanley.
Charles F. Pallister, Staten Island.
Walter Frank Baltes, Tonawanda.
Charlotte House Schoonmaker, Ulster Park.
Frank Piliere, Valley Cottage.
Anna Marriott, Vernon.
Fred Burns, Walden.
Charles Merton Stanton, Wellsburg.
Arthur E. Murphy, Youngstown.

NORTH CAROLINA

George M. Sudderth, Blowing Rock.
Thurla Cole, Cameron.
Joseph C. Peed, Creedmoor.
Alexander E. Waller, Fairbluff.
Joseph Tracy Moore, Greensboro.
Sarah Lucy Cooke, Hildebran.
Lula G. Harris, Macon.
John R. Steele, Ramseur.
Guy S. Crawford, Rowland.
George Glenn Nichols, Sparta.
Bertie L. Matthews, Vass.
Margaret W. Davis, Walnut Cove.

NORTH DAKOTA

Catherine F. Ross, Arthur.
Mildred Peck, Glenburn.
Levurn R. Church, Haynes.
Herbert J. Simon, Lakota.
Carl F. Brandes, La Moure.
Loren J. Savage, Litchville.
Jay J. Eaton, Medora.
Bland Elsberry, Rocklake.
Edward M. Keller, Sherwood.
Hulbert L. Olsen, Van Hook.
William S. McCabe, Walhalla.

OHIO

Edward Wild, Arcanum.
Florence M. DeChant, Avon Lake.
William H. Fike, Bloomville.
William L. Bryan, Bradner.
Charles J. Neff, Canfield.
Dwight C. Banbury, Danville.
Lloyd K. Heckman, Ellet.
Caleb Peter Motz, Fairlawn.
Olive R. Kast, Holloway.
Archie L. Wardeska, Irondale.
Leo A. Bietz, Kent.
Ernest A. Rowland, Lodi.
Lee B. Milligan, Lowellville.
Clifford Carlile, McClure.
Leo M. Keller, Nevada.
Florence Hunter, Rayland.
George R. Kinder, Rockford.
Elias Howard Barns, Sabina.
Isabel A. Downey, Somerset.
John I. Carr, South Charleston.
Fred G. Wetmore, Stow.
Agnes M. Goll, Stryker.
Parke Alden Wehr, Uniontown.
Albert S. Keechle, Waverly.
Earl I. Ducket, Walbridge.
Vance K. McVicker, West Salem.

OKLAHOMA

Mabelene M. Hudspeth, Afton.
James H. Sellars, Jr., Binger.
Frank J. Kamphaus, Canute.
William H. Mouser, Cheyenne.
Fred P. Morrison, Fittstown.
Ralph M. Peach, Foss.
Bryan D. Miller, Forgan.
Grover C. Diedrich, Marshall.
Thomas F. Green, Meeker.
James P. Todd, Oilton.
Alvin A. Powell, Ramona.
Eugene P. Estes, Reydon.
Loula Merry, Valliant.
Ulmer H. Still, Wright City.
Roy Broaddus, Wynona.

OREGON

Marcus A. Hill, Bay City.
Henry LeRoy Straley, Brownsville.
Myrtle L. Elliott, Canyonville.
Isaac R. Howard, Junction City.
Harry E. Mahoney, Oakland.
Pearl A. Lawson, Riddle.
George W. T. Doty, West Linn.

PENNSYLVANIA

John H. Baldwin, Atglen.
Henry N. Byers, Bolivar.
Harry L. Hause, Catawissa.
Reuben S. Lauer, Dover.
Francis A. Meehan, Dravosburg.
Edna M. Jacobs, East Berlin.
Wilmer G. Dimmig, East Greenville.
George V. Beech, East Pittsburgh.
John J. Botts, Elizabethville.
George M. Neely, Fairfield.
Charles V. Finley, Flourtown.
Stratton J. Koller, Glen Rock.
Edna M. Finney, Langeloth.
Grover C. Albright, Lansdale.
Agnes Ann Flynn, Laporte.
Charles H. Held, Loganton.
Royal H. Kline, McClure.
Edward F. Poist, McSherrystown.
William S. Bolinski, Mocanaqua.
Charles A. Sieg, Newfoundland.
Adam D. Swartz, New Freedom.
Fred D. Weiss, New Tripoli.
Robert M. Graham, Newville.
James E. Dereich, Perrysville.
Floyd E. Bashore, Port Royal.
Marie E. Potteiger, Progress.
Philip B. Thompson, Rutledge.
James S. Fennell, Salina.
Frederick A. Phoenix, Shinglehouse.
John Zelinski, Simpson.

Joseph M. Gilliland, Snow Shoe.
Kathryn McFadden, Summit Hill.
Edmund P. Lawlor, Terrace.
Lillie B. Atkin, Tidioute.
Ruth B. Walker, Unity.
James K. Bell, Warren.
John W. Doyle, Waymart.
Francis W. McCartan, Yatesboro.

RHODE ISLAND

William H. Seifert, Chepachet.
George W. Jenckes, Slatersville.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ernest G. Poston, Lake City.
Bessie T. Cooper, Mayesville.
George H. Fogle, Ridgeville.
Olin J. Salley, Salley.
DeWitt T. Latimer, West Columbia.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Perry W. Waltz, Brookings.
Frederick S. Countryman, Canova.

TENNESSEE

Rebecca J. Thomas, Alamo.
Maurice Wilson, Middleton.
James J. Darnell, Morrison.
Eugene L. McDade, Mountain City.
William T. Latham, Niota.
Zula A. Humphreys, Puryear.
James Hunt Morris, Ripley.
John L. Vann, Watertown.
Charles M. Haygood, Waverly.

TEXAS

Guy J. Harp, Canyon.
Conally Gwyn, Lott.

UTAH

Richard B. Porter, Ogden.
Howard Mattsson, Salina.

VIRGINIA

Frank R. Henderson, Nathalie.
Howard F. Gilliam, Phenix.
Florence E. Priest, Scottsburg.

WASHINGTON

Oscar N. Handel, Electric City.
Harry C. Smyth, Mabton.

WISCONSIN

James D. Purvis, Knapp.
Walter M. Touhey, Maribel.
Hartwig F. Breutzman, Nelson.
Earl P. Jamieson, Randolph.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, AUGUST 5, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, we rejoice that Thy Fatherly heart opens with love in response to all our needs. The whole fullness of Thine infinite being is at our disposal. May we ever render unto Thee the tribute of our heartfelt praise.

We are praying for our beloved country and for men everywhere. May health, happiness, and holiness be ours in an ever-increasing measure. May Thy special blessing rest upon our President, our Vice President, our Speaker, the Members of Congress, all the officials and servants of the Government. Grant unto them grace and strength to perform their duties with steadfast loyalty, and may they be abundantly enriched with the tokens of Thine everlasting favor.

When this Congress adjourns, may all receive Thy benediction, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant." We commend one another to Thy care and keeping. We know not what the future holds for us, but we will trust and not be afraid, for as our days so shall our strength be, and no good thing wilt Thou withhold from those who walk uprightly.

May the kingdoms of this world become the Kingdom of our Lord, in whose name we pray. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. R. 377. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of Harry Bryan and Alda Duffield Mullins, and others";

H. R. 5506. An act 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.;

H. R. 6099. An act for the relief of Mrs. S. F. Sewell; and

H. R. 7389. An act to provide for the presentation of a medal to Rev. Francis X. Quinn in recognition of his valor in saving the lives of two of his fellow citizens.

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

S. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution to amend Public Resolution No. 112, Seventy-fifth Congress; and

S. J. Res. 185. Joint resolution to authorize The Assistant Secretary of the Navy to continue to serve as Acting Secretary of the Navy until the appointment of a Secretary, and for other purposes.

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

H. R. 1648. An act to provide for the refund or credit of the internal-revenue tax paid on spirits lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the floods of 1936 and 1937 where such spirits were in the possession of the original taxpayer or rectifier for bottling or use in rectification under Government supervision as provided by law and regulations;

H. R. 5405. An act authorizing the installation of parking meters and other devices on the streets of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5685. An act to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to define, regulate, and license real-estate brokers, business-chance brokers, and real-estate salesmen; to create a Real Estate Commission in the District of Columbia; to protect the public against fraud in real-estate transactions; and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1937;

H. R. 5982. An act for the protection against unlawful use of the badge, medal, emblem, or other insignia of veterans' organizations incorporated by act of Congress, and providing penalties for the violation thereof; and

H. R. 7462. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1939, and June 30, 1940, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1042. An act for the relief of the Epes Transportation Corporation; and

S. 2240. An act to provide for a national census of housing.

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

S. 796. An act for the relief of Mato, Miljenko, Bozo, and Augustin Cibilic, or Zibilich;

S. 1269. An act for the relief of Emil Friedrich Dischleit;

S. 1538. An act for the relief of Konstantinos Dionysiou Antiohos (or Gus Pappas);

S. 1654. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pacios Pijuan;

S. 1708. An act to amend the Employers' Liability Act;

S. 1911. An act for the relief of Daumit Tannaus Saleah (Dave Thomas); and

S. 2271. An act for the relief of Barnet Warren.

REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP

The Speaker laid before the House the following communication which was read:

AUGUST 5, 1939.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law, of Hon. ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-sixth Congress, from the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Georgia, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. E. M. Owen, is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

By: H. NEWLIN MEGILL.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP, a Representative-elect from the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Georgia, appeared at the Bar of the House and took the oath of office.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 10, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the special committee to convey to the members of the American Association of State Highway Officials, an expression of appreciation by the Congress of the praiseworthy accomplishments under their leadership the following members of the House: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. WARREN, Mr. MOTT.

MERRIMAC-MONITOR COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provsions of House Concurrent Resolution 32, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Virginia (Merrimac)-Monitor Commission the following Members of the House: Mr. BLAND, Mr. DREWRY, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, it is usual for the majority and minority leaders to evaluate the work of the session of Congress over the radio. I ask unanimous consent that both these gentlemen be permitted to insert their radio addresses in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY, FIRST SESSION OF COURT

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 33 which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 33

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a joint committee consisting of five Members of the House of Representatives and five Members of the Senate shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, respectively, which is empowered to make plans and suitable arrangements for fitting and proper exercises, to be held on the 1st day of February 1940, in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the commencement of the first session of the Supreme Court of the United States, held at the city of New York on Monday, the 1st day of February 1790.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I understand that this resolution does not carry any appropriation or expenditure of money.

Mr. BLOOM. No appropriation at all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF NAVY TO SERVE AS ACTING SECRETARY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 185, to authorize The Assistant Secretary of the Navy to continue to serve as Acting Secretary of the Navy until the appointment of a Secretary, and for other purposes, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 180, Revised Statutes, The Assistant Secretary of the Navy may continue to serve as Acting Secretary of the Navy until such time as a Secretary of the Navy shall be appointed to succeed the late Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Claude A. Swanson, deceased; and the provisions of section 1761, Revised Statutes, shall not be applicable to an appointment to fill the existing vacancy in said office.

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

There was no objection.

The joint resolution 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.

REAL ESTATE COMMISSION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5685) to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to define, regulate, and license real-estate brokers, business-chance brokers, and real-estate salesmen; to create a Real Estate Commission in the District of Columbia; to protect the public against fraud in real-estate transactions; and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1937, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 3, line 9, strike out all after "estate" down to and including "purposes", in line 11.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

PARKING METERS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5405) authorizing the installation of parking meters and other devices on the streets of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and empowered, in their discretion, to secure and to install, at no expense to the said District, mechanical parking meters or devices on the streets, avenues, roads, highways, and other public spaces in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction and control of said Commissioners (in addition to those mechanical parking meters or devices installed pursuant to the authority conferred on the said Commissioners by section 11, page 40, Public 458, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, approved April 4, 1938); and said Commissioners are authorized and empowered to make and enforce rules and regulations for the control of the parking of vehicles on such streets, avenues, roads, highways, and other public spaces, and as an aid to such regulation and control of the parking of vehicles the Commissioners may prescribe fees for the privilege of parking vehicles where said meters or devices are installed.

"SEC. 2. In purchasing meters under the terms of this act, the Commissioners may purchase 50 percent of the manually operated type meter, subject, however, to specifications to be approved by the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce."

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

AMENDING HEALING ARTS PRACTICE ACT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2779) to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia, known as the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, and consider the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," known as the "Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928," approved February 27, 1929, be amended by striking from the first sentence of section 18 thereof the words "beginning on the second Monday in January and July of each year and at such other" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "at such."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

TAX ON MOTOR VEHICLE FUELS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2778), to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924, be amended by striking from the last sentence of section 10 thereof the word "thirty" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "sixty."

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

PREVENTION AND CONTROL OF SPREAD OF COMMUNICABLE AND PREVENTABLE DISEASES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2745) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and empowered to promulgate and enforce all such reasonable rules and regulations as they may deem necessary to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. The said Commissioners are authorized to prescribe a reasonable penalty of fine, not to exceed $100, or of imprisonment, not to exceed 30 days, or both, for the violation of any rule or regulation promulgated under the authority of this act, and all prosecutions for violations of such rules and regulations shall be in the police court of the District of Columbia in the name of the District of Columbia upon information filed by the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia or any of his assistants.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect from and after 90 days after its passage and approval, and from and after the expiration of said period the following acts are hereby repealed:

An act entitled "An act to prevent the spread of contagious diseases in the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1897 (29 Stat. 635);

An act entitled "An act for the prevention of scarlet fever, diphtheria, measles, whooping cough, chicken pox, epidemic cerebrospinal meningitis, and typhoid fever in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1907 (34 Stat. 889);

An act entitled "An act to provide for registration of all cases of tuberculosis in the District of Columbia, for free examination of sputum in suspected cases, and for preventing the spread of tuberculosis in said District," approved May 13, 1908 (35 Stat. 126); and

An act entitled "An act for the prevention of venereal diseases in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 26, 1925 (43 Stat. 1001).

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.

ADEQUACY AND USE OF PHOSPHATE RESOURCES

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 182), to amend Public Resolution No. 112, Seventy-fifth Congress.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will they complete their report by the 15th of January?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes. This will complete the report. We are still less than the funds originally authorized.

Mr. RICH. And we can expect that report back to the House by that time?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes. The report will be back to the House by that time.

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

Resolved, etc. That the study required to be made by the Joint Committee to Investigate the Adequacy and Use of the Phosphate Resources of the United States pursuant to Public Resolution No. 112, Seventy-fifth Congress, shall include potash and related minerals, and the life of the committee and the time for making its final report is extended to January 15, 1940.

The further expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent funds of the Senate and one-half from the contingent funds of the House of Representatives upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The Senate joint resolution 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

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, Mr. MALONEY, be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a small table dealing with cotton statistics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN NATIONAL PARK, KY., AND FORT M'HENRY NATIONAL PARK, MD.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2046) to change the designations of the Abraham Lincoln National Park, in the State of Kentucky, and the Fort McHenry National Park, in the State of Maryland.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Abraham Lincoln National Park, in the State of Kentucky, authorized by the act of July 17, 1916 (39 Stat. 385), and the Fort McHenry National Park, in the State of Maryland, authorized by the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1109), shall hereafter be called and known as the "Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park", and the "Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine", respectively, and all moneys heretofore or hereafter appropriated for these areas under previous designations may be used in these areas as redesignated.

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.

ATTORNEYS' FEES FROM OSAGE TRIBAL FUNDS

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4117) to provide for the payment of attorneys' fees from Osage tribal funds:

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4117) to provide for the payment of attorneys' fees from Osage tribal funds, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

WILL ROGERS,
JAS. F. O'CONNOR,
USHER L. BURDICK,
Managers on the part of the House.

ELMER THOMAS,
B. K. WHEELER,
HENRIK SHIPSTEAD,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4117) to provide for the payment of attorneys' fees from Osage tribal funds, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely: On page 2, line 2, delete the figures "10" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "12½."

In agreeing to the amendment of the Senate the managers on the part of the House are of the opinion that inasmuch as the Osage Indians have entered into a contract with attorneys to pay a fee not to exceed 12½ percent, contingent upon the amount recovered and which is recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, the said contingent fee should be allowed, further it is believed that without the allowance of the said 12½ percent contingent fee, the suits now pending for the recovery of large sums of money for the Indians may be prejudiced.

WILL ROGERS,
JAS. F. O'CONNOR,
USHER L. BURDICK,
Managers on part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RICH. As I understand it, you are going to increase the attorneys' fees which the Indians will have to pay from 10 to 12½ percent?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. I will say to the gentleman that the contract originally called for 12½ percent. When the bill came before our committee, in line with the regular attorney's fees, we thought it wise to make it 10 percent. So we amended the bill and made it 10 percent. When the bill went to the Senate, the Senate amended our bill and made it 12½ percent, to conform with the contract. The contract was made some time ago and was approved by the Secretary, and they have been working under the contract.

Mr. RICH. Are the Indians going to be compelled to pay this fee?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. It will come out of any moneys recovered for the Indians.

Mr. RICH. Provided they can get the money from the Federal Government?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Oh, no. It is out of the money recovered for the Indians out of suits that they have with the oil companies that have not paid them all we think is due the Indians. The money does not come from the Government.

Mr. RICH. Do you not think you are going to take pretty big attorneys' fees from the Indians when 10 percent ought to be enough for the attorneys for handling their claims?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. That is what I thought, but the Indians themselves have urged us to agree to this and let them go ahead.

Mr. RICH. Is it as much the Indians who are urging it as it is the lawyers back in Oklahoma?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. The Indians themselves. Members of the tribal council have been after us to get this bill through for them.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by placing a statement in the RECORD by my colleague, Mr. SAM MASSINGALE.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RELIEF OF UNDER-AGE WORLD WAR SAILORS AND MARINES

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5734) for the relief of World War sailors and marines who were discharged from the United States Navy or United States Marine Corps because of minority or misrepresentation of age.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. SUTPHIN. Gladly. During the World War many patriotic young men who had not reached the prescribed age of 17 years enlisted in our armed forces. Many of them were killed and others were maimed. When it was discovered that at the time of their enlistment they were under 17 years, according to the regulations they were declared to have fraudulently enlisted.

This bill is unanimously approved by the Secretary of the Navy. It does not cost the Government anything. About 2 years ago we passed a similar bill taking care of those who had served in the Army. This makes similar provision for those who served in the Marine Corps and the Navy.

The SPEAKER. 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 in the administration of law conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon honorably discharged sailors of the United States Navy and upon honorably discharged marines of the United States Marine Corps, their widows and dependent children, a sailor or marine who served as an enlisted man between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, both dates inclusive, and who was discharged for fraudulent enlistment on account of minority or misrepresentation of age, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the naval service on the date of his actual separation therefrom if his service otherwise was such as would have entitled him to an honorable discharge: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowance shall accrue by reason of the passage of this act: *Provided further*, That in all such cases the Navy Department shall, upon request, grant to such men, or their widows, a discharge certificate showing that the sailor or marine is held and considered to have been honorably discharged under the provisions of this act.

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.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the question of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania and Mr. MURDOCK of Utah asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of relief.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, and to include a letter in each one, one on the subject of the Chinese-Japanese situation, and the other on the subject of the poll tax.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TRANSPORTATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF MAILS ON MOTOR-VEHICLE ROUTES

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6424) to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this bill have the approval of the Post Office Committee?

Mr. BURCH. Yes; it has been considered by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and there is no objection.

The SPEAKER. 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 Postmaster General is authorized to contract for carrying the mails and railway postal clerks on routes between points where, in his judgment, the conditions justify the operation of such service in motor vehicles especially designed and equipped for the distribution of mail en route: *Provided*, That such vehicles shall be constructed, fitted up, maintained, and operated in accordance with such specifications, rules, and regulations as he may prescribe: *Provided further*, That the Postmaster General is authorized, within his discretion, to transport and provide for the distribution of mails in Government-owned motor vehicles on such routes between points where in his judgment the conditions justify the operation of such service: *Provided further*, That all laws and regulations governing Star Route Service, not in conflict with this act, shall be applicable to contracts made under the authority of this act: *And provided further*, That no contract shall be awarded for a period of less than 2 years nor in excess of 4 years, and that payment for such service shall be from the appropriations for inland transportation by star routes.

SEC. 2. The Postmaster General may, in his discretion, and in the interest of the Postal Service, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, provide for the distribution of mail on motor-vehicle routes in motor vehicles specially designed and equipped for that purpose and provided for in section 1 of this act: *Provided*, That the supervision and distribution of mails in motor-vehicle service, as herein provided, shall be under the jurisdiction of the Second Assistant Postmaster General, and the personnel therein shall be a part of the Railway Mail Service under the same working conditions, rates of pay, travel allowance, and other benefits applicable to railway postal clerks: *And provided further*, That payment for such service shall be from the appropriations for Railway Mail Service salaries and railway postal clerks' travel allowance.

SEC. 3. Every individual or company carrying the mails shall carry on any vehicle it operates and without extra charge therefor the persons in charge of the mails and when on duty and traveling to and from duty, and all duly accredited agents and officers of the Post Office Department and post-office inspectors while traveling on official business, upon the exhibition of their credentials.

SEC. 4. The Postmaster General is authorized to promulgate such specifications, rules, and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

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.

PROHIBITING UNLAWFUL USE OF VETERAN ORGANIZATION INSIGNIA

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5982) for the protection against unlawful use of the badge, medal, emblem, or other insignia of veterans' organizations incorporated by act of Congress, and providing penalties for the violation thereof, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after "the" down to and including "sold," in line 6, and insert "manufacture or sale in interstate commerce."

Page 1, line 7, after "thereof" insert "or the reproduction thereof for commercial purposes."

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the Senate amendments?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, the amendments placed in the bill by the Senate simply limit the application of this bill to transactions in interstate commerce. The bill relates entirely to the insignia of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans, and makes it unlawful to manufacture and sell them without the permission of the organizations. I ask merely that the House concur in the Senate amendments which limit the bill, and I think perhaps it is advisable to interstate transactions.

Mr. MICHENER. Otherwise the bill is the same as when it passed the House.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes. It was reported out by the Judiciary Committee and passed unanimously by the House.

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

Mr. CHANDLER. With pleasure.

Mr. WADSWORTH. According to the terms of this bill does it become a Federal offense if any person should wear one of these badges without authority?

Mr. CHANDLER. The bill provides simply against the manufacture or sale in interstate commerce of these insignia on caps, pennants, advertisements, and so forth, which are used at the conventions and hawked about, simply commercializing patriotic emblems.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does such manufacture beecome a Federal offense?

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This is the result of creating Federal corporations.

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope not.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. This bill has the endorsement of all the major veteran organizations.

Mr. CHANDLER. The gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. What the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] just said is very worth while taking into consideration; namely, it may be the outgrowth of these incorporations. I hope the Members of the House will refrain from offering bills providing for incorporation by Congress. We have a statute in the District of Columbia which can answer all purposes if anyone wants to form a national corporation. Twenty or thirty such bills are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary. Most of the members of the Judiciary Committee have indicated their opposition to these bills, because once we open the door we would have to open it wide, and we will have a plethora of these applications. That would be most disastrous.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope the acting chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary means what he says, and I hope that his courage will stay with him in the next Congress, because our committee has been reporting these bills favorably. I for one believe that the committee should adopt the policy which the Judiciary Committee did years ago, and which policy was adopted by the Senate committee, and was that we would report out no more Federal corporations unless the corporation was necessary for the functioning of the Government. Until we do that we are going to have a lot of trouble. These corporations want Federal charters for the prestige it gives. And then there is no agency of visitation. After a charter is granted the corporation can do about anything it desires, with no supervision or check-up.

Mr. CHANDLER. These veteran organizations, of course, were incorporated years ago. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan and have taken the same position he has taken on the Federal incorporation of institutions of one kind and another which could and should be incorporated under the laws of the various States or the District of Columbia. That is beside the question before us at the moment. I ask for concurrence in the Senate amendments.

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

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHANNON] objects to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CHANDLER]?

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I object because the longer we stay here the more we have to come back to Washington for law enforcement. Let these people incorporate in their respective States. It is a movement in a direction we have been fighting for centuries. Yesterday we went after the gambling problem on the ocean. This is a bad bill, and I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHANNON] objects to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CHANDLER].

REFUND OR CREDIT OF INTERNAL REVENUE TAX PAID ON SPIRITS LOST BY FLOODS OF 1936 AND 1937

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1648) to provide for the refund or credit of the internal-revenue tax paid on spirits lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the floods of 1936 and 1937 where such spirits were in possession of the original taxpayer or rectifier for bottling or use in rectification under Government supervision as provided by law and regulations, with a Senate amendment thereto and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 3, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 2. No tax shall be collected under title VIII or IX of the Social Security Act or under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act or the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, with respect to services rendered prior to January 1, 1940, in the employ of the owner or tenant of land, in salvaging timber on such land or clearing such land of brush and other debris left by a hurricane; and any such tax heretofore collected (including penalty and interest with respect thereto, if any), shall be refunded in accordance with the provisions of law applicable in the case of erroneous or illegal collection of the tax. No interest shall be allowed or paid on the amount of any such refund. No payment shall be made under title II of the Social Security Act with respect to such services rendered prior to January 1, 1940."

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the same bill we passed the other day having to do with spirits damaged in the recent floods?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is right.

Mr. RICH. What is the idea of bringing it back today?

Mr. DOUGHTON. There is a Senate amendment and I have asked to take the bill from the Speaker's desk, with the Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial on Argentine beef that appeared in a California newspaper.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include quotations from the views of the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee relative to tax and trade treaty legislation.

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

There was no objection.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

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. RICH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I call attention during the last minutes of this session of the Congress to the fact the Government is going in the red. We have gone in the red to the extent of $9,000 a minute since the 1st of July. I realize that the House has become economy minded during the last few days, and I want to congratulate the Members for their first real efforts to save the country from financial ruin of this New Deal administration.

Mr. Speaker, to you and to the majority leader and to the minority leader, may I say that you are all fine fellows, and I make the same statement with reference to every other Member of the House. [Applause.] I appreciate the things you will try to do from now on in being more economical in Government spending, and I hope you will take the advice that I have given you in being economical so that in the future we may save this country. I believe you will do it. I wish for each and every one of you a very, very happy vacation, and I hope that you will all come back here next January ready for whatever duties may be assigned to you, with a determination to do those things that are best for America and for our people, that we maintain our form of government, our liberty, and our happiness.

Mr. GEYER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GEYER of California. The gentleman forgot the "Merry Christmas" part of it.

Mr. RICH. Yes; I wish you all a merry Christmas, for it will be here and gone before we open again for business the first of the new year, 1940.

[Here the gavel fell.]

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE ROYAL C. JOHNSON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the neutrality bill in the Seventy-sixth Congress I heard the sentiment uttered on this floor that in the event of war those Members who voted for a declaration of war should be compelled to accept active service in the Military Establishment of the Nation. The proposal may appear most unusual. It might be even more unusual if Members of Congress resigned or voluntarily absented themselves from their legislative duties to serve in war. There have been such Members. Yesterday one of them was committed to the dust from whence he came. He was Royal C. Johnson, of South Dakota.

He was a man. On the broad prairies of South Dakota he was nurtured to ruggedness of mind, body, and spirit and retained that ruggedness throughout life.

In 1915, when he was but 33 years of age, the people of South Dakota elected him to Congress. Came the war. To Speaker Champ Clark he tendered his resignation that he might serve his country in uniform and that tender was refused. Unselfishly and with that kind of rugged fealty which Nature had builded into his spirit, he absented himself from these Halls and enlisted as a private. Here, then, we see a display of loyalty and unselfishness which marked him as one of Nature's noblemen. He served as a private, as a sergeant, and as a first lieutenant of infantry. He asked no more for himself than he would ask for the men in his command, sharing their joys and triumphs, their sorrows and dangers alike. At Mont Faucon he was wounded. There, under fire, he displayed that heroism and courage that marked his character in peace and in war. A grateful nation awarded him the Distinguished Service Cross and the French Republic bestowed upon him the Croix de Guerre with gold star.

When his bit for democracy had been done, he returned and was reelected to the Seventieth Congress. An unusual man, with unusual attributes. Yes; Royal Johnson was

unusual. He was an unusual man, an unusual soldier, an unusual Congressman. He has joined his comrades in the bivouac of the dead.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I was very much pleased to hear my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] pay a merited tribute to the worth and work of a deceased former Member with whom I had the pleasure of serving for many years and with whom I came in contact frequently after he returned from combatant military service abroad, he having resigned his seat in this honorable body to serve his country after voting against a declaration of war against Germany—Royal C. Johnson.

Mr. Johnson, a Republican, was courageous; he was honest; he was able and diligent, and he served his country and his people well upon battlefields and in legislative halls. His important achievements, most of which were nonpartisan, are his greatest assurance of perpetuity of grateful remembrance.

He rests from his labors. We grudge him not his rest. His beneficial works do follow him.

[Here the gavel fell.]

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, due to an inadvertence on yesterday, for which I cannot account, the bill (H. R. 6971) to allow the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to extend the period of amortization of home loans from 15 to 25 years was laid on the table. I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which this was done be vacated and that the bill be restored to the calendar in its proper place.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask what this request is?

The SPEAKER. It appears that, by some inadvertence, upon the suggestion of the Chair the wrong bill was laid upon the table. The gentleman from Alabama is asking unanimous consent that the proceedings by which that was done be vacated and the bill be restored to the calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS TO S. 1802

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks briefly at this point in the RECORD on legislation passed yesterday.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the RECORD show that the amendments which I offered yesterday to S. 1802 were offered only because that was necessary in order to obtain passage of the bill at this time. The bill as it came to us from the other body was the same as my bill (H. R. 6613), which had been favorably reported by the House committee, and naturally I would like to have had it approved without dropping any part of it. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], however, advised me during the session yesterday that he could not consent to the section and clause in the bill that suggested agreements for the transfer of funds from one department to another. He pointed out that he has consistently taken that position on other legislation as is well known in the House. His position was supported by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. We discussed the matter at considerable length. I pointed out the relative minor importance of this item in this particular bill, and the importance of securing action at this session. They felt, however, that their often-stated position on this matter prevented their permitting the legislation to go through by unanimous consent, which, of course, was the only method by which it could pass before Congress adjourns. Passage at this session is the only method by which estimates for Great Plains projects could be considered by the supply committees next winter. Otherwise they would go out on a point of order. In view of the great importance, then, of having the bill passed at this session I consulted with the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR], who was calling up the bill, and with others interested, and the amendments were agreed upon in order to secure the main objectives of the bill. The measure is of great importance to the people in our region, and the consideration of the Congress in approving it at this time is appreciated.

ILLINOIS' SHARE OF THE NATION'S DEBT

Mr. CHURCH. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain figures I have prepared myself.

Mr. SABATH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CHURCH. I will be glad to show this data to the gentleman. It is tabulations relating to certain counties of Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I will not object, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, if the farmers of the State of Illinois sold their farms and the improvements on them for the 1938 tax value, the total sale price would pay less than half of Illinois' share of the national debt.

Indeed, if all of the farm lands and improvements in the State of Illinois were sold for double the 1938 tax value, the money received would still not quite pay Illinois' share of the national debt. An additional $61,739,000 would have to be raised. The total 1938 tax value of Illinois' farm lands is $1,225,823,351. The Illinois share of the national debt is $2,513,384,814. These are the facts which my study reveals from tax figures published by the Illinois Tax Commission, and population figures from the United States Census Bureau.

The per capita share of the national debt for each individual in the Nation is $329.38. The population of Illinois under the latest census is 7,630,654. To realize the extent of the debt that the citizens of Illinois carry I have allocated that debt by counties. It reveals some astonishing facts.

Cook County itself offers a fair example. Cook County's share of the national debt is $1,311,631,673. All of the property—farm and urban—in Cook County is valued for tax purposes at but $1,699,245,030.

Other counties are not so well off when viewed in the light of these figures. They owe their shirts, so to speak, in an invisible mortgage—the Federal debt.

An outstanding example is Franklin County. This county is well populated, having 59,442 souls within its borders. Its share of the national debt, therefore, is $19,579,005. But, we find that, for tax purposes in 1938, the value of every bit of property—improvements and all—in the county was but $8,514,305. This means that the property owners of Franklin County would have to sell their holdings at three times the tax valuation to be able to pay their share of the national debt and still make a profit.

Other counties with a towering share of the debt to consider are Hamilton, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Massac, Pope, White, and Williamson. All would fare badly unless the sale price they got were two or three times the tax evaluation.

The 1938 tax value of all of the urban property and improvements in Illinois was just approximately equal to the State's share of the national debt. The property, on tax records, is worth $2,496,777,481—just short of the previously quoted national-debt figure.

Why, if every single piece of property in our State, farm and urban, improvements and all, were sold for twice the 1938 tax value—and that is surely a reasonable assumption for a reasonable deal—nearly 35 percent of that enormous total would have to be paid over to the Federal Government to settle Illinois' share of the national debt.

That is Federal Government spending of State funds with a vengeance. Is it any wonder then that the House of Representatives revolted at the thought of still another spending spree by the Federal Government?

What it amounts to for the State is that the New Deal has placed a 35-percent mortgage on all of the property in Illinois. We and our children will have to lift that mortgage. We can only pray that the loose spenders have at last been ousted from our temples and that we can keep them out.

Illinois' share of the national debt

Counties	Population (latest census)[1]	1938 tax value of all real estate[2]	County share of national debt[3]	Percentage of real-estate value
Adams	62,784	$43,430,040	$20,679,793.92	48
Alexander	22,542	8,306,765	7,424,883.96	89
Bond	14,406	7,895,605	4,745,048.28	60
Boone	15,078	13,983,488	4,966,391.64	35
Brown	7,892	5,825,780	2,599,466.96	45
Bureau	38,845	20,482,135	12,794,766.10	62
Calhoun	8,034	4,750,720	2,646,238.92	56
Carroll	18,433	13,478,775	6,071,461.54	45
Cass	16,537	10,998,890	5,446,957.06	50
Champaign	64,273	43,673,760	21,170,240.74	48
Christian	37,538	25,072,005	12,364,266.44	49
Clark	17,872	6,684,715	5,886,679.36	88
Clay	16,155	5,817,500	5,321,133.90	91
Clinton	21,369	10,979,695	7,038,521.22	64
Coles	37,315	16,277,040	12,290,814.70	75
Cook	3,982,123	1,699,245,030	1,311,631,673.74	77
Crawford	21,085	7,846,905	6,944,977.30	88
Cumberland	10,419	3,244,377	3,431,810.22	106
De Kalb	32,644	28,334,150	10,752,280.72	38
De Witt	18,598	13,253,770	6,125,809.24	46
Douglas	17,914	14,334,990	5,900,513.32	41
Du Page	91,998	52,382,745	30,302,301.24	58
Edgar	24,966	16,572,809	8,223,301.08	50
Edwards	8,303	3,548,650	2,734,842.14	77
Effingham	19,013	12,024,535	6,262,501.94	52
Fayette	23,487	8,246,270	7,736,148.06	94
Ford	15,489	14,620,185	5,101,766.82	35
Franklin	59,442	8,514,305	19,579,005.96	230
Fulton	43,983	26,630,570	14,487,120.54	54
Gallatin	10,091	3,472,522	3,323,773.58	96
Greene	20,417	12,215,900	6,724,951.46	55
Grundy	18,678	13,011,280	6,152,159.64	47
Hamilton	12,995	2,768,340	4,280,293.10	155
Hancock	26,420	21,742,599	8,702,219.60	40
Hardin	6,955	2,281,128	2,290,837.90	100
Henderson	8,778	8,818,208	2,891,297.64	33
Henry	43,851	35,965,610	14,443,642.38	40
Iroquois	32,913	32,835,716	10,840,883.94	33
Jackson	35,680	8,448,241	11,752,278.40	139
Jasper	12,809	4,672,035	4,219,028.42	90
Jefferson	31,034	8,023,655	10,221,978.92	127
Jersey	12,556	7,885,965	4,135,695.28	52
Jo Daviess	20,235	13,925,870	6,665,004.30	48
Johnson	10,203	2,482,629	3,360,664.14	135
Kane	125,237	63,539,604	41,250,563.06	65
Kankakee	50,095	23,104,285	16,500,291.10	71
Kendall	10,555	10,211,780	3,476,605.90	34
Knox	51,336	41,564,095	16,909,051.68	41
Lake	104,387	66,744,175	34,382,990.06	51
La Salle	97,695	61,979,455	32,178,779.10	52
Lawrence	21,885	6,380,945	7,208,481.30	113
Lee	32,329	26,381,335	10,648,526.02	40
Livingston	39,092	33,310,350	12,876,122.96	39
Logan	28,863	26,729,480	9,506,894.94	35
Macon	81,731	45,352,060	26,920,556.78	59
Macoupin	48,703	15,436,258	16,041,794.14	104
Madison	143,830	54,430,155	47,374,725.40	87
Marion	35,635	12,354,805	11,737,456.30	95
Marshall	13,023	11,539,475	4,289,515.74	37
Mason	15,115	13,284,580	4,978,578.70	37
Massac	14,081	3,886,275	4,637,999.78	119
McDonough	27,329	20,181,329	9,001,626.02	45
McHenry	35,079	27,676,205	11,554,321.02	42
McLean	73,117	51,804,210	24,083,277.46	46
Menar	10,575	10,867,165	3,483,193.50	32
Mercer	16,641	14,547,475	5,481,212.58	38
Monroe	12,369	10,251,180	4,074,101.22	40
Montgomery	35,278	15,951,224	11,619,867.64	73
Morgan	34,240	25,625,045	11,277,971.20	44
Moultrie	13,247	10,691,860	4,363,296.86	41
Ogle	28,118	24,362,870	9,261,506.84	38
Peoria	141,344	79,875,450	46,555,886.72	58
Perry	22,767	10,493,135	7,498,994.46	71
Piatt	15,588	15,357,390	5,134,375.44	33
Pike	24,357	9,327,175	8,022,708.66	86
Pope	7,996	1,874,595	2,633,722.48	140
Pulaski	14,834	4,420,080	4,886,022.92	110
Putnam	5,235	3,516,390	1,724,304.30	49
Randolph	29,313	11,547,090	9,655,115.94	84
Richland	14,053	6,233,965	4,628,777.14	74
Rock Island	98,191	48,669,030	32,342,151.58	66
Saline	37,100	6,452,570	12,219,998.00	189
Sangamon	111,733	65,169,255	36,802,615.54	56
Schuyler	11,676	7,027,844	3,845,840.88	55
Scott	8,539	6,761,415	2,812,575.82	42
Shelby	25,471	15,567,334	8,389,637.98	54
Stark	9,184	10,002,630	3,025,025.92	30
St. Clair	157,775	65,299,045	51,967,929.50	79
Stephenson	40,064	27,714,380	13,196,280.32	48
Tazewell	46,082	30,881,880	15,178,489.16	49
Union	19,883	6,044,971	6,549,062.54	108
Vermillion	89,339	43,451,951	29,426,479.82	68
Wabash	13,197	5,309,505	4,346,827.86	82
Warren	21,745	17,265,870	7,162,368.10	41
Washington	16,286	9,895,875	5,364,282.68	54

[1] Census of 1930: U. S. Bureau of the Census.
[2] Illinois State Tax Commission.
[3] Gross national debt as of June 30, 1939: Daily Treasury Statement.

Illinois' share of the national debt—Continued

Counties	Population (latest census)	1938 tax value of all real estate	County share of national debt	Percentage of real-estate value
Wayne	19,130	$6,470,984	$6,301,039.40	97
White	18,149	4,186,135	5,977,917.62	143
Whiteside	39,019	26,384,519	12,852,078.22	49
Will	110,732	47,365,127	36,472,906.16	77
Williamson	53,880	10,294,310	17,746,994.40	172
Winnebago	117,373	53,518,825	38,660,318.74	72
Woodford	18,792	17,029,430	6,189,708.96	36
Total for State	7,630,654	3,722,600,832	2,513,384,814.52	68

Computed by multiplying the per capita gross national debt ($329.38) by population of each county.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, and to include therein an editorial from the Wheeling Intelligencer and an article from the Washington Post.

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

There was no objection.

CLOSED SHOP APPLIED TO CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, for more than 2 years, and until the Supreme Court declared the sit-down strikes illegal, on this floor, and wherever opportunity offered, it has been my privilege to condemn the sit-down strikes. During the same period duty and conscience forced a like condemnation of the coercion, intimidation, and violence through which John L. Lewis and his C. I. O., aided by the Communists, have endeavored to establish the power of Lewis to compel every employer to hire only members of the C. I. O.; to force every worker to join that organization and pay tribute to it or to lose his job, or to be denied a job if opportunity offered.

Either because of campaign contributions, which, from the United Mine Workers amounted to more than $470,000 and from similar organizations to more than $1,700,000, or for political or other reasons the administration, through the activities of the Senate Civil Liberties Committee, has backed Lewis in his war against employers in his attempt to establish a dictatorship over all labor.

At the last session of Congress when legislation in which he was interested was pending, Lewis invaded the Speaker's private office and from it conducted his lobbying activities.

Yesterday the administration made two payments on the political debt which it owed Lewis for his campaign contributions. In the Senate it gave the LA FOLLETTE so-called Civil Liberties Committee, whose reports show a vicious persecution of employers, are of invaluable aid to Lewis in his organizing campaign against employers and workers, another $50,000—it has already had more than $100,000—to smear farmers organizing in California.

In the House Lewis and the C. I. O. decreed that I should be barred from membership on the committee charged with investigating the activities of the N. L. R. B., although Republicans are entitled to two members on that committee. It has been my duty and privilege on many occasions to bring to the attention of the House facts showing the prejudice and the bias of the N. L. R. B. and the need for amendment of the Wagner law.

Such action in the interest of the C. I. O. on the part of the New Dealers, is recognition at least of whatever small part I may have played in voicing on the floor of Congress those self-evident truths which have been recognized by 80 percent of our people as being vitally necessary to be observed if our liberty is to be preserved.

If my days be prolonged to the next session of Congress, attention will again be directed to the necessity of amending the N. L. R. A.; of curbing the activities of the Senate Civil Liberties Committee; of deflating John L. Lewis; of exposing

the true force behind the C. I. O., and of compelling it to give an accounting of the millions which it has collected from the men who toil.

Permit me to thank you for your kindly consideration, for the good will which so many have shown, and to wish you all, health, happiness, and prosperity, until we meet again in January of 1940.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALL, Mr. BOLLES, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. MILLER asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by inserting therein a letter and an article regarding the bill I have introduced known as H. R. 6827.

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

There was no objection.

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PITTENGER. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a resolution of the Village Council of the village of Gilbert, Minn.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, during this session of Congress one of the big problems has been the relief problem. On February 4, Public Resolution No. 1 became a law. That was a relief measure. It was a measure appropriating money to be expended for the benefit of the unemployed of this country, and for the W. P. A.

Under date of June 30, 1939, the relief program was adopted for the year ending July 1, 1940. That is a measure by which the Congress appropriates money for additional work and relief for the unemployed. It has many features. It provides for the National Youth Administration, and lays down for W. P. A. new rules and regulations which were adopted under the direction of the administration leadership of this House. I believe some changes ought to be made in this law. I believe that greater latitude ought to be given to the Work Projects Administrator in the administration of the law. I believe it is going to be one of the mistakes of the administration leaders in this Congress if some of the necessary changes are not brought about.

It is a significant fact, Mr. Speaker, that after 6 years of experiment we have more unemployment in this country than ever before, and during all this time the Congress of the United States at the request of the administration has been appropriating money for relief and for unemployment purposes. I have supported these unemployment relief measures, and have supported efforts to increase the amount of the appropriations. I think adequate funds should be provided for work projects until private industry can furnish additional jobs. Now, what is the history of the present law under which W. P. A. operates? Briefly, it is correct to say that the present administration has sufficient votes to write the laws it wants.

So, Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1939, President Roosevelt approved this work-relief bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940. This new law is known as Public Resolution No. 24.

Col. F. C. Harrington, the Works Progress Administrator and the representative of President Roosevelt, appeared before the House Appropriations Committee and recommended certain changes in the W. P. A. law. One of those changes had to do with the number of hours per month which W. P. A. employees are required to work. With the recommendation of Colonel Harrington, Congressman WOODRUM of Virginia and administration leaders had the proviso written into the new legislation so that W. P. A. employees work 130 hours per month without additional compensation. In other words, the prevailing wage scale was abandoned and a new wage scale adopted.

This new legislation also contained the requirement that W. P. A. employees who have worked 18 continuous months are to be given a 30-day furlough and other people to take their places. There are also other changes in this legislation, all of which met with the approval of the administration.

Since the passage of this act I have received a great amount of correspondence protesting against these features which I have just described and suggesting that the prevailing wage standard be restored and also that the 30-day furlough proviso be eliminated from the law.

Numerous municipalities and organizations have expressed their views to me. I set forth the following resolution adopted by the village of Gilbert, from my district, and transmitted by the village clerk, Frank J. Indihar.

The resolution reads:

Whereas the hours of labor under W. P. A. have been lengthened by Congress, resulting in a smaller compensation per hour for W. P. A. employees, which force W. P. A. labor compensation per hour to a smaller rate than private industry pays; and

Whereas Congress has provided that all relief workers, excepting veterans, who have been continuously employed for more than 18 months, shall be removed from employment for at least 30 days and until recertified for restoration to employment; and

Whereas the above provisions of the Federal law are deemed inexpedient and unfair, and will result in much suffering in many cases: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the village council of the village of Gilbert, Minn., That a protest be sent to the Minnesota Senators, Congressman PITTENGER, and Governor Stassen, requesting them to exert their influence to repeal such legislation.

MIKE KOHLER,
President of the Village of Gilbert.

Attest:

FRANK J. INDIHAR,
Clerk of the Village of Gilbert.

Upon motion made by Clerk Indihar, supported by Trustee Schweiger, the foregoing village resolution was passed and declared adopted this 12th day of July 1939, upon the following vote: Ayes, President Kohler, Trustees Schweiger, Kraker, and Potocnik, and Clerk Indihar; nays, none.

I could call the attention of the House of Representatives to many other resolutions of similar character from other sections of the district. All of them indicate that a change in the law is desired and that there should be more authority given to the Administrator in handling relief-work programs so as to avoid hardships. I believe in the prevailing wage standard, and it is my opinion that before Congress adjourns we should give attention to the section of the act which abolishes the prevailing wage standard. That prevailing wage standard should be restored.

It is my opinion that the administration did not fully realize the hardships that would result from the 30-day furloughs, and I believe the law regarding those furloughs should be changed so that the W. P. A. administrators would have authority to waive that requirement in connection with cases entitled to such consideration. I do not believe Congress should adjourn until these matters are taken care of, and if the House leaders give an opportunity it is my purpose to support such legislation at this time.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, action by the Commissioners for the District of Columbia in refusing to sustain rulings and regulations laid down by the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board is creating a distasteful and unfortunate situation, and unless this is remedied I can foresee a general break-down in the enforcement of the liquor-control act and many changes in the law before the end of the next session of Congress.

I have no desire to impose upon the time of the House today but I believe the situation, for which I feel the District

Commissioners are responsible, is of sufficient importance to justify the brief period I have requested.

Refusal by the Commissioners to uphold rulings of the A. B. C. Board is creating a feeling of contempt on the part of the dealers for any regulations the Board may make and as a result little care is being taken to ascertain the ages of purchasers, and sales are being made to intoxicated persons.

Two cases in which the District Commissioners refused to sustain the suspension of licenses of violators of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act have been called to my attention and I have in my possession transcripts of the hearings in both of these cases. The first case is one in which the permit of a holder of a class C license was revoked for selling alcoholic beverages to an intoxicated 15-year-old girl. The decision in this case was changed by the District Commissioners to a suspension of 4 months, despite the fact that the report of the Commissioners stated that the A. B. C. Board was fully justified in the decision it had rendered.

The second case was that of a class A license holder whose permit was suspended for 60 days for selling liquor to an intoxicated minor. This decision was changed to a 5-day suspension, despite the fact that the report of the Commissioners stated that the action of the Board had been "fully justified."

Mr. Speaker, I have a high regard for the members of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board in the District of Columbia. The three members of that Board are conscientious and are cooperating with each other in an effort to do a good job, so far as the enforcement of the Liquor Control Act is concerned. It is my belief that this Board should have the support and cooperation of the District Commissioners, but it is apparent that their efforts to do a good job are now being hamstrung.

My purpose in making this statement today is to serve notice on the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that unless the efforts and decisions of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board are sustained, steps will be taken by Congress during the next session to take from the Commissioners the power to review the Board's decisions. In my opinion, these decisions should be reviewed by the courts.

I might add that efforts must be made to abolish the use of glaring electric signs, cut-rate advertising, and other methods of inducing citizens to purchase liquor. Glaring electric signs to advertise liquor in front of stores and restaurants and the advertising of cut-rate prices in newspapers is against public policy and should be stopped, and unless license holders themselves correct this situation, I predict that the District of Columbia will see Government-operated stores before many months. The licensees of the District will have only themselves to blame if Government-controlled stores materialize. I trust when the Congress returns next January we will see the present situation remedied.

THE NATIONAL DEBT AND THE PRODUCTION OF WEALTH

Mr. VOORHIS of California. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, a nation or a person can only overcome debt by increasing the production of wealth, and in the case of a nation by bringing about an increase in values of property or commodities.

The main and underlying purpose of the lending and housing bills, which the House recently turned down, was to increase the demand for goods and services in the country by increasing the volume of money in circulation so people would go back to work and recovery be stimulated; but this Congress turned down both of those measures and, in addition, provided for the laying off of 1,000,000 W. P. A. workers. This, I fear, may lead to another recession, and certainly it is going to cause severe hardship on many, many people. But this Congress also defeated an attempt to deprive the President of his power to issue $3,000,000,000 of currency, if he deemed it necessary. These powers were given the President to be used in just such an emergency as the recent action of Congress may lead to. I hope that the President will utilize this power in order to issue this debt-free money, to put it in circulation, to stimulate employment and recovery. I hope this may be the first step toward an honest, constitutional monetary system.

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. STEAGALL. I want to ask the gentleman if he is not slightly in error in using the word "defeated"? Those measures were postponed.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman. I should have said that the House had refused consideration for the time being of these meritorious measures, and I am convinced that had the gentleman from Alabama had 5 more minutes to address the House when we were considering the rule for the housing bill it would not only have been considered, but the bill would have been passed on that occasion. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 1 minute, and I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may follow the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with the National Resources Committee report having to do with the rehabilitation problem in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan, and to include in my extension a communication or resolution from Eveleth, Minn.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix a letter from Hon. E. E. Browne and a report of the Wisconsin W. P. A. on conservation work in Wisconsin as submitted by the Honorable E. E. Browne, who, for 18 years, was a Member of this body.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a little over the 2½-page limitation, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be included notwithstanding that fact.

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

There was no objection.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION EMPLOYMENT

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I shall take a very short time to call attention to an error which we made when we passed the relief bill, especially one that I am sure is going to plague every one of us when we get home. I refer to the provision that compels a 30-day compulsory lay-off, regardless of the need of the people. I am just commencing to find that out. I opposed that provision, and I also opposed the emasculation of the prevailing wage-rate provision. I hope that we can restore both of these, but the former provision could be restored very easily by a simple joint resolution.

We are about to adjourn the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress. In looking back over the past 7 months of the session I do not feel very proud of our accomplishments. We have authorized expenditures of more money than any previous Congress, but that increase is not for those unfortunates unable to find a private job.

There is altogether too much stress laid on the fact that war is imminent and that we must be prepared. I agree that other parts of the world are in a turmoil and that actual war has been and is now in progress across the sea, but I cannot see why we must get hysterical about that in this country if we remain neutral and treat them all alike and show no special favors to any of them. I really cannot see how any nation, or combination of them, can possibly even think of attacking us in the near future. They have their hands full at home and are bankrupting themselves to prepare to either attack or be attacked by one of their neighbors.

I honestly feel that we should devote much more of our time to solving our own internal problem, because I feel that to be decidedly much more important. We have passed several bills aimed at suppressing subversive influence and aimed at preventing the spread of communism and other isms. I do not believe that any country has ever successfully legislated loyalty into their people. I know that it would be difficult to convert very many Americans to communism if there were plenty of jobs available which would provide an American standard of living. But under present conditions it is very easy to gain such converts to un-American organizations when thousands are being dispossessed of their homes and when they see their families in need and want through no fault of their own.

I believe that it would be a better policy for Congress to turn its attention away from the war-crazy nations and divert part of the huge sums of extra war preparation appropriations that we made this year toward saving cherished homes and assisting in providing a means of livelihood for the millions of destitute American citizens. Most of these foreign isms will become insignificant and starve for lack of support when we can assure gainful jobs to the millions now on W. P. A., and security for the farmer and homeowner.

I am afraid that we made a terrible mistake by writing into law the compulsory 30-day lay-off after being on W. P. A. for 18 months or more. There are thousands in my district who absolutely have had no possible chance of finding private employment during the last several years. A great many of those who must be laid off now are heads of families with several children. The pay in my rural district is around $40 per month.

Does any one of us believe that a man with a family to support could have laid up money so that he could take at least a 60-day payless vacation? I say at least 60 days because if and when they are again certified as being in need after the 30-day period they will have to wait until there is an opening, and in many cases it may be even longer than 60 days. Why, for the sake of humanity, we did not retain the amendment that the House adopted which would have exempt the heads of families and those over 45 years of age is hard to understand. That should absolutely be corrected by a simple resolution before we adjourn. The Administrator has no alternative; he must enforce it; but we can remedy that unfair provision in a few minutes if the majority want to do it. I was opposed to this, as well as the prevailing-wage elimination, and voted to change them both. I voted for a much larger appropriation, which I feel certain will have to be made in January. But, for the sake of humanity, let us at least allow the heads of families to continue on W. P. A. and let us reinstate the prevailing-wage provision before we adjourn.

I wish to read only one letter, which is similar to dozens I have thus far received, which shows how unfair we have been. I have a number of letters from widows who support from two to six children by being employed on sewing projects and earning less than $40 per month. They have received their 403's because they were on there 18 months. They will have to depend on local charity, and it will be difficult to put them on later, because the places will be filled, perhaps with single persons. The following is a sample of what we are doing to some of these unfortunate people:

DEAR MR. GEHRMANN: I was given a 403 on the W. P. A. on the account of being on the job 18 months. Now it is going to be impossible for me to live and try and send my four children to school without a job. I am a railroad laborer but didn't work any since July 31, 1937. There are six children in my family, besides myself and wife, and there isn't any work in this community to be had at all. I understand there was a clause to the bill that anybody with a large family would be put on again if it would cause any hardship. We will have to go on direct relief, as I have no way to make a living. With winter soon on us, it will be awful in these northern counties unless something is done about it.

Yours very truly.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the gentleman that that provision was put in the bill by amendment at the time it passed the House, and that it was taken out in conference, even though the Senate bill contained a similar provision. That has always been hard for me to understand.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Yes; I have never been able to find out who really was responsible for that.

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

Mr. GEHRMANN. Yes.

Mr. HEALEY. I call attention to the fact that many persons over 45 years of age are compelled to take this enforced vacation, and that these people are unable to find employment in private industry.

Mr. GEHRMANN. That is correct.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I agree 100 percent with what the gentleman has said. I have many letters in my files of a similar nature to the one that he quoted, and I believe this body will be called back in special session to right this injustice on these people, and I hope that does happen.

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

Mr. GEHRMANN. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not true that Colonel Harrington recommended this change to the conferees?

Mr. GEHRMANN. Yes; that was stated by the committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. So that the responsibility lies with the administration?

Mr. GEHRMANN. Yes. I had already stated that the bill had the provision in it as it passed the House and that it was taken out in conference, and I do not see why we do not rectify that terrible mistake before we adjourn.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of this House to a letter that has just been read by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN], and I say to you that there are 2,000,000 such letters in the making at the present time. This House did not do itself proud when it passed the W. P. A. appropriation. With the small appropriation asked for, the President expected that a very much larger appropriation would be made for lending and spending that would encourage business to provide direct employment for half a million men, at full pay and many more indirectly also at full pay. If that had been done, the present bill would have been largely sufficient to meet the demands. But when we turned down every other provision for work which the President had in mind when he permitted the small appropriation to be put forward for the W. P. A., it absolutely threw back into our laps the difficulty of the whole subject.

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

Mr. KELLER. Yes.

Mr. HEALEY. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that when the bill was before the House attempts were made to eliminate the provision; that is, the enforced vacation provision from the bill, and I ask the gentleman how many of the Republicans joined with the group that attempted to remove that?

Mr. KELLER. I think about 12 on that side.

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

Mr. KELLER. Yes; if the gentleman will get me another minute.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may have an extra minute when his time expires.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. All right; shoot away with your question.

Mr. RICH. If you had changed the Wagner Act and had brought in from the Committee on Labor changes that ought to have been brought here in the National Labor Relations Act, you would be putting people back to work in private industry, and you would not have to put them back on the W. P. A. or on the Government pay roll. That is where the Democrats fell down.

Mr. KELLER. I suggest that I do not know of a single employer of labor who has come forward and said that he would put anybody to work for the reason given by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]; that is, of a sufficient number to cut any figure in the large number of people unemployed in the United States today. In fact, the whole campaign of propaganda against the labor relations law and Board was not for the purpose of providing jobs, but for the purpose of destroying the National Labor Relations Act and taking away from the men who labor the right to organize and bargain collectively. And if my Republican friends or reactionary Democratic colleagues think the laboring men of America are not aware of that, they are heading for the surprise of their young lives. Because there can only be one result of the combined attack upon the National Labor Relations Act and the wage and hour law, and that is to completely consolidate the men and women who do the work in America against the men who have sought to nullify those laws. And take notice that in that consolidation of human interests previous party lines will be swept away and the workers will kick out of political life the men or women officials who have aided or abetted this conspiracy against these vital laws—vital to the economic, political, and spiritual rights of all the producers of wealth.

We are going to be compelled to come back here and put about a million more men to work, and do not forget it. You people who think you have been saving something will find you have been wasting something; that you have been wronging people of this country who are not in a position to help themselves. But they will find a way.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In other words, the gentleman believes that the important matter from the standpoint of employment of labor is whether they have orders for their goods or not?

Mr. KELLER. Exactly. Unless you have ability to buy you cannot put men to work. The question of employment is the one great question before America today. Solve that and we solve all. Fail to solve that and we have solved nothing.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that gentlemen rise on the floor at this time to read an appeal of the character just read by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN]. I have received many similar letters. Most of the Members must have received these frantic appeals from people who are receiving notices of dismissal from the W. P. A. To all who have received such notices it amounts to a tragedy, regardless of age, because they have satisfied all of the eligibility requirements that made it possible for them to be certified and placed on the W. P. A. and thus proved their need. There are many heads of families, young men and young widows, who sorely need this employment on W. P. A., but I think the saddest blow will fall on those persons over 45 years of age, who are receiving dismissal notices and who do not know where to turn for private employment. It must be a known fact to every Member that men and women over 45 years of age cannot find employment in private industry today.

When the bill passed the House an amendment was added which would eliminate these men and women of 45 years, heads of families, from this cruel, harsh, and inexorable rule of dismissal.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALEY. That passed the House by a goodly number, as I recall, and it was kept in by the Senate, but the conferees took out that provision affecting people over 45 years of age. I do not know what those people are going to do. Certainly we know their difficulties. We must appreciate the fact that private industry has established the rule making it impossible for persons having reached the age of 45 years to successfully obtain employment. Now, I am told by the Administrator of W. P. A. that when those persons have been off the rolls for a month it does not necessarily mean that they can go back at the end of 30 days. They must be certified all over again, and their case will then be considered as a new case. So that it may be many months before they will be able to be restored to the W. P. A. rolls.

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

Mr. HEALEY. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman recall whether there was a separate record vote in the House on the question of striking out this 30-day provision?

Mr. HEALEY. Not a record vote, because we were in Committee, but the amendment was offered to strike out the provision and we had a viva voce vote and a standing vote on the amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. My recollection is that there was not, and I am asking the gentleman whether or not he voted to strike out that 30-day provision?

Mr. HEALEY. Oh, I will say that I voted for all amendments that would remove these oppressive restrictions from the bill, including an enthusiastic affirmative vote for the amendment offered to strike out the 30-day suspension.

Mr. KEEFE. I suggest that the gentleman read the RECORD.

Mr. HEALEY. I state to my colleague that I have read it, and respectfully refer him to it.

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

Mr. HEALEY. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I agree 100 percent with everything the gentleman has said so far. I want to say that in my State almost every person who will be dismissed on account of this unjust and harsh provision will be the head of a family, and the children will be the ones to suffer.

Mr. HEALEY. I presume that perhaps it is too late to remedy this situation now, as I understand the Congress will adjourn this afternoon; but I know we can all expect to be sorely troubled by the predicament of these persons, and we will have presented on our front doorsteps when we arrive home the pitiful cases of thousands of persons who have received these dismissal notices.

[Here the gavel fell.]

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF UNITED STATES COURTS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 381, to provide funds for the maintenance and operation of the

administrative office of the United States courts for the fiscal year 1940.

The Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the appropriations "Miscellaneous salaries, United States courts, 1940," and "Miscellaneous expenses, United States courts, 1940," are hereby made available to the Supreme Court of the United States in such amounts as may be determined necessary by said Court, not to exceed in the aggregate $150,000, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the United States courts, and for other purposes."

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

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

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand, this appropriates no new money; it just transfers money from one fund to another in order that the new law may be complied with.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is all it does. No additional money is involved.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein certain excerpts from three issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the question of Territorial jurisdiction of marginal areas and to include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

30-DAY DISMISSALS FROM W. P. A.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise solely for the purpose of keeping the RECORD straight on the question of the 30-day dismissals. Two amendments were offered to strike out this provision—one by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKEOUGH] and the other by myself. Both these amendments were voted down by the reactionary coalition that has ruled this House since its very inception. I distinctly recall that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] supported both amendments.

Before Congress closes, I cannot help but mention that on that black Friday, when Congress wrote these vicious provisions against the unemployed of our country, it wrote one of the blackest pages in the history of our country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah and Mr. CRAWFORD asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

THE SPENDING-LENDING BILL

Mr. HINSHAW. 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. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, in the nature of posthumous remarks upon the late spend-lend bill I want to take this oportunity to read a brief poem submitted by a constituent of Mrs. Mildred R. Meadows, of Glendale, Calif.:

The liberty I take—I hope will not offend.
I seek your aid in squelching that bill of "Spend and lend!"
I'm just a poor old taxpayer who feels she cannot meet
Another added burden—so please help us to defeat
The wild and crazy spending that has gone on so long,
For everyone I talk to thinks its time it got the gong!
I thank you, Mr. HINSHAW, I'm not as light-hearted as I sound.
Let's push that "spending orgy" from the dog house to the pound.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

There was no objection.

RECESSES MADE IN ORDER

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order during the remainder of this session of Congress for the Speaker to declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that for the remainder of the session of this Congress the Speaker be authorized to declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, for the information of the House will the majority leader state when he expects the conference report on the deficiency bill?

Mr. RAYBURN. I talked to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] some 30 minutes ago, and he said he thought the conferees would finish their work within 30 minutes. He stated that in all probability it would take the clerks perhaps 20 minutes to prepare the conference report. Since then I have heard they have completed their work, so it ought not to be many minutes before the report is brought in. I was asking this permission for the remainder of the day.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object for the information of the Members, I presume bells will be rung following any recess.

Mr. RAYBURN. The Speaker, I think, always does that.

The SPEAKER. Ten minutes' notice will be given by the ringing of the bells, under the usual practice.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION LAY-OFFS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] stated that there were 2,000,000 letters in the mails today protesting against the 30-day lay-off on W. P. A. If this be true, this is not a wave of public resentment but a wave of propaganda that has its beginning in the Department of Labor here in the Capital.

I hold in my hand a paper, one of the great dailies of the country, which asks a question to the effect, Should a young woman who is a high-school graduate take a job at household work? Of all the answers that appear in the paper only one says yes. Now, to me this is tragic. It seems to me that the whole country is getting into the state of mind where the people think that as soon as somebody gets a little education he or she should not work.

I believe it is the job of the leaders of this country to dignify labor and to make people more work-minded. It is their duty to teach people as a whole that labor is honorable and regardless of what kind of labor it may be, it is the common responsibility of every man and woman to work whatever their hands find to do. I believe when we have accomplished that, and when we have adopted a few amendments to the Wagner Act, and amended the Wage and Hour Act, with the right kind of a chairman at the head of the National Labor Relations Board and a willingness on the part of the Administrator to cooperate, and further with the stopping of governmental interference with people who are creating jobs, we will get to the place in this country where we can go to town, so to speak. We will be getting back to the days when men want to work and we will be getting back to the days when we permit them to work. The present law has thrown many people out of employment.

In my district the wage and hour law has thrown about 5,000 people out of employment, principally cigar makers.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. I would like the gentleman to correct his statement. I did not say there were 2,000,000 letters coming in the mail at all. I said there was the possibility of 2,000,000 in the making all over the country.

Mr. GROSS. It still smells to me of propaganda—having its inception in the Labor Committee here in the Capitol.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised at the gentlemen on the Republican side trying to justify their actions in condemning a starvation policy for the people of the United States. When they go home they will find that these letters, of which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] spoke, will not come because of propaganda issuing out of any department. They will come because people are actually starving to death.

The first thing we do to the people is to pauperize them. We make them sell their jewelry; we make them give up their life insurance before they can get on to the W. P. A. Then, after keeping them there for a certain length of time, we tell them that they will have to stand aside. We will have paid them a very, very small sum in the meantime. However, I must say, out of justice, that there were a few men—three or four—on the Republican side of the House who joined with those on the other side of the House, other than the Tories, and went along as they should, when we tried to keep that vicious section out of the bill. But here again, as usual, we had the joining of the hands across the aisle to defeat something for the good of the people—this merely for the purpose of revenge or for political purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of many Members of Congress who are interested in the veterans, I am compiling a condensed analysis of all laws enacted by this Congress, and I ask unanimous consent at this time to insert in the last CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this session this compilation. I also ask to include in the RECORD this compilation notwithstanding the fact it may exceed the allotted two and a half pages permitted. This may run to three and a half pages.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer on the subject of stream-pollution legislation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain editorial comment from the Washington Post on the tax bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a lot of demagogy emanating from the majority party about the welfare of American citizens. During the present session and for the past 7 years Congress has been submitting to the demands of pressure groups.

The gentleman from California [Mr. GEYER] said we were pauperizing American citizens. That is exactly what the New Deal has been doing constantly for the past 7 years. We have been attempting to legislate security, contentment and prosperity for the American people, but the time has come when we must take into consideration the security and the welfare of millions of conscientious American citizens who are attempting to solve their own problems. This is the major problem confronting the Congress of the United States and the country today. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, that was a remarkable statement we heard from the gentleman from Idaho awhile ago. He says we are pauperizing America. Now, let us analyze the situation that confronts us in this, the closing day of the Congress.

At the present time the Federal Government is spending for relief and for extra curriculum activities, such as the P. W. A., about $300,000,000 a month. This means the difference between fair times and miserable depression times. In the closing day of this session we witness the fact that the amount in W. P. A. bill which was asked by the President was a comparatively small sum, because it contemplated that other things such as the housing bill which would cushion a decrease from the $300,000,000 a month would be passed by the Congress. But these acts were not passed by the Congress.

The housing bill and the spend-lend bill, which was self-liquidating, were not passed because 99 percent of the Republican Party voted against them. Oh, I know there was a small block of Democrats who voted against them, but they amounted to less than 20 percent of the Democratic Party. So the responsibility rests with the Republican Party for failure to pass the housing bill and for failure to pass the spend-lend bill, which would have acted as a cushion to take care of the decrease in the $300,000,000 per month expenditure. What the Republicans are doing is betting that private industry will take up the slack. I do not believe so, and I think we are bound for a depression. When it comes, I say to the gentleman from Idaho and the rest of the Republican Party, in view of the fact that 99 percent of the Republican Party voted against the consideration of the housing bill and against the consideration of the spending-lending bill, theirs will be the responsibility, and they cannot escape it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

DAUMIT TANNAUS SALEAH (DAVE THOMAS)

Mr. SCHULTE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1911) for the relief of Daumit Tannaus Saleah (Dave Thomas).

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1911) for the relief of Daumit Tannaus Saleah (Dave Thomas) having

met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
WM. T. SCHULTE,
N. M. MASON,
Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
FRANCIS T. MALONEY,
HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
WILLIAM H. KING,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 1911) for the relief of Daumit Tannaus Saleah (Dave Thomas) submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization reported the bill S. 1911 with an amendment. The conferees of the House and Senate, after due consideration, agreed that the amendment made by the House should be receded from. Your conferees, therefore, recommend the agreement.

SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
WM. T. SCHULTE,
N. M. MASON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MATO, MILJENKO, BOZO, AND AUGUSTIN CIBILIC, OR ZIBILICH

Mr. SCHULTE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 796) for the relief of Mato, Miljenko, Bozo, and Augustin Cibilic, or Zibilich.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 796) for the relief of Mato, Miljenko, Bozo, and Augustin Cibilic or Zibilich having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 1 and 2.

SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
WM. T. SCHULTE,
N. M. MASON,
Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
FRANCIS T. MALONEY,
HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
WILLIAM H. KING,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 796) for the relief of Mato, Miljenko, Bozo, and Augustin Cibilic, or Zibilich, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization reported the bill (S. 796) with two amendments. The conferees, after due consideration, decided that the amendments of the House should be receded from. Your conferees, therefore, agreed to such rescission.

SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
WM. T. SCHULTE,
N. M. MASON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMIL FRIEDRICH DISCHLEIT

Mr. SCHULTE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1269) for the relief of Emil Friedrich Dischleit.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1269) for the relief of Emil Friedrich Dischleit, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 1 and 2.

SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
WM. T. SCHULTE,
N. M. MASON,
Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
FRANCIS T. MALONEY,
HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
WILLIAM H. KING,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 1269) for the relief of Emil Friedrich Dischleit, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization reported the bill, S. 1269, with two amendments. The conferees of the House and Senate, after due consideration, agreed that the amendments from the House should be receded from. Your conferees, therefore, recommend the agreement.

SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
WM. T. SCHULTE,
N. M. MASON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. PACIOS PIJUAN

Mr. SCHULTE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1654) for the relief of Mrs. Pacios Pijuan.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1654) for the relief of Mrs. Pacios Pijuan, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
WM. T. SCHULTE,
NOAH M. MASON,
Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
FRANCIS T. MALONEY,
HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
WILLIAM H. KING,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 1654) for the relief of Mrs. Pacios Pijuan submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization reported the bill S. 1654 with an amendment. The conferees of the House and Senate, after due consideration, agreed that the amendment made by the House should be receded from. Your conferees, therefore, recommend the agreement.

SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
WM. T. SCHULTE,
NOAH M. MASON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KONSTANTINOS DIONYSIOU ANTIOHOS (OR GUS PAPPAS)

Mr. SCHULTE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1538) for the relief of Konstantinos Dionysiou Antiohos (or Gus Pappas).

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1538) for the relief of Konstantinos Dionysiou Antiohos (Gus Pappas) having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
WILLIAM T. SCHULTE,
N. M. MASON,
Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
FRANCIS T. MALONEY,
HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
WILLIAM H. KING,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 1538) for the relief of Konstantinos Dionysiou Antiohos (or Gus Pappas), submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization reported the bill S. 1538 with two amendments. The conferees of the House and Senate, after due consideration, agreed that the amendment from the House should be receded from. Your conferees, therefore, recommend the agreement.

SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
WILLIAM T. SCHULTE,
N. M. MASON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUYALLUP INDIAN TRIBAL SCHOOL, TACOMA, WASH.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table for immediate complete title to the Puyallup Indian tribal school property at complete title to the Puyallup Indian tribal-school property at Tacoma, Wash., for Indian sanatorium purposes.

Mr. MAPES. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill—H. R. 2653—which was passed by the Senate as S. 2141 on August 1 by unanimous consent. This bill, identical with the Senate bill, was on the House Consent Calendar this week, but we did not quite reach it. The bill was reported by the House Committee on Indian Affairs and was agreed to by the members of the committee on both sides. I have already consulted the ranking Member on the gentleman's side of the House, as well as the chairman of the committee on our side. This is a bill the Department of the Interior has long wanted, and the Bureau of the Budget has indicated its consent to the authorization.

Mr. MAPES. The minority members approve the bill?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this bill was considered by the Committee on Indian Affairs, of which I am a member. Is this the bill upon which the clerk of the committee polled members of the committee?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. It may possibly be. The bill was reported on July 28 by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL]. The bill was before that committee, I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, during the last session of Congress, and was then favorably reported by the committee. This is an identical bill.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. What does this bill do?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. It authorizes the acquisition of a site upon which an Indian hospital is now located in the city of Tacoma, Wash. The site contains a great many firetrap buildings, which are in danger of being burned at any time.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. This is not the bill to which I had reference. The bill the gentleman is asking to have considered is a good bill and I shall not object.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

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

There was 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 acquire, from the Puyallup Tribe of Indians of Washington, for Indian sanatorium purposes, tracts Nos. 6 and 7, containing 38.50 acres, including all tribal-owned improvements thereon, of the Indian addition to the city of Tacoma, Wash., established under the act of March 3, 1893 (27 Stat. 633); title to be conveyed to the United States by such tribal officials as the Puyallup Tribal Council shall authorize by resolution and by such form of relinquishment or deed as the Secretary of the Interior may designate.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the provisions of section 1 hereof there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $228,525, which sum shall be distributed by the Secretary of the Interior in equal shares to the members of the Puyallup Indian Tribe, determined in accordance with the constitution and bylaws of the tribe approved May 13, 1936, as of the date of the passage of this act, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe: *Provided*, That acceptance by each individual, or by his or her natural or legal guardian or heirs, of the pro rata share of the amount hereby authorized to be appropriated shall be recognized as completely extinguishing any and all right or interest such member of the tribe might have had in said property.

SEC. 3. The fulfillment of the provisions of section 2 hereof shall not bar the hospitalization of or medical attention to members of the Puyallup Tribe at the Indian sanatorium referred to in section 1.

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. 2653) was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD with three separate extensions down to and including the last publication of the RECORD and to insert in these extensions certain tables prepared by myself.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly, at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m., the House stood in recess to meet at the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1939

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report and statement upon the bill H. R. 7462, making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1939, and June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7462) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1939, and June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 15, 24, 26, 27, 56, 57, 58, and 59.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 37, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum "$2,500,000" named in said amendment insert "$1,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

"For an additional amount for five Commissioners and other personal services in the District of Columbia, and for all other authorized expenditures of the Securities and Exchange Commission in performing the duties imposed by or in pursuance of law, including the employment of experts when necessary, fiscal year 1940, $100,000, including the same objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of such sum shall be available for the conduct of a foreign office."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

"To complete the compilation and publication of a history of the formation, signing, ratification, and establishment of the Constitution, including such historical facts and data as the Commission may deem pertinent relative to the commencement of the First Congress of the United States under the Constitution; the proceedings and ceremonies in connection with the inauguration of George Washington as the first President of the United States under the Constitution; the adoption and ratification of the Bill of Rights, and the first meeting of the Supreme Court of the United States; including therein also a final report of the activities of the Commission during the Nation-wide observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formation, ratification, and establishment of the Constitution, fiscal year 1940, $15,000, of which not to exceed $5,000 shall be available exclusively for personal services."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

"United States Warehouse Act: For an additional amount to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Warehouse Act, fiscal year 1940, $17,500, of which not to exceed $3,200 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Defraying deficits in treasuries of municipal governments, Virgin Islands: For an additional amount for defraying the deficits in the treasuries of the municipal governments because of the excess of current expenses over current revenues for the fiscal year 1940, municipality of Saint Thomas and Saint John, $15,000, and municipality of Saint Croix, $20,000, in all, $35,000, to be paid to the said treasuries in monthly installments."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$18,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$272,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$915,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For expenditure, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, for chartering and commissioning the steamship *Bear* as a vessel of the United States Navy for the purposes of the survey of the Antarctic regions to be made by the United States Antarctic Service as authorized by the Urgent Deficiency and Supplemental Appropriation Act, fiscal years 1939 and 1940, approved June 30, 1939, Public, Numbered 160, Seventy-sixth Congress: *Provided*, That such expenditure shall be made from the amounts appropriated for this purpose for the Department of the Interior under the head of "Expenses, Division of Territories and Island Possessions" in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1939, approved May 2, 1939, and the Urgent Deficiency and Supplemental Appropriation Act, fiscal years 1939 and 1940, approved June 30, 1939."

And the Senate agree to the same.

EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
C. A. WOODRUM,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

ALVA B. ADAMS,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
FREDERICK HALE,
JOHN G. TOWNSEND, JR.,
GERALD P. NYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7462) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1939, and June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

On amendments Nos. 1 to 7, both inclusive, relating to the Senate: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, $177,360 for additional clerks, including $960 for additional compensation for two employees; $2,604 for the pay of Senate pages, and $30,000 additional for contingent expenses.

On amendment No. 8: Provides for the payment of extra compensation to certain Government Printing Office messengers, payable

from the appropriation for printing and binding for Congress, fiscal year 1940, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 9: Appropriates $4,000,000 for civilian pilot training, instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $5,675,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments Nos. 10 and 11, relating to the Federal Housing Administration: Provides for an additional amount of $1,300,000 for administrative expenses, payable from available funds, instead of $1,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, and $1,000,000, as proposed by the House.

On amendments Nos. 12 and 13, relating to the Public Health Service: Appropriates an additional amount of $1,500,000 for grants to States for public health work, instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and an additional amount of $40,000 for disease and sanitation investigations, instead of $81,000 as proposed by the Senate, both pursuant to the provisions of the amended social security law.

On amendment No. 14: Appropriates $1,750,000 additional for salaries and expenses, Social Security Board, pursuant to provisions of the amended social security law, instead of $2,500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 15: Strikes out the additional appropriation of $1,000,000 proposed by the Senate on account of public building construction outside of the District of Columbia.

On amendment No. 16: Authorizes the expenditure of $40,000 from administrative funds available to the Public Roads Administration for uses incident to the construction of the Inter-American Highway and for performing engineering service in Pan-American countries, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 17: Appropriates $5,000 for expenses of participation by the United States in the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the writing of The Star-Spangled Banner, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 18: Appropriates $150,000 under the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for the acquisition of land within the area of the George Washington Memorial Parkway, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 19: Appropriates an additional $100,000 for salaries and expenses, Securities and Exchange Commission, fiscal year 1940, instead of $110,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provides that no part of the sum shall be available for the conduct of a foreign office.

On amendment No. 20: Appropriates $200,000 on account of the United States Coronado Exposition Commission, instead of $250,000, as proposed by the Senate, and $175,000, as proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 21: Appropriates $15,000 for compiling and publishing data by the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission, instead of $40,000, as proposed by the House, and the elimination of the item, as proposed by the Senate, and limits expenditures for personal services to $5,000.

On amendment No. 22: Appropriates $600 for the payment of a claim, approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in pursuance of law, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments Nos. 23, 24, and 25, relating to the Department of Agriculture: Eliminates the provision of the Senate appropriating $6,500 for Mormon cricket control research activities, and provides $17,500 for expenses incident to effectuating the provisions of the United States Warehouse Act, instead of $35,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments Nos. 26 to 34, both inclusive, relating to the Interior Department: Restores the item proposed by the House appropriating $100,000 of tribal funds for the purchase of land for Colville Indians, Washington; restores the appropriation of $795,000, as proposed by the House, for the purchase of nonnative-owned reindeer in Alaska, including $75,000 for administrative expenses; appropriates $6,416.42, as proposed by the Senate, for the relief of Western or Old Settler Cherokees; appropriates $20,000 for operation and maintenance administration, Bureau of Reclamation, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $8,000 for extending the boundaries of the Hot Springs National Park, Ark., as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $55,000 for the purchase of land for expanding the area of the Kennesaw Mountain National Memorial Military Park, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $40,000 for construction, and so forth, of an administration building in the Kings Mountain National Military Park, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $35,000 for defraying anticipated deficits in the treasuries of the municipal governments, Virgin Island, fiscal year 1940, instead of $70,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments Nos. 35 to 44, both inclusive, relating to the Department of Labor: Appropriates $1,205,000 for salaries, traveling and contingent expenses, Wage and Hour Division, instead of $2,010,000, as proposed by the Senate, and $1,005,000, as proposed by the House; extends until June 30, 1940, the availability of the appropriation "Transporting Filipinos to the Philippine Islands," as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $1,512,500 for additional grants to States for maternal and child-health services, for services for crippled children, and for child-welfare services, and for necessary administrative expenses in the Children's Bureau incident thereto, instead of $2,290,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments Nos. 45 to 49, both inclusive, relating to the Navy Department: Appropriates an additional amount of $3,841.11 to pay claims for damages arising from collisions with naval vessels, as proposed by the Senate; makes previous appropriations for the United States Antarctic Service available on account of chartering and commissioning the steamship *Bear*, instead of charging such expenditures to naval appropriations, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the appropriation and contractual authority, proposed by the House, for constructing a rigid airship, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $2,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the purchase from the Maritime Commission of two motorships and their conversion for use as naval vessels.

On amendments Nos. 50 to 54, both inclusive, relating to the Department of State: Appropriates $750 for payment of a death claim of a foreign national; appropriates $2,010,000, which, in conjunction with $1,000,000 of funds heretofore made available, will enable payment to be made to the Government of Panama for the years 1934 to 1940, inclusive, for the use, occupation, and control of the Panama Canal Zone in compliance with the provisions of the treaty ratified by the Senate on July 25, 1939; makes the appropriation proposed by the House for expenses of the Agrarian Claims Commission, United States and Mexico, fiscal year 1940, available also for the fiscal year 1939; appropriates $16,000 on account of the second Inter-American Radio Conference, Santiago, Chile; and appropriates $2,750 on account of the meeting of Treasury representatives, Guatemala, Guatemala, all as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments Nos. 55 to 58, both inclusive, relating to the Treasury Department: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, the sum of $119,599,918.05 for restoration of the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation; and strikes out the proposals of the Senate authorizing the merger, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, of certain appropriations for 1940 for the Coast Guard and the Lighthouse Service.

On amendment No. 59: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate making not exceeding $60,000 of an unexpended balance available for the construction and installation of a sewage-treatment plant at the Fort Niagara Military Reservation, N. Y.

On amendments Nos. 60 to 71, inclusive, relating to appropriations for judgments and authorized claims: Appropriates the additional sum of $432,770.52 for such purposes, as proposed by the Senate.

EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
C. A. WOODRUM,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to explain the report in detail and I ask unanimous consent that the further reading be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. We have had no opportunity to understand just what is in the report. I do not want to object, but I trust the gentleman from Virginia will explain all of the Senate amendments on which there has been disagreement, and what has been done in the conference report.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, to ask the gentleman from Virginia with reference to amendment numbered 8. This has to do with the provision inserted in the House bill which went out on a point of order. It has been reinserted in the conference report. It was taken out because it was legislation on an appropriation bill. How can that get back into the bill through the conference report?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would be very glad to explain that to the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is a complete report on the third deficiency appropriation bill. I shall go through the items hurriedly and take as little time as possible, with the indulgence of the House, to explain the action taken on the amendments as they were considered, and then I shall be very glad to yield briefly, and I hope it will not mean yielding more than briefly for questions.

Many of the amendments, an examination of the report will show, involve section numbers—purely clerical. I shall go hurriedly through such of the others as I think might be of particular interest to the membership and if I do not happen to mention the one that any particular Member may be interested in, he will have an opportunity to ask me about it.

Amendment No. 9 is an amendment increasing the amount for the Civil Aeronautics Authority for civilian pilot training. The House allowed $3,000,000 for that purpose and the Senate

raised it to $5,675,000. The Senate conferees agreed to fixing the amount at $4,000,000.

Amendment No. 10 and amendment No. 11 refer to administrative expenses of the Federal Housing Authority. The Senate added an additional $500,000 to the $1,000,000 the House had allowed. The conference committee agreed upon an additional $300,000. Those are the funds available to the Federal Housing Authority. They are not funds out of the Treasury, but they are their own funds, accruing from the action of the Congress in amending the Federal Housing Authority Act.

The Senate added $3,000,000 for the Public Health Service because of changes made in the Social Security Act, which is now in the process of being agreed to. The conferees agreed to split that amount, $1,540,000, until experience demonstrates a more accurate estimate of the amount required.

The same is true of two million and a half dollars for the administrative expenses of the Social Security Board. We cut that to $1,750,000.

Public Building Administration, $1,000,000. This was added in the Senate for public buildings outside of the District of Columbia. Of course, the amendment carried no authority to erect buildings. Under such circumstances there was no point to keep the money in, so the amendment was not included in the bill.

Public Roads Administration, Inter-American Highway, amendment numbered 16, provided $40,000 for expenses incidental to the survey and construction of the Pan-American Highway.

Amendment numbered 18: The Senate reinserted $150,000 for the further purchase of land for the George Washington Memorial Parkway and the conferees agreed to it.

Amendment numbered 19 reinserted a part of the Budget estimate of $110,000 for the Securities and Exchange Commission. That has been reduced to $100,000.

Amendment numbered 20 increased the amount for the Coronado Exposition Commission, for which there was a Budget estimate of $250,000. The House had reduced the amount of the estimate to $175,000, and the conferees agreed upon $200,000.

Amendment numbered 24: The Senate inserted an additional amount of $6,500 for experimental and research work upon Mormon crickets. We have already appropriated liberally for insect-pest control, as every Member will realize, and that item was eliminated.

Amendment No. 25, Marketing service, under the United States Warehouse Act, we split the amount of the estimate in half and allowed $35,000.

Several amendments respecting expenditure of funds for Indians out of tribal funds were stricken out by the House. The Senate reinserted some of the items and the conference committee agreed to the reinsertion of them.

The famous Alaska reindeer item, which was stricken out in the House and reinserted by the Senate, was agreed to by the conference committee.

Perhaps one of the two or three amendments of particular interest to the House, of course, were the amendments respecting the enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Many of you will recall what happened in the House. The committee did not report any amount for such purpose because of the fact that in the regular 1940 appropriation act quite a liberal increase in the appropriation for such purpose had been granted, which the committee felt should be tried out before additional funds were appropriated. There was a great display of interest in the House and we thought we compromised with the advocates of this by suggesting an amendment of $1,000,000. I feel confident that if we had brought the item back to the House perhaps the Members of the House would have respected a compromise agreement, but in the Senate conference we could not do better. So we had to allow an additional $200,000 in addition to the $1,000,000 the House had approved for the enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The other amendment, perhaps the only one which was of particular interest to the House generally, was that respecting the Commodity Credit Corporation. The conferees agreed to the inclusion of the full amount of the estimate.

I wish to be perfectly frank with the House and yet frank with myself. I did not approve the reinsertion of the full amount of the estimate for the Commodity Credit Corporation, though I signed the report and, of course, I shall vote for the report. And may I say this: I have voted, I believe, for as many farm acts and farm appropriations as any Member of the House away back in the days when we were voting for farm appropriations. The more we have appropriated, the more debts we have piled upon agriculture. We come back the next session of Congress and those of our colleagues who are supposed to know about it demonstrate to us that agriculture is in worse condition than it has ever been before.

To my way of thinking, sometime, somewhere, somehow, there must be an end to this thing. I do not believe the end to it is in a continuous and increasing subsidy. I just cannot feel that that is the end to it. I cannot feel that the brain, ingenuity, and resourcefulness of the American legislative body is bankrupt for an answer to the agricultural problem. [Applause.]

Now, I must be frank to say that I do not know what the answer is, and I do not pretend to know. It has been demonstrated that some of my friends who pretend to know do not know what it is.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Does the gentleman differentiate between loans and subsidies? All of our legislation has been to loan to agriculture.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No. It is all the same. It all goes out and nothing comes in. [Laughter.] When you take it out of the Federal Treasury—good-bye! [Laughter.]

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. SIROVICH. As one who has always voted to help the farmers of our Nation, I asked the Vice President of the United States, Mr. GARNER, if he could give me a solution for this problem, and he stated to me that if you took four Members of the House of Representatives on both sides of the aisle, who knew most about farming, and put them with four Members of the Senate, and locked them up in a room for a week, they would never come out with a solution of the farm problem.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think, perhaps, that is as enlightening information as we will get on agriculture. [Laughter.] In other words, I do not particularly disagree with my friend. In other words, I might say, we do not know anything about it. Now, if that is true, then should we continue spending money for something that we do not know anything about?

I realize perfectly well that eventually—and I think our committee realizes it—there was nothing we could do but put up this $119,000,000. It was a program that Congress had authorized, and we had embarked upon it.

Personally, I was anxious to center the spotlight on this question with the hope it would stimulate thinking upon the subject, and that we should come to a point some time where we would try to do something for the farmer except to have as our objective each session of Congress as piling up additional gifts and subsidies because that is not helping him. We are not helping the farmer when we increase his indebtedness and make it easier for him to borrow. I hope that some place, somewhere, there will be a solution and that we shall be able to find it. One billion two hundred million dollars and more this Congress has appropriated this year for agriculture, and I voted for most of it. Some of it I did not vote for because it was above Budget estimates.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I highly respect what the gentleman has said, and I am very much in agreement with him. I wish to ask with reference to this particular item, insofar as the

conference went, was there a presentation made by the Department of Agriculture spokesmen to the effect that if this $119,000,000 were reinstated in the way of rebuilding the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation—did they seem to think that with this additional resource in their hands they would be able to take care of the price situation on cottonseed oil, lard, and some of the other surplus commodities for some time to come?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may say to my friend that as he, of course, knows, no hearings were held by the conferees. The only information we had was such information as was given in the House hearings and in the Senate hearings.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The reason I put the question that way was as a result of some press releases which have been made, and which I understand came from the Secretary of Agriculture, to the effect that farm prices would probably drop down to or below 1932 farm prices unless this $119,000,000 were granted at this time. I thought perhaps some representation had been made to the conferees by the Department of Agriculture in a direct manner.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The most direct representation the conferees had came from our distinguished colleagues at the other end of the Capitol, and they were of such tenor that, if the Congress were to adjourn in peace and harmony, then we must accept the inevitable.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will permit, I certainly was one who questioned the procedure here about wanting to hold back $119,000,000 and wreck the farm-price structure of this country, and I am sure the gentleman does not want to.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What the gentleman has said about the $119,000,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation plainly shows that the success of the entire agricultural program is dependent upon the amount of money that Congress will appropriate to provide parity prices. Farm prices will go down and the program in itself, without appropriations from Congress, will break all of the farmers of this country. Something should be done to straighten it out and get a sound program that will restore the price level without the aid of Congress.

Mr. STEAGALL rose.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STEAGALL. I wish to state to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and to the membership of the House that I have the direct assurance of the officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation that the item carried in the bill now before the House does afford sufficient funds to enable the Corporation to finance the holding of farm products and the orderly marketing thereof during the next season, as they have done heretofore. It is true, however, that the capital structure of the Commodity Credit Corporation has been whittled down to the point where there is only a few millions left of margin between obligations incurred and the capital left on hand and available for commodity loans.

In this connection let me say that it should be thoroughly understood that the funds that have been supplied to the Commodity Credit Corporation do not represent gifts or grants, but they are loans; and all our advices are that these loans that have been furnished up to now are solvent down to the amount indicated by this appropriation, but it does take that amount to restore the capital, treating loans outstanding as solvent.

Mr. HOBBS rose.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. I simply rise to express to our conferees, what I feel sure is the sentiment of the vast majority of the Members of this House, our thanks for having agreed to this item, and to assure the distinguished chairman of the House conferees that whether or not he may have his doubts as to the wisdom of this item, it certainly represents the best wisdom of this House upon this subject. [Applause.] In addition to that I would say that it is in accordance with the solemn pledged word of Congress enacted into law. Without the approval of this item Congress would have broken its word to 85 percent of the commercial corn farmers of America; and I know that this Congress will not stand for any kind of repudiation. [Applause.]

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

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

Mr. HEALEY. I understand that the conferees of the House receded and met the full amount of the Commodity Credit item, that is, $119,000,000; but on the item for proper enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act the House conferees would go only one-quarter of the way to meet the difference between the two Houses.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman should bear in mind, of course, that I had an understanding with my friend from Massachusetts on the $1,000,000, and that he would not ask for more.

Mr. HEALEY. That was at that particular time [laughter], but when the Senate in its wisdom granted the full increase of $2,000,000 then, of course, a different picture was presented. The House conferees having gone all the distance with the farmers should have been more liberal with regard to the item for the enforcement of the Wage-Hour Act.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. But as the matter now stands the gentleman has $200,000 over what I promised to do for him.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman think that the conferees expended a lot of energy in considering $200,000 but that they were very generous with the $119,000,000?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Most of the energy was spent on the $119,000,000, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. But very little accomplished.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Very little accomplished.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. From the angle of the gentleman's viewpoint.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. But quite a good deal was accomplished with respect to the $1,200,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is hardly fair to make that sort of comparison.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I am not making that sort of comparison. I am not particularly opposed to the Commodity Credit Corporation, but I think a little bit more leeway should have been given to the consideration of the $1,000,000, a relatively insignificant sum, which had to do with the proper enforcement of an act that affects millions of underpaid people in this country.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not have the slightest doubt about the fact that adequate funds have been provided for the Fair Labor Standards Act Section of the Department of Labor. As one who voted for the bill and who wishes to see that act enforced, I make the statement that they are adequately provided for.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. There was an agreement on the amount of not to exceed $10,000,000 for the establishment of a research laboratory for aeronautics. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Virginia, and especially the gentleman from Indiana, a member of the committee, on seeing to it that in that connection a 30-day period from passage was allowed whereby Members of Congress and others might bring to the attention of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics the reason why they feel that the

aeronautical research laboratory, tentatively agreed upon at Sunnyvale, Calif., should be placed in another part of the United States. A majority of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics would then select the site for this needed research facility. We realize that any aeronautical research laboratory will not be constructed as a temporary center. It will be established to aid American aviation in the years ahead.

With the rapid advance in aviation America is becoming conscious of the fact that in future years we might be vulnerable to attack from the skies by countries many thousands of miles from us, which may send aircraft to invade this country. That is not beyond the realm of the possible. The coast is not, in my opinion, the location for such a research laboratory. I believe this provision allowing a further study of possible sites is a mighty splendid one. The interior of our country, in many sections, offers the proper location.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. May I ask the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], would he have any objection to this research laboratory being located in the State of West Virginia?

Mr. RANDOLPH. None whatsoever. In fact, I appeared before the committee in behalf of a location in my fine district, and in a great State.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. On behalf of a great wheat-growing section of the United States, I want to extend to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia and to all Members who served as conferees our thanks and congratulations for their splendid work in connection with the conference report and the insertion of this $119,000,000. I want to thank the gentleman again for promising to vote for that item, as I think he is deserving of the thanks of the Members of the House.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Although there is little corn produced in the State of Arizona—none commercially—I want to thank the gentleman for favoring the $119,000,000 item. I rise particularly to congratulate the conferees for concurring in the Senate amendment with regard to the vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons and also in the amendments concerning the care of dependent and crippled children.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RICH. May I ask the gentleman how there is put back into the bill an item that was stricken out by the House on a point of order, to which the gentleman from Virginia agreed, when the legislation passed the House of Representatives? We have passed bills here requiring the manufacturers of this country to permit their employees to work only a certain number of hours. How can the gentleman except the Government to request certain employees to work overtime when they are paid their full salary, plus 15 percent additional for working at night, then give them a bonus of $900 a year? How can the gentleman put that back into the bill?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That might have been subject to a point of order on the conference report, if any one had made it. The gentleman knows this is a very small item, which has been carried for at least 8 or 10 years by the Congress, year after year, with respect to the salaries of two or three employees.

Mr. RICH. It is not a question of salary. I am considering a question of principle. I think the conferees should have adopted the principle that if you require the manufacturers of this country to do something, then the Government should show the way by doing the same thing.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MAPES. The gentleman in his explanation of the conference report referred briefly to an item relating to the appropriation for new post-office buildings. His statement on that was so brief I did not understand the situation.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The Senate put in a million dollars for additional post-office buildings, but did not put in the authority to build them, that being subject to a point of order in the Senate, by reason of which they could not secure the necessary two-thirds vote to get it through. They simply left it with the money in there, with no authority to use it, so the conference committee deleted the money.

Mr. MAPES. Does that mean that this bill carries no appropriation for additional post offices?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct. But we have the regular yearly program provided for in a preceding bill. This is an additional program.

Mr. MAPES. There has been the hope, at least on the part of some communities, that the deficiency appropriation bill would carry an appropriation allowing the Department to build additional post offices. That has been eliminated?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Temporarily. That is something for us to work upon next winter when we come back.

Mr. MAPES. I just wanted to get the information straight.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COLMER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the reindeer item was kept in there?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COLMER. Then that means Uncle Sam, as Santa Claus, will not have his own reindeer?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman can put his own construction upon that. I refer him to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado, who, I am sure, can convince him upon the subject.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. In connection with the post-office item a provision was included increasing the limit of cost of certain buildings. Was that item retained in the bill?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That item is in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, in a few moments, after further yielding very briefly to several gentlemen who wish to say something upon this conference report, I shall move the previous question, and I have no doubt it will be overwhelmingly adopted, which will complete action on appropriation items at this session of Congress.

The Appropriations Committee has had a problem to deal with. Some of our subcommittees convened here the 1st of December to begin hearings on appropriations. I believe I presented the first bill to the House, and I am presenting the last one. It has been an onerous task. This bill, after all of its trials and tribulations, comes to you more than $56,000,000 under the Budget estimates. I regret very much that I cannot say that all of our appropriation items have been under the budgetary estimates; but it is not my purpose now to talk about that. I am sure every Member has acted in accordance with what he has believed to be the best interests of his constituents and his country. I hope as we leave here very shortly to wend our ways homeward that we shall remember the truism that these perplexing problems do not have two sides, they have three sides: My side, your side, and the right side. [Applause.] It is the right side that we try to get.

I still believe that the ultimate judgment of the legislative body of the United States, even with all of our trials and

tribulations and with all of our seeming inconsistencies, is the expression of the safest and sanest system of democratic representative government that now exists on the face of the earth. [Applause.]

I wish to express to my colleagues my sincere personal appreciation for your indulgence and your forbearance. I wish to express to my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee my appreciation of their fine and splendid help and of the privilege it is to work with them. I wish to express to the minority my appreciation. Many times we have disagreed and many times we shall disagree in the future, but it has all seemed to me to be in a spirit of fine sportsmanship. We make our records here, we go back and give an account to our constituents, and they keep us at home or send us back according to whether or not that account is pleasing to them. That is the American way and as long as it continues to be that way our institutions of government are safe. [Applause.]

I wish to express my appreciation to the leadership for its consideration of the Appropriations Committee and its problems which we have had to present to the House.

Last, but not least, I wish to express my appreciation to the fine clerical assistance we have had on this committee. Few Members of the House, I fancy, realize what the clerical assistants of these busy committees of Congress have to go through. I do not know about others, but I do know about the Appropriations Committee. We shall pack up tonight and go home. The clerical force of our Appropriations Committee will be here for weeks and for months getting up the reports and making the necessary forms and returns that have to be made. They will be back then ahead of us to get ready for the next session, and we shall be obligated to them for that.

To the distinguished, venerable, and beloved chairman of our committee, as he leaves here again, having headed up this committee in his fine way with his splendid leadership, I express our hope that he shall have a pleasant summer and a pleasant vacation. [Applause.]

To each and every one of you, may I say that I hope you will have health and prosperity, that the fish will bite [laughter], that the golf ball will go straight, that whatever your amusement or recreation may call for, it will be to your heart's content, and that you will go back home and talk with your constituents, and I feel confident that when you do I shall have a large recruitment to that element of the House which believes that the time has come when we should put on the brakes a little bit. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, as the deficiency bill came from the Senate it carried increases of approximately $135,000,000 above the figure that was adopted by the House. As it comes back to you in conference it carries increases of $128,447,534.54 above what it was as it passed the House. For my own part, I could not sign the conference report because it carried the full amount of the estimate for the Commodity Credit Corporation, one-hundred-and-nineteen-million-five-hundred-thousand-odd dollars. The Commodity Credit Corporation, I believe, is one of the most difficult agencies there is in the whole Government structure about which to find out anything. I believe it is managed very poorly and is very extravagant in its operations. In my opinion, upward of $40,000,000 is wasted on storage charges. The result of its operations is continuous agricultural distress, and the longer it continues to operate the greater will be the distress.

According to the way I figure it, and according to the information I have obtained from figures I received from that agency, they now have a borrowing capacity, uncommitted, of $118,000,000, with which they could buy agricultural products and with which they could make loans upon agricultural products. In my opinion, that would meet the situation we are facing. We have also to consider that since their appraisal on the 31st day of March the price of cotton has gone up so that their value on that is $25,000,000 more than it was before and their prospective loss is much less. The more we pile up in warehouses tremendous surpluses as a threat to glut the market the more we cut the price of agricultural products.

The Congress should now be ready to deal with facts rather than be led astray by the vaporings of bureaucrats.

Unless we get to a situation where our storage is normal and our carry-over is only normal on agriculture, we are going to have continually greater and greater distress in agriculture. I felt that should not be done.

I felt that an additional $200,000 should not have been allocated to the Wage and Hour Division. What kind of a proposition do they present? They had appropriations already granted by the Congress which would permit them to add 371 inspectors beyond those now on the rolls. They had no program for putting on the number they would have under the Budget estimate prior to the 1st of January. Those who want to hand these people funds to run riot and waste money were in favor of increasing the amount. It was not a question of enforcing the law. It was a question of whether they should abuse their administrative authority and operate inefficiently. Those who wanted to give them more money wanted them to operate inefficiently and not get their money's worth for Uncle Sam out of those who were working.

There were many other propositions upon which an agreement was reached that ran the conference report up. We kept in the notorious reindeer item. About the only thing that we really threw out that the House put in that was not justifiable was the rigid airship for $300,000. Nevertheless, the position of the House has been commendable, and for a change in respect to recent bills this bill is a little bit below the Budget. Our total appropriations in this Congress, nevertheless, have been upwards of $300,000,000 above the Budget. The House on many occasions has shown commendable readiness to cut down the expenses of Government. The trouble has been that we have not gone far enough and have not stuck close enough to it. I commend at this time the attitude of the chairman of the committee and of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] and many of the Members upon the majority side and the Members on the minority side for the way they have stuck out in trying to reduce the expenses of Government. I would really like to join with the gentleman from Virginia in asking that this House awaken to a renewed sense of its responsibility when it returns here next January, and that we start out on a program that will cut down expenses to a point where we can say to our people back home that we have tried and we have accomplished something toward the solvency of the Government of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, my regard for the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] for his courage, for his consistency, is such that when I do disagree with him I always like to go back and reexamine the premises. I do not believe there is a Member of this House who has so courageously and consistently fought for economy as my appropriations leader JOHN TABER, and I take off my hat to him. But once in a while I find it necessary to disagree with him and that happens to be the case in connection with the item for the Commodity Credit Corporation. I found it necessary to disagree with my committee the other day. The reasons for that I can state briefly. The first reason is legislative. It is only 6 weeks or 2 months ago that we enacted a bill which extended the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation from $500,000,000 to $900,000,000, and certainly Congress must have had in contemplation the use of that borrowing power for the benefit of agriculture. The second reason is fiscal. I have a statement from the Commodity Credit Corporation as of yesterday, and when they make the commitments which they feel must be made to wheat, to the shipment of cotton to Great Britain, to rye and all the rest of the commodities there will remain only $9,000,000 with which to move the magnificent, astronomical corn crop, and it must be moved and put under loan before the first of January and before we come back.

The third reason is economic. If we do not keep this corn off the market, there will be such a glut that we will certainly reach the prophecy made by some more expert than I in the Department of Agriculture that lard will go to 3 cents a pound and corn to 20 cents a bushel, and I for one do not want the onus of that kind of responsibility. I am sure the responsible members from the corn section and the wheat section and from other sections express that same opinion and will concur in the action of the conference committee in restoring the $119,000,000.

Finally—and I do not care to inject a political note—but I will say that I believe I share the opinion, and I concur in the opinion of a great group on this side of the aisle that it would be very difficult for us to go back home, if the farm price structure does collapse, and confess to the farmers in the Central West that by our vote in refusing to provide loan money that will keep the great surge of grain off the market, we have made it possible, as Republicans, for the devastation of the grain price and for the complete collapse of agriculture in that great Mississippi Valley area. I was most happy to observe that my own colleagues quite generally favored a restoration of this item in the belief that it is absolutely to meet the emergency now at hand.

I am sorry I have to depart from the sentiments of the Appropriations Committee on this occasion, but I did feel it was mandatory and imperative that I say for those with whom I have talked in the last few days on this side, Members from Iowa, from Wisconsin, from Minnesota, from Illinois, and that other great section of the empire in the Middle West that we have an abiding interest in the $119,000,000, and we are appreciative to the conference committee that it was restored. [Applause.]

In addition to the fiscal reason, the legislative reason, and the economic reason which impels me to support the appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation, there is a moral reason.

When the Farm Act of 1938 was enacted, we wrote in a provision which directed the Corporation to make loans to those farmers who cooperated in the farm program. Now, there may be disagreement as to whether that program is sound or not. There is a settled body of opinion to the effect that the program has failed. That, however, is quite beside the point. The program is in force and effect. The farmers have cooperated. They have kept their share of the bargain that was made by solemn law and there devolves upon the Congress now the moral duty of providing the loan funds with which to carry out the Federal Government's agreement. By approving the funds contained in the bill before us for that purpose, we do nothing more than discharge the moral and legal obligation which is reposed in us by law.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] such time as he may require.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in a rather long experience as a member of the Appropriations Committee I confess that I have come to look upon deficiency estimates with more than a modicum of suspicion. If I were asked whether in my opinion most of the deficiency estimates that come to the Appropriations Committee should be passed or thrown out of the window, I would have to say, without intending any reflection whatsoever on the good faith of the proponents of such estimates, that it is my humble judgment that for the best interests of America many, if not most of them, should be thrown out of the window.

I make this statement because as chairman of one of the appropriations subcommittees and as a member of the important deficiencies subcommittee I have observed a growing practice which fills me with a good deal of concern, and which, I fear, threatens the integrity of our appropriating system. That is an increasing tendency of administrative officials to go to the deficiency subcommittee to obtain appropriations which have been turned down by the regular subcommittees or which through laches of their own the proponents have failed or neglected to submit to the regular subcommittees that should have jurisdiction.

The range of ingenuity in giving what really are regular items a coloration to make them appear as deficiency or supplemental items is remarkable, and in itself is a glowing tribute to the inventive genius of the official mind. In cleverness of legerdemain, some of the schemes devised to present to the deficiencies subcommittee a hook of jurisdiction are almost equal to the loaded cigar and the wooden nutmeg.

In the interest of good practice and to preserve our appropriating system in its pristine vigor, our deficiency subcommittee, under the capable leadership of its chairman, Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, and its acting chairman, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, has sent many of the estimates that were presented for the third deficiency bill back to the subcommittee where they belong. A list of them will be found in the report. This, I believe, is a step in the direction of committee reform that is highly commendable and which I think the House in its sober judgment, jealous of the preservation of the integrity of its appropriating instrumentalities, will appreciate and approve. There is a sound reason for this step, as the regular subcommittee is always familiar with the subject matter and all the factors involved in an estimate, while the deficiency subcommittee is composed of a different personnel, unfamiliar with the background of the particular item. There are of course some items that are real deficiences, arising as a result of new legislation or for some other unpredictable cause, and these must always be treated as deficiencies, but I hope that the salutary precedent established in this bill will be continued and that in future the deficiency subcommittee will be governed by a strict rule of sending back to regular subcommittees items that are not actual deficiencies or emergent in their character.

The extent of the efforts to overplay the deficiency subcommittee is vividly illustrated by the fact that estimates totaling the enormous sum of over $216,000,000 came up from the Budget Bureau for inclusion in the measure now presently before us. This is an astounding fact, showing how appropriations are running away with our reason. The time was, a deficiency bill, especially one coming as late as a third deficiency, was a mop-up bill to take care of a few ragged ends of appropriations and seldom carrying more than a few hundred thousand dollars; but here in the year 1938 we find estimates submitted for a third deficiency bill approaching a quarter of a billion dollars or almost one-fourth of the amount that was required to run the entire Government a few decades ago. These estimates in printed form occupied 100 printed pages, making a bill larger in size than many of the regular supply measures. By careful supervision of the estimates, reducing those that would stand a reduction, and by giving a regular reference to those that were incorrectly routed to our subcommitee, we cut the appropriations from $215,891,168, as estimated, to $53,190,056, the amount carried in this bill.

The tendency to swell deficiency items is but a segment of the larger picture of the mounting appropriations of our Government. On the Democratic side of the aisle we reward the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Brother RICH with the raspberry when he arises to give us his daily curtain lecture on spending, but he at least affords us plenty of food for thought. I am beginning to join company with him in wondering, "Where are we going to get the money?" How can it be said that there is any excuse for appropriations totaling over $13,000,000,000 a year in a time of peace? And how, may I ask with special emphasis, can it be said that there is any excuse for going ahead and appropriating $3,500,000,000 a year in excess of our receipts? I wonder how many of us realize the appalling extent of our deficit spending. The sum of $3,500,000,000, the estimated amount of our annual deficit, is equivalent to $1,800,000 for every year since the birth of Christ. Think of that before you close your minds too tightly against the stentorian pleas of Brother RICH.

It is all right to speak jocularly about protecting the deficit, but deficit financing cannot go on forever. If it

does go on, the solvency of the Government will be at stake. Far better it would be to tackle the problem of a balanced Budget on at least one, and possibly two fronts. With our present broad tax base a reduction of Government expenditures of 25 percent, as promised in our 1932 Democratic national platform, would almost take care of our national deficit. The other point of possible attack is mentioned by me with some reservation, because taxes are always a pain in the neck; but a moderate increase in taxes, equitably distributed, might go hand in hand with a reduction in spending as an approach to sound Federal financing. We are now within $1,000,000,000 of the statutory debt limit of $45,000,000,000, and if we keep on at the rate we have been spending, we will soon reach the limit. Our primary responsibility, as I see it, is to put a check on spending and to avoid contingent liabilities that might have the indirect effect of increasing our debt above the statutory limit.

According to my way of thinking it would not be safe to raise the present statutory debt limitation. The appropriations already made at this session are an increase of $300,000,000 above the Budget estimates and that, I think, is a danger signal, as there is a tradition in the appropriating branch of the Congress that it is not good practice for appropriations to exceed the Budget.

It is not my purpose to discuss the provisions of the pending bill at length, as that has been ably done by others, and I shall advert to only one additional phase of the problem before us, because I regard it as an untoward tendency which should be curbed. I refer to the appropriations we are making under the general guise of cultivating good will among the Latin American nations. While this sort of activity is prompted by benevolent motives, the conclusion is inescapable that Uncle Sam's leg is being pulled beyond all reason. The taxpayers of the United States have paid $2,000,000 up to date toward construction the Inter-American Highway through Central and South America. In some cases bridges have been built by our people even before the connecting sections of highway were constructed.

We have performed this service and paid the bills without any guaranty whatever of the use of the highway in case of emergency. If we should become involved in war with any European power over the Monroe Doctrine, any Latin American country through which passes the road that we have helped to build could shut us out of the use of the road. This is made clear on page 120 of the hearings which records the following colloquy:

Mr. LUDLOW. Have we reserved any right to use the highway in case of war?

Mr. MACDONALD (Public Roads Administrator). The road has not been built under any treaty agreement of any kind. There has simply been a convention that was adopted by those countries and congressional agreement to assist in building the road between the countries involved.

Mr. LUDLOW. We are putting money down there without knowing whether we could make use of the road in the event of an emergency.

Mr. MACDONALD. That, of course, is a matter of policy for the State Department to determine.

It was testified that we have an engineering personnel of 11 on this work—5 engineers and their assistants. A request that $100,000 more be made available for this purpose was put over by our subcommittee for consideration in connection with the regular bill.

It developed at the hearings that under the generous cloak of good will we are sending many experts into South America to instruct the people how to do this, that, and the other thing, and that very rarely, if ever, is there any reimbursement for these services by the country that benefits. The Department of Agriculture sent us an estimate of $130,000 to pay for an expedition of 31 persons into Latin America to conduct "biological and economic investigations of rubber, forestry, medicinal, and insecticidal, and other agricultural plants and products."

One of the details on the program of this expert service to be given free of charge to South America is to furnish instruction in raising rubber. To some of us it seemed rather incongruous that civil-service employees from the bureaus in Washington should be sent down to South America to instruct the natives on raising products indigenous to their own countries; and the following colloquy occurred between Mr. Leslie A. Wheeler, Chief of the Foreign Agricultural Service, and myself:

Mr. LUDLOW. Would it not be sending coals to Newcastle to send people down there to teach them how to raise rubber?

Mr. WHEELER. No, sir; I do not think so. They have done very little of it since 1910. They did produce it up until 1910.

Mr. LUDLOW. What do we know about raising rubber that they do not know?

Mr. WHEELER. They do not have technical people down there at all.

Without discounting the earnestness and good faith of those promoting this activity, it seemed to some of us that there was no justification for burdening the taxpayers of the United States with the expense of paying these good-will emissaries to perform services for South American countries which those countries ought to pay for themselves, or for which they should at the very least reimburse the United States. This sort of thing has gone so far that a jokesmith remarked that it may not be long until Uncle Sam will be sending an expert to Mexico to teach the Mexicans how to make hot tamales. The estimate of $130,000 provided for some high-paid personnel, including a principal agriculturist at $5,600 a year, three senior horticulturists at $4,600 a year each, two senior pathologists at $4,600 a year each, one senior engineer at $4,600, one senior forester at $4,600, one senior wood technologist at $4,600, and numerous others above $2,000 a year.

Our deficiencies subcommittee put this estimate over for consideration by the regular agricultural subcommittee, as we could not see in it any of the characteristics of a deficiency item.

We believe the bill we have brought to you is a good one; that it will inflict no undue hardships; and that in a small degree it will point the way to a sensible and reasonable retrenchment in governmental expenditures.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, this is neither the time nor the place for an extended statement. I believe everybody wants to go home. [Applause.] But I cannot help but make an observation with regard to the statement made by my distinguished colleague from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] for whom I have the highest regard, when he made reference to the solemn pledge that had been made to the farmers of America. Out of this Commodity Credit Corporation debate there comes to me one very gratifying thing, and that is that there has been a revival on the part of the Congress for the solemn pledges of the Government. I remember the day when the solemn pledge of the United States Government was lightly looked upon by the majority now in power. Well do I remember the day of repudiation and disregard for the solemn obligation and pledge of the United States Government. So I say it is most gratifying. It points to a better day when, within the heart and spirit and soul of this group, there is a revived regard for the pledges not only of the Congress but of the United States. I commend the majority for the new outlook and the new viewpoint that it lately expresses.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Agriculture has sent out an S. O. S. He and his farm program are in dire distress. His planned economy seems headed for the rocks unless his self-liquidating program for farm prosperity can be further subsidized by a gift from the taxpayers of $119,000,000. At least that is the prospect that he holds out in his letter of August 3, which is stamped for immediate release by the propaganda producers of the Department of Agriculture.

The purpose of the letter was to arouse public sympathy for the Commodity Credit Corporation, the concern that was created by the New Deal to give the farmers a fake prosperity, and which now wants $119,000,000 more to save it from bankruptcy. One sentence in that letter intrigued me. I refer to the closing sentence. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be charged with any possible misinterpretation, so I shall

read that sentence, word for word as the propaganda machine at the Department of Agriculture ground it out—ground it out to arouse sympathy, to create fear, to suggest calamity, and incidentally to influence public opinion and the action of the Congress. The letter is a fine specimen of letter lobbying by a department. That sentence, Mr. Speaker, reads as follows:

> I do not think it would be an exaggeration to say that inability to continue and make loans on agricultural commodities for the remainder of 1939 would be a national calamity.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that is a startling statement—a national calamity faces us unless we continue year in and year out to bail out the defunct Commodity Credit Corporation. The Secretary and his program of collectivism must certainly be in hot water to require a calamity howl of that kind. This voluntary confession is in marked contrast to the boastfulness of an earlier day when the alluring prospects of farm prosperity by a planned economy was held out as such a certainty that it was not even debatable. As Moses led the Children of Israel out of Egypt so Wallace was to lead the farmers to a new Canaan.

By his recent press release of a national calamity, it would seem the "New Caanan" has turned out to be a pawnbroker's paradise. All in all this latest product of the propaganda machine operated by the Department of Agriculture at the expense of the taxpayer is a complete confession of failure on the part of the New Deal to solve the farm problem. I have read that letter carefully, Mr. Speaker, and from the first word down to "sincerely yours," there is nothing to suggest the slightest solution other than lending the farmers money—putting them deeper into debt—by pledging and pawning their crops. That is the New Deal's panacea for the farmers; that is the net result of 6 years of spending and lending and borrowing, 6 years of promising, pretending, and procrastinating; a "national calamity" faces us unless the Department be permitted to continue its creation of an artificial prosperity. That is the whole thing in a nutshell. That is the nub of the whole matter. This confession, unadorned by fancy phrases or funny figures—and this press release is unique in this respect—is an acknowledgment that the New Deal's farm program, the much publicized and loudly proclaimed A. A. A., is just a flat failure. My, how the New Deal ghosts come back to haunt these loudly articulate apostles of a more abundant life when a confession of this kind is forced from them. My, how their pious professions and exaggerated promises must plague them at such a time as this. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we should be considerate of the feelings of the Secretary as he assumes an abject and suppliant attitude, seeking and pleading for another chance to fool the farmer. These ghosts must be hard things to live with. But the thing I am afraid of is that if we grant the prayer of his present plea, there will only be more ghosts to plague him next year. Try as I will to find some evidence that Wallace's wonders will work, I simply cannot find the most fragmentary bit of evidence pointing in that direction.

So in consideration of Mr. Wallace, not to mention the best interests of the farmers, I cannot bring myself to the place of advocating more money to make more ghosts to plague and frighten him. The sooner these ghosts are destroyed, the sooner his peace of mind will be restored.

But I am interested primarily, Mr. Speaker, in the best interests of the farmer. Pennsylvania boasts of a strong, sturdy, self-reliant agricultural population. Our farmers know more about farming than they do about borrowing and pawning. Taken as a whole they are practical and substantial. I have serious doubts as to their approval of pouring more money every year down a rat hole just to create a sense of artificial security in their minds. Security to them must be just as real as the reaper and binder is which they use at harvest time. And, what is true, Mr. Speaker, of the Pennsylvania farmer, is true in a large measure to most of the farmers of the country. Certainly they want good prices for farm products—prices in line with the energy and industry that they put into their work—and they are entitled to such prices. But, I contend, Mr. Speaker, that artificial price-pegging—perpetual pawning and borrowing—cannot establish such prices for them so long as a Secretary of Agriculture voluntarily admits that a "national calamity" faces us unless this defunct lending agency is put on its feet; that he has nothing to offer the farmer but a future of pawnbroker's paradise, which is certainly a future of futility and failure. Are we doing the farmer a real service by helping the Secretary carry on this masquerade of pretended prosperity? In the long run will it help or hinder the farmer by fooling him with a false sense of security? I cannot believe it.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that every false hope that we raise will make the final disclosures of reality all the more difficult and disappointing. False hopes never did a thing for anyone but cause heartache and aggravate disappointment. And that is just what the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation thus far have done—raised false hopes and nothing more. All the utopian dreams of the "brain trusters," all their economic theories—all their extravagant experiments, all their socialistic and communistic controls over crops—all these, the Secretary says point to a "national calamity," unless Uncle Sam continues to maintain a pawnbroker's establishment for the economic safety and security of the American farmer. At best that is a rather doleful outlook, especially when we look back on the dreams and theories and experiments and controls of the last 6 years.

Instead of this cry of wolf, Mr. Speaker, instead of this effort to arouse a hysteria of fear, I believe some assurance of a change of policy which would hold out some hope for the future would be vastly more encouraging. Has the administration any plan in mind which will restore a market for farm commodities rather than an enlarged lending agency? Should not the Congress have some specific and reasonable assurance that the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation is not likely to occur next year? Should not the Congress expect some suggestion that the disastrous results of the past operations of the administration's farm policy will be corrected? Should we not have some word that the administration intends a change in policy which will prevent the widespread importation of agricultural products from abroad? Should not the farmer have the assurance that something more hopeful, more encouraging is in store for him in the future than the prospect of borrowing money and pledging crops? Should not the taxpayer, who after all pays the bill, have some assurance that his pockets will not be picked in the future to pay the price of foolishness and failure?

On these points, Mr. Speaker, we find a strange silence, a silence that cannot help but be discouraging to the American farmer and to the American taxpayer. Many of us remember—how could we possibly forget—those halcyon days of the New Deal when the propaganda machines of every department ground out ream after ream of paper promises that utopian days were at hand. The farmer came in for his share and a very generous share at that, of these paper promises, and he has the right to expect some material result, other than borrowing and pledging, to come from those promises.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, if the conditions are as grave as the Secretary seeks to show, then he or the officers of the Commodity Credit Corporation should have brought home notice of the impending collapse of the corporation at an earlier date.

It is hardly in order at this late date to come with a plea that a "national calamity" faces us unless funds are provided for the lending agency. It would be much more to the point had the administration developed an agricultural program which would have been self-sustaining—an agricultural program which would not have depended on the pledging of crops by the farmers, and by the lending of money by Uncle Sam—an agricultural program that would not have required the pegging of prices or the creation of pretended prosperity—an agricultural program that would have provided markets for our crops and a coordinated domestic

economy that would have meant prosperity for all of our people. [Applause.]

I ask for the privilege of extending and revising my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] such time as he may desire. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate from the bottom of my heart this most cordial and kindly greeting of the House. The position of chairman of the great Appropriations Committee is a great honor and a great responsibility. The work of our committee has never been as hard and constant as it has been during every day of the last 7 months. But we have had such splendid teamwork and earnest cooperation among all of the 40 Members, regardless of politics, that it has been a pleasure for me to act as a general manager and supervise the many billions of dollars we have appropriated. I want to acknowledge publicly the wonderful support and help that has been given me by all. I have put practically all the detail hard work onto the younger members of the committee. I want to especially thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] for carrying most of the burdens that ordinarily would fall upon the chairman of the committee.

I am not going to make a speech. But I want you to know that I profoundly feel that this body is the real safeguard of our Republic. [Applause.] I feel that our Government needs defense from within as well as from without. In view of the harassing circumstances with which we are constantly surrounded I believe history will accord this session of the House of Representatives a very high degree of courage, good judgment, and genuine patriotism.

There are very dangerous, insidious tendencies at work in the world and in our Republic today that require the highest order of patriotic statesmanship. Regardless of the hazard to our political lives, I am confident the membership of this House will fully measure up to our duty and responsibility to our beloved democratic form of government. But I am not going to attempt to make a speech. I just want to thank you all for your uniform courtesy and kindness to the oldest man in the House; and as the father of this body I extend the hope that all of you young people will have a pleasant vacation and that we will all return here next January. [Applause.]

I thank you all.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein the statement that is usually made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations as to all the appropriations made by Congress during the present session, and to be permitted also to include therein the customary tabulations that go along with the statement of our appropriations for the fiscal year 1940.

May you all have a pleasant vacation. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the gentleman from Colorado is granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in connection with House Resolution 295 asking for an investigation of the reciprocal-trade policy of the administration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced House Resolution 295, which directs the House Committee on Agriculture to investigate the damage done to American producers of beef on account of the President's advocacy of Argentine canned beef. It will be remembered that on May 12, 1939, President Roosevelt said that Argentine canned beef is superior and cheaper than the product produced by the farmers of the United States. Since this statement was uttered the prices on meat products have fallen in this country, to the damage of American producers. My resolution also directs the committee to investigate the matter of excessive competitive imports of farm products and the effect of the reciprocal-trade program upon American producers. In view of the distressed condition of agriculture, I urge the Rules Committee to take action on this resolution today in order that the committee may immediately begin its investigation.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION APPROPRIATION

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said, we are glad that Congress is going to adjourn. It should be noted, however, that the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress has done nothing by way of constructive action to solve the agricultural problem, as it exists today, other than to appropriate money.

Farm prices are falling to new lows, and agricultural income is disappearing like a snowball on a hot day, despite the all-weather regimented program of the New Deal. Secretary Wallace said a few days ago that if he did not receive the $119,000,000 Commodity Credit appropriation, prices would go lower than they were in 1932.

I am pleased that the Appropriations Committee has included this $119,000,000 so as to save agricultural prices, although I feel that it will take many times this sum to maintain parity prices for the farmers of this country.

Secretary Wallace said to the press that if he did not get this appropriation, he would blame the Republicans in Congress for the low prices on farm products. The Secretary would like to get rid of the farm problem, because of falling prices and the complete failure of his program. He would like to put the blame on the Republicans for the failure of his program to work. He wants to "pass the buck", which has become quite customary for other New Deal leaders to do, when their fantastic schemes fail, after a great deal of damage has been done.

Nothing would please the Secretary better than the failure of this appropriation so that he could "pass the buck" to Congress, for the failure of his program and falling farm prices. We do not assume the responsibility, Mr. Secretary, and I am therefore urging all of my Republican colleagues, 168 in number, to vote unanimously for the $119,000,000 appropriation. [Applause.]

No program for American agriculture can long survive when it is wholly dependent upon Federal appropriations for its success. The present A. A. A. program will collapse when Federal funds are exhausted. That point has been, or soon will be reached, and then the farmers of this country will face a situation far worse than in 1932, or any other time.

Our job, as Representatives, should be to provide a sound and permanent program for the farmers of this country. I therefore urge upon the leadership of this House, that as soon as we return in January, immediate steps be taken to work out a sound program that will bring parity income to the farmers without the need for governmental appropriations. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the only reason I address the House at this time is because I realize that at this particular moment there are something like 1,062 ears open and listening to the voice of agriculture because this item is up for consideration. You will soon pack your baggage and automobiles and buy your tickets and be on your way home. I hope as you ride home you will commit yourselves to a program of assisting the Agriculture Department, the State Department, the Treasury Department, and the Bureau of Customs to put our house in order so that agricultural commodities may move out of this country to other countries and there be consumed before we meet again in January 1940. That is one way to solve your agricultural program—get the goods out of storage, get the goods out of the loan, and get them in use and into the stomachs of the people and animals who can eat them, because that is why they

are produced in the first place. This proposition is now open for negotiation. The Department of Agriculture is working on it. I hope that the Members of Congress and the people in the cotton States, the corn States, the peanut States, and all the other States will work to this end. Get these goods out of storage. Use this money, if you please, to help finance the movement of goods into consumption. This will do as much to solve your agricultural problem as anything else, and certainly more than lending more money on more goods to be stored. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, reversals of policy such as the House did in denying the $119,000,000 the other day serves to emphasize the difficulty of operating a planned economy within the framework of our form of government. We should bear in mind that the authoritarian state gave birth to planned economy. We should not expect, and I personally do not expect, it to operate with much of a degree of efficiency or efficacy. I hope my farmer friends will not expect too much from the Commodity Credit Corporation or the various legislative acts of Congress. The revolt of Congress, the response of Congress to pressure groups, the power of these groups to operate under democratic government, will undoubtedly prevent the smooth functioning and the necessary regimentation which planned economy must have if it is to show results. When you begin to unlock these goods from the warehouses, when they are repossessed by the original borrower—the farmer—and as they try to get back into the channels of trade, Government red tape will be encountered. Title papers must go along with the goods. Where government is involved for the protection of the taxpayer and in order to prevent scandals from developing, there must be much red tape. This all takes on the appearance of faulty and inefficient administration. If grouped with appearance, there is more or less actual fallacy and fault, then in the end we must expect serious trouble. The more we pattern after Europe in this economic planning, it seems to me, the greater will be the conflict with democracy, with civil, political, and other rights of our people. Necessarily, in my opinion, will all this interfere with free trade in our own country and contribute to less production, a lower standard of living for all our people, and greater opposition to the plans of the planners.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, now that the Congress has adopted a policy of economy and has failed to sanction the President's lending program by refusing to make appropriations to finance business by Government lending and there is an apparent shortage of money—liquid capital—it is time that the President exercise his authority to issue new money in the form of interest-free Treasury notes to meet the need of the country for liquid capital and supply the money function for all lines of business activity. The creation and circulation of this kind of money by our Government would relieve business and the people of this country of the interest load it now must pay for the use of the bulk of the national currency. If the President will exercise the authority given him by Congress to create and issue this form of currency it will stimulate business, raise prices, create profits that will increase the Government income from taxes and provide a much better way to supply the needed money to finance industry than the proposed "lending and spending" and Federal housing-lending program. Industry must have capital to employ labor. Business cannot function without money. Every day that our Government delays in providing the American people with an adequate, workable money system we are increasing the certainty of uncontrolled and disastrous inflation in the future. The President has the means to provide the money business needs—let him use it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on this bill may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is customary at the close of a session for the minority, whether they happen to be on the Democratic side or the Republican side, to call attention to the total expenditures for the session and deplore the reckless prodigality of the particular party which happens to be in power at the time, in the expenditure of public funds. That time-honored custom has just been duly observed with all the traditional fervor by the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who have viewed with appropriate alarm the profligate dissipation of public funds by a heedless and dissolute majority.

And, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations who, like my colleagues on the committee, has been bitterly excoriated because I was too parsimonious and roundly abused because I was too extravagant, I desire to enter a plea of confession and avoidance. As has been said by my distinguished friends from New York and Pennsylvania, the appropriations for this session have been large. But the need has been correspondingly large and the occasion for expenditure correspondingly imperative. Never before has a peacetime Congress been confronted with world conditions of the nature confronting us today. And seldom before, if ever, has any Committee on Appropriations been subjected to such exacting demands as those made on the Committee during the session closing this afternoon. We have devoted more time, more continuous attention, to consideration of the Budget estimates; have held longer hearings, dispatched more business, and have made a more earnest and consistent effort to enforce economy of administration and expenditure than in any comparable session of the Congress within my recollection.

But we are face to face with world conditions under which the elemental instinct of self-preservation requires expenditures in support of the Army and the Navy beyond anything heretofore undertaken in time of peace. It is this cost of preparedness which in the main has skyrocketed the 1940 appropriations to the totals criticized by the gentlemen of the minority, and I do not think there is a Member of Congress or any substantial group of American citizens who do not approve those expenditures.

Likewise, we are confronted with unprecedented economic conditions of such extent and duration as to constitute a more serious menace to the American people and American institutions than the constantly recurring alarms of war against which it has been necessary to wage as vigorously and expensive an offensive as if we had been invaded and were fighting in defense of our own soil. Under such conditions there have been times when we could not stop to count the cost.

However, even on matters of national expenditure there is much in the personal point of view. The poet writes of the "receding echo of the watchdog's deep-mouthed bay as he draws near home" and it may have been observed that the homilies of these two eminent watchdogs of the public funds frequently abated into receding echoes as the objects of expenditure drew near New York and Pittsburgh. [Laughter.]

But I heartily concur with the gentleman and others who have expressed gratification that the limelight is being focused on the agricultural question. It is the most important question before the American people today. National recovery and prosperity are inextricably dependent on its solution. And I agree with them that the mere expenditure of money will not permanently remedy the situation. Regardless of how much you lend the farmer, or how many subsidies you give him, as long as you leave the market price of his products below the cost of production you have merely deferred the inevitable day of reckoning. Unfortunately, gentlemen seem to have no solution. They offer no suggestion. They propose no alternative. They have no legislative program to increase farm prices. And until you increase farm prices, until you pass legislation which will give the farmer

as honest a wage for his labor as he must pay for the labor of those who serve him, you are not subsidizing the farmer. You are subsidizing labor and industry who eat his bread without paying for it.

The proposal in this bill to repeal indirectly the law under which the farmer may borrow money on his warehoused products by refusing to appropriate capital for the Commodity Credit Corporation is characteristic. The Secretary of Agriculture notified Congress and announced through the press that failure to make the appropriation would insure a return to 1932 prices for farm products.

In commenting on the proposal, Secretary Wallace said:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, August 4, 1939.

DEAR MR. CANNON: * * * The appropriation of $119,000,000 requested to restore the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation is vitally necessary to the success of the farm program. At present only $9,000,000 is available for new loans on agricultural commodities. This appropriation is neither for the purpose of embarking upon any new undertaking nor for financing any transactions other than those already authorized and directed by the Congress. Moreover, these funds would not be expended but would be used for making loans with farm commodities as collateral. In other words, the appropriation is merely to restore the capital of the Corporation in order that it may continue to carry out the program specifically assigned to it by existing legislation.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 makes it mandatory under certain circumstances for the Corporation to offer loans to producers of corn, wheat, and cotton. In accordance with this requirement, a loan program has already been announced with respect to the 1939 wheat crop. Wheat is now being marketed, and, largely as a result of the loan, the price of American wheat is very substantially above world prices. Unless the $119,000,000 appropriation is made, the wheat loan probably could not be continued through this season. If the loan on wheat should be discontinued, a precipitate drop in American wheat prices is almost certain to follow.

In the case of corn, arrangements for a loan normally would be made in September, and it is virtually certain that a loan on the 1939 crop will be mandatory. Moreover, if lack of funds should make it impossible to provide a loan on the 1939 corn crop, the effect would have widespread and disastrous results on the whole of agriculture. The extremely low corn prices which would follow such action would in turn bring about sharp reductions in prices of hogs, beef cattle, pork and dairy products, cottonseed, other feed grains, and fats and oils. Under conditions as they are at present, a loan on cotton is not mandatory. But inability to make such a loan through lack of funds could easily contribute to a price decline which would under ordinary circumstances make the loans mandatory.

During the past 6 years the Commodity Credit Corporation has made loans on these commodities: cotton, corn, wheat, butter, wool, mohair, tobacco, rosin, turpentine, figs, peanuts, rye, prunes, raisins, pecans, and hops.

The existing loans, and estimated commitments now outstanding, leave only $9,000,000 available to the Corporation for additional programs, including loans on the 1939 crops of corn, cotton, and several other commodities whose producers will undoubtedly be in serious need of loans this year.

In planting their crops this year the farmers naturally had reason to believe that at least all the loans which Congress made mandatory under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 would be made available. To fail to provide for these loans would be regarded by the producers, and rightly so, as a breach of faith.

It would appear difficult, if not impossible, for the Secretary of Agriculture to take responsibility for incurring additional commitments on loans, even though such loans are mandatory under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, if the Congress should fail to make the appropriations contemplated under the Commodity Credit Corporation Act to make such commitments secure. The Commodity Corporation Act of 1938 makes it clear that Congress must replenish the capital stock of commodity credit as of March 31 each year if it expects commodity credit to remain active. This view is substantiated by the hearings in the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on February 14 and February 21, at which time the Commodity Credit Corporation was severely criticized for making an emergency arrangement last year with Reconstruction Finance Corporation so that in case of need, it could make loans beyond its capital and authorized borrowing power. I do not believe that the Members of Congress expect or desire a Cabinet officer to take a responsibility that properly belongs to the Congress.

Abandonment of the farm loan programs would remove an important part of the entire farm program, cause a sharp decline in farm prices, seriously impair the credit resources of farmers, and greatly reduce their ability to pay outstanding debts to banks and Government agencies. The impact of such a blow to American agriculture could be expected to have repercussions on the economy of the entire Nation. I do not think it would be an exaggeration to say that inability to continue and make loans on agricultural commodities for the remainder of 1939 would be a national calamity.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. WALLACE, *Secretary.*

The position of the Department of Agriculture on the appropriation is warmly supported by the farm organizations. One of the most significant statements from that source is the following letter from the Farm Bureau:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., August 4, 1939.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The provision of the deficiency appropriation bill restoring $119,000,000 of the capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation is imperative if the Government of the United States is to discharge its commitments and obligations to millions of farmers throughout the country. Unless this full amount is approved by the House of Representatives, the Government will be unable to carry out its part of agreements entered into with the farmers, who have already discharged their part of the obligations by adjusting their production of basic crops as authorized by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Under the provisions of the Commodity Credit Act of 1938, the Corporation's capital is fixed at $100,000,000 and its maximum borrowing power on the credit of the United States is limited by the extent of its unimpaired capital. Consequently, the Commodity Credit Corporation lacks definite congressional authorization to make loans or guarantee loans made by banks to farmers.

Therefore it is respectfully urged that this provision, as adopted by the Senate, be approved by the House of Representatives without change, and thus enable the continuance of the commodity-loan programs to the extent of understandings and commitments made by the representatives of the Federal Government with the cooperating farmers throughout America. To do otherwise would be breaking faith with farmers and would weaken the confidence of farm people in the Government.

Sincerely yours,

EDW. A. O'NEAL, *President.*

I congratulate the committee and the House on the addition to the bill of the full Budget estimate of $119,000,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation. Until legislation is enacted assuring agriculture of its fair share of the national income it provides the farmer with facilities for orderly marketing and protects him from the market gluts which formerly operated in favor of the speculator at the farmer's expense.

The incident has served to focus attention on the steadily decreasing price of farm products.

It is well that Congress is leaving Washington with this problem ringing in its ears. And I trust after you have been back home, and rubbed shoulders with the people who are more interested in prosperity than in politics, you will come back next January with constructive suggestions and in frame of mind to cooperate in a just and practical solution of the problem you have discussed so interestingly this afternoon. The farmer is not asking primarily for loans or subsidies. If you will give him a decent wage for the 14 hours a day he works in rain and sun, through the heat of summer and the frost of winter—if you will give him a fair price for the food his patrons have been mooching at his expense ever since the war, you may keep your loans and subsidies so far as he is concerned. And until you do we can have no permanent economic progress in the Nation.

I join with the gentleman from New York in the laudable hope that we will all come back resolved to affect even greater economies in the administration of government. May I also express the hope that we will all come back after a pleasant and profitable sojourn among the home folk more than ever resolved to cooperate in support of measures recommended by the administration with a view to accelerating recovery and increasing the national income to a point where the amounts appropriated at this session of Congress will appear small in comparison. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAYBURN). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 296

Resolved, That ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP, of Georgia, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committees of the House of Representatives on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, Patents, Public Buildings and Grounds, and Revision of the Laws.

The resolution was agreed to.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have requested the privilege of addressing the House for a few moments at this time because we cannot present a sine die resolution immediately. Senator BARKLEY has made the request that this resolution not be presented at this time, and in view of the fact there are two important conference reports to be disposed of, that it be withheld until those two conference reports are disposed of by the Senate. Knowing that the last important business in the House was the adoption of the conference report on the deficiency bill, I make this statement, because I know that when we return after recess many of you will have gone.

Mr. Speaker, may I say to you that in the arduous and onerous position I have occupied, I thank you from the bottom of my heart for your manifold courtesies and kindnesses. [Applause.]

To my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader, I say the same. In matters of procedure he has been as fine as one occupying his position could be, and I tender to him my grateful thanks. [Applause.]

To each chairman of a committee in the House with whom I have had to deal, and I have been compelled to deal with all of them, may I say that you have been as helpful to me as it has been possible for you to be.

To each and every Member of the House on both sides of the aisle I can say without a moment's hesitation that you have all been fine and kind to me. You could have made this difficult position I occupy much more difficult if you had so desired.

We are leaving now. It has been a long, it has been a trying session. We go to our respective homes. I trust that whether you go to your homes or for the next few weeks to some place that may be quieter than a politician's home, the rest may refresh you, and that you will enjoy association with your people when you do get home. It is a fine thing for us to go back home and spend a few months each year refreshing ourselves by rubbing elbows with our own people.

As for myself, I shall at the earliest possible moment go to my country home on the broad prairies of Texas. If any of you drive the broad highway that passes the door, I hope you will stop and at least take salt with me. If you can remain overnight, there is room enough in that house to shelter and to bed more than two score of you, and I should like to have the rooms full of my colleagues very often. [Applause.]

I am going back under the roof where my father and mother lived. My father and mother were great folk. They did things in a big way. They raised eight boys and three girls to be grown. Eight of us are still living. Almost any Sunday you can look around that farm and see the five brothers and three sisters there, because we not only have a Scotch name but we are just a little clannish.

I want to go back with my own blood for a while and with my friends of a lifetime. I know I will have a good time. I know I will come back with enough vim and vigor next winter to carry me through 7 more long months.

I have had my disappointments, but I have had no heartaches. Men on that side of the aisle on controversial questions I expected to vote against the position I took when party matters were involved. My heart has not ached, but I have been disappointed many times when some Members on my side of the aisle did not see things exactly as I saw them; but I know that when they did not see things as I saw them, when in good conscience and believing that they represented the views of their constituents they cast a vote differently than I cast mine, they had no pleasure out of it, and that it really hurt them more than it hurt me.

To those who have stood by at all times—and a few of us have, of course, on everything—let me express my appreciation. To those who are advertised to be the recalcitrants, may I say that I have nothing in my heart against them; on the contrary, I have the finest feeling for them, because some of the best friends of my lifetime have been men on my side of the aisle who have not agreed with me on all things. I know they voted in conscience; I know they voted without hate, without spleen, and without venom, following the dictates of their judgment and voting as they thought their constituents would have them vote.

We live in a great country; the greatest on the face of the earth; the greatest that ever existed on the face of the earth. [Applause.]

I was here at a time when politics divided these two aisles; when there was division on the majority side in the days when the Republicans were in power as well as when the Democrats were in power. I have seen the Republican Party divided when they were in power. But I have never seen a time when the supreme test of patriotism and love of country above all other loyalties was presented to this House that Members of both parties did not rise unanimously to sustain the historic principles of this great Republic of yours and mine. [Applause.]

We live in an unhappy world. It has been unhappy for months past. I trust that when we go home to drink in inspiration from our own people we may rededicate ourselves to their service and will come back as determined as were the fathers who brought this mighty Republic into existence to maintain, perpetuate, and defend against all enemies, foreign and domestic, the great institutions that underlie this giant state.

For you and each of you throughout the days you are away from here it is my fervent prayer and my highest hope that you and yours may enjoy to the fullest measure the rich blessings of health, of prosperity, and of peace. [Applause.]

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a few moments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain, on behalf of the membership I am privileged to lead in this House, from expressing our appreciation of the fairness and the fine integrity with which you have upheld the great office of Speaker. [Applause.] It was, of course, to be expected from your notable past experience.

I am also delighted to pay tribute to the majority leader, Mr. RAYBURN, of Texas, one for whom I have the highest respect. His word is as good as his bond, and it has been a pleasure to cooperate with him. While we might differ on great fundamental principles, we are both interested in the welfare of the country and are anxious at all times to see that this House has an opportunity to express itself in a fair way. [Applause.]

Of course I thank my colleagues on the Republican side who have been so good and kind to me, as well as those on the majority side, who have paid to me every personal respect one could ask. While in this session of Congress we have had great battles which have divided us, I believe there has been less partisan spirit exhibited than in any Congress in recent years. We all come here with one purpose in mind. We, of course, do not always see the same way, but our common purpose has been in a constructive way to build up

our common country. That has been the motive which has actuated practically every Member. I thank you Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House for the courtesies that you have all extended to me. I hope each one will have a pleasant vacation and come back with renewed health, to continue the great work that is ahead of us. Everyone in this House, regardless of party, knows that constitutional government and democracy are both on trial. The welfare of the American people is at stake. We are called upon to intelligently grope with many tasks. We need this rest so we can come back and solve these problems intelligently and constructively. I repeat I wish for every Member of the House a happy vacation and a safe return in renewed health. [Applause, the Members rising.]

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a unanimous-consent request and ask that it be presented to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RAYBURN asks unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published, to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress: *Provided*, That quotations from reports of committees of Congress shall be from such reports only as have been submitted officially and printed as documents by order of the House, by law, or pursuant to the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. May I inquire of the gentleman from Texas why it was necessary for him to embody in that resolution the last proviso?

Mr. RAYBURN. In the first place, I do not think it is an unreasonable proviso, and, in the next place, I desire to get the unanimous-consent request through the House. I say to the gentleman from Illinois that nothing in the resolution has any reflection upon him, following the colloquy that happened here yesterday.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to ask for unanimous consent to embody in any remarks that I made any extracts from any committee report. I have enough evidence in the hearings of the Committee to Investigate Real Estate Bondholders' Reorganizations that are ready and shall be ready for those who desire to know the facts and truth as to the investigation of that committee. I shall comply with the many requests that have come to me, due to the advertising that has been given to the final report, and I shall supply the various institutions that have sought to obtain the final report, which has been temporarily suppressed by the parliamentary tactics of a few gentlemen in this House, with the hearings on which the report has been based. I want the gentlemen who have been trying to stop this report to know I appreciate the advertising they are giving the fine work of our committee. Their tactics are focusing public attention on our report and people will get the truth in spite of their activities, I am certain. At least, they will get it if I can help them.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE N. L. R. B.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House resolution 258, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee to Investigate the National Labor Relations Board, the following Members of the House: Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Mr. HEALEY, Mr. MURDOCK of Utah, Mr. HALLECK, and Mr. ROUTZOHN.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The Speaker laid before the House the following resignation which was read:

AUGUST 5, 1939.

Hon. W. B. BANKHEAD,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the special committee to investigate un-American activities, of the House of Representatives.

With expressions of my high regard and esteem, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR D. HEALEY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed without amendment to concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution to commemorate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the commencement of the first session of the Supreme Court of the United States; and

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution providing for the signing of enrolled bills notwithstanding the adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6635) entitled "An act to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3 and 4 to the bill (H. R. 5681) entitled "An act to authorize the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation to purchase and distribute surplus products of the fishing industry."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1540. An act to adjust the compensation of the members of the National Advisory Health Council not in the regular employment of the Government"; and

S. 1802. An act authorizing construction of water conservation and utilization projects in the Great Plains and arid and semiarid areas of the United States.

AMENDING ACT OF AUGUST 26, 1937

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 878) to amend the act of August 26, 1937.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a brief statement.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana to make an explanation of the bill.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill was referred to the committee and was amended by striking out "January 1, 1939", and inserting "February 1, 1940." Since we are about to adjourn, that would require this bill to go to conference. I have been requested by a majority of the Members on both sides of the aisle to make this request, and ask that the committee amendment be voted down, so that the bill can become law.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Reserving the right to object, to what subject matter does this bill refer?

Mr. DEROUEN. This has to do with the extension of certain prospecting permits on the public domain. This would extend those that have gone down to 2,000 feet up to January 1, 1939. That is, all those who have drilled one well or more would be exempted, and would be embodied in that. Therefore, it only does one thing: Instead of 1,000 feet we are taking those who have drilled to 2,000 feet. It was our understanding in the committee that we were

not to take up any oil bills, and I had promised many of the Members. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HORTON] and I have tried to carry that out. It is with his consent right now that I am acting in asking the committee to recede from that amendment. I have also spoken to all the Members on the minority side.

In order that the House may understand the entire matter in this bill I wish to read the departmental report which is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, March 14, 1939.

Hon. ALVA B. ADAMS,
Chairman, Committee on Public Lands and Surveys,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR ADAMS: By letter of January 25 you transmitted a copy of S. 878, entitled "A bill to amend the act of August 26, 1937," with request for a report on the bill for your committee.

The act of August 26, 1937 (50 Stat. 842), extended to December 31, 1939, the oil and gas prospecting permits outstanding on December 31, 1937, which on that date were within one or more of the classes designated in clauses (a) to (e), inclusive. The class of permits extended by clause (d) were those "under which at least one well shall have been drilled to a depth of not less than 2,000 feet subsequent to August 21, 1935." The bill would amend that clause to provide that at least one well shall have been drilled to a depth of not less than 1,000 feet subsequent to August 21, 1935, and prior to January 1, 1939.

Under the act of August 26, 1937, all permits not extended thereby to December 31, 1939, have ceased and terminated. The purpose of the bill seems to be to restore to life any of the terminated permits under which drilling of a well to a depth of not less than 1,000 feet had been done subsequent to the approval of the act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 674). As you know, that act changed the system of development of oil and gas resources in the public domain chiefly by providing for the issuance of leases instead of prospecting permits for unproven oil and gas lands.

The act of August 21, 1935, authorizes any permittee to exchange his permit, prior to its termination, for a lease under that act. All permits outstanding on December 31, 1937, which were not extended to December 31, 1939, by the act of August 26, 1937, were extended by departmental order to December 31, 1938. Between 4,000 and 5,000 permits terminated on December 31, 1938, and applications have been filed to exchange approximately 3,000 of these permits for leases. Any permittee whose permit terminated and who filed a timely application for exchange may begin or continue drilling on the land even before the lease is issued to him, so that his right to prospect the land is not denied or retarded by reason of the exchange of the permit for the lease.

The bill would favor a comparatively small number of permittees, whose permits were outstanding December 31, 1937, by lowering the standard requirement of 2,000 feet of drilling which was in effect throughout the existence of the permit system. The number of permits which would benefit if S. 878 is enacted is probably not more than 1 percent of all permits outstanding on December 31, 1937, or less than 100. Clause (d) of the act of August 26, 1937 (50 Stat. 842), is consistent with the original obligation assumed by the permittees who qualified thereunder, i. e., a requirement to drill on the permit lands to a depth of 2,000 feet during the initial 2-year term of the permit or during any extensions thereof theretofore granted. The procedure contemplated under S. 878 is not consistent with the standard requirement which obtained before the permit system was displaced. Moreover, 1,000 feet of drilling is wholly inconclusive as a bona fide test in the great majority of the structures found in the public-land States. Furthermore, the special privileges which would be extended to the small number of permittees who would be affected by S. 878 would be inequitable to the vast number of permittees whose permits were canceled for failure timely to meet the 2,000-foot-minimum drilling requirement during the 15-year period following 1920 when a special inducement of a 5-percent royalty was offered for the discovery of new oil and gas fields. Likewise, the extension of such privileges to this small group of permittees would be discriminatory against new applicants for oil and gas leases on the public lands who, since 1935, have not received any special reward for discovery of new oil or gas fields.

I therefore find no reason for the proposed amendment and recommend that the bill not be enacted.

The Bureau of the Budget, in response to a request from this Department, states that it has no objection to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,

E. K. BURLEW,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That clause (d) of the act of August 26, 1937, entitled "To provide for the extension of certain prospecting permits, and for other purposes", is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Under which at least one well shall have been drilled to a depth of not less than 2,000 feet subsequent to August 21, 1935, and prior to January 1, 1939."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "January 1, 1939" and insert "February 1, 1940."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the committee amendment will be rejected.

There was no objection, and the committee amendment was rejected.

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.

PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT FOR THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2868) to facilitate the procurement of aircraft for the national defense.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

VIRGIE B. WEAVER

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5515) for the relief of Virgie B. Weaver, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 5, after "act", insert *"Provided further,* That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] made a speech on the floor of the House. My purpose is not to discuss the general remarks of the gentleman, or the objective of his remarks, a resolution to investigate the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. But during the gentleman's remarks he made some reference to Mr. Le Hand, who is State manager of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; also to Mr. Fahey, who is Chairman of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. I know the gentleman from Illinois is a very fair gentleman. I know that the gentleman from Illinois would not intentionally make any misstatements. During his remarks the gentleman said that Mr. Le Hand conducted his office, in substance, from a political angle. I want to assure the gentleman from Illinois—and I think I am somewhat acquainted with Massachusetts' politics—that there is absolutely no foundation for that statement. As a matter of fact, some of our Democrats from Massachusetts have been rather critical of Mr. Le Hand for the fact that we felt proper consideration had not been given to our recommendations on personnel matters. But I do want to say that, as far as the conduct of his office is concerned, Mr. Le Hand has conducted himself in a very fair and in a very efficient manner. There has been no criticism of Mr. Le Hand in the conduct of his office. His associates have also been fair in the performance of their duties.

I know the gentleman relied upon others for his information. Also, during his remarks the gentleman said that Mr. Le Hand had no experience in loan and real-estate lines. As a matter of fact, Mr. Le Hand has had many years of experience in the real-estate and mortgage business. He was qualified to fill the position to which he was appointed, and his present responsible position, which he was promoted to because of his ability, which he so clearly evidenced.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] also made another statement, unintentionally, I am sure, but which is not a correct one, one that is inconsistent with the true facts. He

said that John H. Fahey, Chairman of the Board, was inferior politically to Mr. Le Hand, or words to that effect. I assume he meant by that that Mr. Le Hand dictated to him politically. As a matter of fact, Mr. Fahey—as every Member from Massachusetts, whether Republican or Democrat, knows—has had a very honorable career. Years ago he was a militant fighter without regard to politics, for decency in government. I remember him years ago as editor of a great newspaper in Worcester, Mass., fighting practically lone-handed against the nefarious practices of the power interests that then dominated the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

I have not always agreed with Mr. Fahey in his policies, but I have profound respect for him, and I know the gentleman from Illinois, who is fair, upon further study and investigation, will realize that the source from which he received his information in regard to Mr. Fahey and Mr. Le Hand is absolutely erroneous.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman would not object to an investigation by this body of the matters I spoke of with reference to his friends and these other agents, would he?

Mr. McCORMACK. Not if there was any justification for it; but the gentleman has not given one case in support of his statements. I do not believe in investigations unless they are necessary. As a matter of fact, we have too many investigations. The United States Senate has a number of investigations each year. They are now going to investigate the bankers, I understand. We would be better off if we let business alone. We would be better off not to have investigations unless the evidence is convincing, warranting the same, and that the investigation is necessary for the best interests of the people.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. I join enthusiastically in what the gentleman has said with regard to both Mr. Le Hand and Mr. Fahey. I have had a great deal of contact with both these gentlemen, and I can subscribe to everything the gentleman from Massachusetts has said. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute additional.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes. I would like to ask him some questions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, 30 seconds will be sufficient.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALTER). The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. My purpose was not to enter into any controversy with my friend from Illinois. I have profound respect for him and feel that he has been advised by misinformed people. I do know in his statements about Mr. Fahey and Mr. Le Hand, and which I have referred to, that he has been misinformed. I regard the gentleman from Illinois as a strong character, and I say that not flatteringly. He is a strong character, but strong characters frequently make more mistakes than those who are more inclined to investigate.

In this respect with reference to Mr. Fahey and with reference to Mr. Le Hand I assure my friend from Illinois that neither one of them is a politician. If any feelings of uneasiness have existed, none do now. It has been because they have not been politicians. While I have been somewhat critical of them in the past from personnel angles, I have profound respect for both of them as men who are performing their jobs in a very fine, excellent manner, and, after all, that is what counts.

Reference has been made to the fact that Mr. Le Hand is the brother of Miss Le Hand, a secretary of the President. If Miss Le Hand had anything to do with the appointment of her brother, what is wrong with that? He was qualified, and he is her brother. But the truth is that Miss Le Hand had absolutely nothing to do with Mr. Le Hand's appointment. Mr. Le Hand was first employed by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation at Boston as assistant State manager when men of his experience, ability, and honesty were greatly needed and without a suggestion from any source that he be employed. I am reliably informed that neither the President nor Mr. Le Hand's sister even knew of his connection with the organization until sometime after he had entered the employ of the Corporation. He was promoted to the position of State manager solely on his merits, a position which he has filled with great credit to himself and to the advantage of the Corporation.

Reference has been made to the fact that Mr. Fahey is executor and trustee of the Edward A. Filene estate in Boston. The late Edward Filene was one of the outstanding businessmen of the country and a great citizen. His progressive and humane viewpoint of life will always be remembered. The fact that a man like the late Edward A. Filene named Mr. Fahey to be an executor and trustee of his will and estate is the best evidence of the type of a man that John Fahey is. The performance of his duties in this connection will not interfere in any way with his duties as Chairman of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. John Fahey would not permit such a condition to exist. He is too honorable a man to do so. We, of Massachusetts, know John Fahey and what he has always stood for—honesty and decency in every walk of human endeavor, and in public life. He has always fought the fight of the weak and the oppressed. That was what he did, at great financial loss to himself, when he was editor of a large newspaper in Worcester, Mass., and that is what he will always do.

Reference has been made to the large number of loans made in Massachusetts, New Jersey, Connecticut, and New York. Politics has never been connected with any loan. The only time that I have ever contacted the Boston office on any loan was to urge that foreclosure proceedings be withheld, or some action taken that would enable a home owner to obtain easier arrangements so that his or her home might be saved from foreclosure. Consistent with the interests of the Government, on all such requests, which I gladly made, as fair consideration as possible has been extended. That is not politics—that is humaneness.

The figures of the Corporation show that the above States have not made a larger number of loans or accepted a larger number of mortgages than the country as a whole. The figures of applications received and loans closed for the country as a whole and for the above States are as follows:

	Applications received	Loans refinanced	Percent
United States	1,886,491	1,018,171	53.9
New York	157,872	80,145	50.7
New Jersey	81,920	36,339	44.3
Connecticut	22,327	10,281	46
Massachusetts	50,419	24,524	48.6

The situation in Massachusetts is best stated in a letter that I received from Mr. Fahey under date of July 14, 1939, long before my friend from Illinois had made his remarks on the floor, and which I include herein:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD,
Washington, July 14, 1939.

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. McCORMACK: We recently have received inquiries from a number of Members of the Congress regarding the operations of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, both nationally and in their own States. Believing that you will be interested, I therefore am attaching a brief, informal report as of December 31, 1938, which not only gives a picture of our current activities, but outlines the permanent contributions the Corporation has made to a broader and more secure home ownership. To supplement this report I am taking the liberty of presenting you with some interesting figures on your own State of Massachusetts.

The H. O. L. C. has refinanced 24,524 Massachusetts home owners to the extent of $112,286,546 since the beginning of its lending period, June 12, 1933. These Massachusetts borrowers, like all H. O. L. C. borrowers, were without private credit at the time; the average was 2 years delinquent in both principal and interest and between 2 and 3 years on taxes.

As of February 28, 1939, Massachusetts borrowers had repaid $11,808,000, or 10.5 percent, of their total principal indebtedness. Collections in March were 87.11 percent of billings. Five hundred and twenty-three Massachusetts borrowers have paid in $1,833,000 to settle their accounts in full; 7,729 others today are current or less than 3 months in arrears, while 2,758 more are in a liquidating class, meaning that they not only are meeting all current bills but, in addition, are making regular monthly payments on their arrearages.

This means that we now have 10,487 accounts in Massachusetts in a satisfactory condition, representing borrowers who clearly are on their way to debt-free home ownership. There are 7,285 other borrowers who are making adjusted payments sufficient to keep their accounts active and who are being given every assistance in their effort to rehabilitate themselves.

The H. O. L. C. now owns 4,901 homes in Massachusetts. It has sold 1,118 others. Of the homes it owns, and which are available to yield income, 87.4 percent are rented. Rental collections in February were 99.3 percent of billings.

These figures tell a story that we believe is a credit to both home owners and the manner in which they were assisted by the Government. They show that more than 74 percent of these almost hopeless home owners H. O. L. C. refinanced either have saved their homes, are almost certain to have them, or at least have a good chance—and only 29 percent are in the last category.

Included in the original loans made in Massachusetts were $2,868,000 for reconditioning and repair of homes to make them sound security, and about $7,400,396 for payment of delinquent taxes. Since the close of our lending period the Corporation has advanced an additional $3,179,000 for taxes, maintenance, insurance, and similar purposes to aid and protect borrowers. Further, $3,834,000 more has been spent on properties which the Corporation has acquired. Every dollar spent on reconditioning, of course, stimulated the construction industry and enhanced neighborhood values; the taxes we advanced provided needed revenue to Massachusetts communities and to the State.

The story of how the H. O. L. C. tried to serve the purpose for which it was established by the Congress is told in the attached national statement. Its constructive social purposes have been carried out in the State of Massachusetts to the best of our ability.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. FAHEY, *Chairman.*

I arose, to address the House in the closing minutes of this session, to advise the gentleman from Illinois of the misinformation he received, and in justice to two men, whom I respect; two men who are performing their duties in an efficient and honorable manner. [Applause.]

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

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

There was no objection.

ANNUAL CONVENTION OF YOUNG DEMOCRAT CLUBS OF AMERICA

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask your indulgence and the indulgence of the Members of the House to announce to the membership, both Republican and Democratic, that on next Wednesday there will commence in the city of Pittsburgh, in my congressional district, the annual convention of the Young Democrat Clubs of America.

I extend to all of you an invitation to be present on that occasion. If you visit my congressional district you will visit one of the busiest commercial districts in the entire country, and a district recognized as one of the art centers of America. You will visit a district that is known as the steel center of the world.

If you attend this convention you will be able to see some of the leading political figures of America. There will be in attendance some who aspire to be the next President of the United States.

I hope I may have the pleasure of greeting many Members of Congress personally at Pittsburgh at the convention of the Young Democrat Clubs of America commencing next Wednesday. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a former colleague, Mr. John O'Connor, of New York, written by him to Mr. Arthur Krock under date of August 5.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include therein a telegram I have just received from the Taylor County Agricultural Association relating to the restoration of the $119,000,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation, to be used by them in connection with making loans on agricultural products.

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

There was no objection.

The telegram referred to follows:

ABILENE, TEX., *August 4, 1939.*

CLYDE L. GARRETT,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Taylor County farmers vitally interested in loan features of Triple A and regret Congress struck out appropriation which would provide loans on cotton and wheat if same became necessary. Please express to your colleagues our disappointment in their actions.

TAYLOR COUNTY AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION,
J. WALTER HAMMOND, *President.*
E. D. THOMAS, *Secretary.*

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on June 19 of this year I introduced H. R. 6911, while at the same time Senator SHEPPARD, of Texas, introduced a companion bill (S. 2638), seeking to "extend eligibility for disabled emergency officers' retirement benefits to those disabled officers of the World War, otherwise entitled thereto, who failed to file application therefor within the time provided for in Public Law No. 506, approved May 24, 1928, Seventieth Congress."

This request is very similar to the one made in behalf of merchants who failed to file claims for refunds under the processing tax of the A. A. A. It was brought to the attention of this Congress that many people did not get their claims filed within the limits of the measure. Then Congress justly extended the time for these merchants to file their claims. For this action the Ways and Means Committee was congratulated from the floor of the House for their efforts to make equal the rights of all.

Under the same principle of equality I ask that the Members of the House consider the merits of this bill. Congress has seen the justness of helping these merchants who were unaware of the law or learned of their rights under the law only too late to file; and, in line with the foregoing, justice also demands that disabled emergency officers of the World War who did not know of their rights under the Tyson-Fitzgerald Act be given an opportunity to receive their retirement pay under bills H. R. 6911 and S. 2638.

No such bills as these would have been necessary had the original act been written like other similar bills. This act for the relief of emergency officers—unlike the one written for enlisted men—was the only one containing the clause limiting the filing period. Too, since the bill was enacted years after the war, these officers affected were scattered throughout the United States and the rest of the world. They knew nothing, or very little, about this law.

I know of one officer who has positive proof that he knew nothing of this law until after the benefits had expired. He was confined in a private hospital receiving treatment for disabilities he gained during the war in the service of his country.

The majority of the cases that will be affected by the passage of this legislation are of officers who lived in the country or in small towns and out of touch with veterans' organizations. However, I have seen affidavits made by service officers and post commanders of American Legion posts in Texas stating that "their posts knew nothing of this retirement act, nor did they receive application blanks or any other information regarding this act."

These veterans I speak for—disabled in the service of their country—are desperately in need of aid from their country. For to them that war is not over. In towns and villages of our Nation these men live their broken lives. These men who were the officers entrusted with the lives of our boys overseas are now denied their rights under the principles established by George Washington so many years ago, solely because they were not aware at the specified time that they might file for retirement benefits.

These men, equally justified to receive these benefits, are denied the same benefits that others are receiving. The late Congressman J. J. McSwain, writing to an officer of the World War suffering a service-connected disability, comments on the fact that he knows of another officer "who is in the same fix as you are—disabled for life—and drawing 100 percent total permanent disability." The officer neglected to file his application in time and so he is out. In like manner I have a number of very close, dear, personal friends who are in the same fix, and I have been compelled to advise them all that there was no chance.

From my district I can recite you the case history of an officer who was in France as a major of Artillery. His record is of the highest caliber. He fought through the war with honor and distinction. He and his fellow officers who would receive aid from my bill led their men in the most desperate fighting that the world has ever seen. Poison gas and the terrors of fields strung with barbed-wire entanglements and pocked from bursting shells and the rain of machine-gun fire was their arena of duty to their country. This particular officer was wounded, receiving now a small compensation for permanent disability. Today he is not physically able to work. Both his and his wife's savings are now gone. He is 58 years of age. Despite his attempts to remain in contact with the agencies of Government and the service organizations, he failed to file application for benefits because the law was unknown to him.

Clearly, under the laws of equality and justice, this officer and those like him should be allowed the right to place their applications. For every other service branch has received their rights to benefits.

Root of this discrimination goes far back in the history of our country's defense system. A similar complaint to the one that my bill seeks to remedy was made by the emergency officers of the War between the States. T. W. Harrison, one-time Congressman from Virginia, wrote:

> For years the Civil War officers have been clamoring at the doors of the Military Affairs Committee to be placed in the class of the Regular Army officers, and to remove any possible distinction against the new emergency officers. The language was inserted in the draft bill to remove the controversy. The language was very broad, and I have never understood how the War Department managed to evade it.

However, the War Department did manage to evade the language, and when the World War drew into its vortex the United States, emergency officers were not included in the Regular Army, despite the context of section 10 of the Selective Service Act of May 18, 1917, which states:

> That all officers and enlisted men of the forces herein provided for, other than the Regular Army, shall be in all respects upon the same footing as to pay, allowances, and pensions as officers and enlisted men of corresponding grades and length of service in the Regular Army.

The intent of Congress in this law which provided our World War forces is plain. It was construed not only as a promise but a contract with men entering the Army for the period of the war.

Later, under the Retirement Act of 1920, these emergency officers were excluded. It was not until 8 years later that the emergency officers were given the same justice that other branches of our defensive forces received. And in that bill they were subject to a limitation clause that was never inserted into the retirement acts of other branches. So the enactment of this bill—H. R. 6911—will not be a radical departure from custom but merely a correction of the original act to conform to the general wordage and force of retirement measures.

I would like also to answer an objection that has been made to extending the time. It has been said that such an action would increase the cost of Government since a recent report of the Veterans' Administration estimates the cost to be $344,500 for the fiscal year of 1940 and the addition of 380 officers to the rolls.

These figures are quite misleading standing alone. But certain deductions must be made from this sum when we consider the fact that practically all of this class of officers, now suffering disabilities, are now receiving compensation. When this deduction is made the figure is changed to only $59,975 for the fiscal year of 1940.

The difference in these two figures can be easily seen by the consideration of the following figures obtained from the Veterans' Administration. In a letter received by my office, dated July 12, 1939, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs stated:

> Number of emergency officers receiving World War service-connected disability compensation rated 30 percent or more (June 30, 1938) on permanent basis is 5,882. Approximate annual compensation, $4,404,156.

These figures render the average annual compensation per officer to be $748.75.

The Administrator, in a letter to the Honorable JOHN E. RANKIN, chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, dated June 6, 1939, estimated the costs that this bill would produce. Acting on the premise that the bill became law, he stated:

> It is estimated that the cost for the fiscal year 1940 would be $344,500 and would bring on the rolls approximately 380 emergency officers.

From this it can be seen that the annual average pay to each officer would be $906.58.

Therefore, from the foregoing statistical data and estimates as furnished by the Veterans' Administration, I find that the difference between the retirement pay of $906.58 per annum and compensation of $748.75 per annum is an increase of $157.83 per annum for each officer, and for the estimated 380 officers would mean an increased expenditure of $59,975.50 per annum to place these worthy officers on the retirement rolls.

Surely, ladies and gentlemen of the House, in view of the above facts, you can do nothing less than grant equal rights to these emergency officers and give them the consideration that they so richly deserve.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a decision of the Supreme Court relative to Indian Affairs.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the New York Sun.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a chart relative to the distribution of veterans throughout the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 6:22 p. m.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. J. Res. 381. Joint resolution providing funds for the maintenance and operation of the administrative office of the United States courts for the fiscal year 1940.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is

requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 375. Joint resolution to authorize the sale of surplus agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2973. An act for the relief of Inez Gillespie.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7462) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1939, and June 30, 1940, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4117) entitled "An act to provide for the payment of attorneys' fees from Osage tribal funds."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 181

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate, to join a similar committee appointed by the House of Representatives, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses, having completed the business of the present session, are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some further communication to make to them.

The message also announced that pursuant to the foregoing resolution the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. AUSTIN as members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following concurrent resolution in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 29

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, the 5th day of August 1939, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate concurrent Resolution 29.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 29

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring, That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday the 5th day of August 1939, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 297

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 375) to authorize the sale of surplus agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after "Corporation", strike out all down to and including "by" in line 6, and insert "with the approval of."

Page 2, line 19, after "selected", insert: "*Provided further*, That in case of a sale, settlement must be made within 60 days after delivery and not more than 500,000 bales of cotton shall be sold upon the terms and conditions provided in this joint resolution."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UMATILLA INDIAN RESERVATION, OREG.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4540) authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Oreg., and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 15, insert:

"SEC. 4. For the purpose of carrying into effect the land-purchase provision of this act, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to use so much as may be necessary of any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated pursuant to section 5 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984)."

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

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman believe that this amendment will be satisfactory to the Indian tribe involved?

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. The amendment is satisfactory. It does not hurt the bill. The amendment was inserted in the bill at the request of the Indian Office by Senator McNARY before he went away. I did not learn of this action until late tonight.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I wish to congratulate the gentleman. I think the gentleman should get first prize for getting Indian bills through this Congress. As a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs I wish to congratulate the gentleman and assure him I will not object to his request.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 29. An act to authorize the use of certain facilities of national parks and national monuments for elementary-school purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 161. An act granting an increase of pension to Grizelda Hull Hobson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 166. An act for the relief of Nathan Kaplan; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 310. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 419. An act for the relief of Luke A. Westenberger; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 538. An act for the relief of certain purchasers of lots in Harding town site, Florida; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 844. An act to simplify the accounts of the Treasurer of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1024. An act for the relief of Harriett Boswell, guardian of Betty Fisher; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1214. An act to provide for a more permanent tenure for persons carrying the mail on star routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

S. 1326. An act for the relief of Janet Hendel, nee Judith Shapiro; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 1510. An act for the relief of George Louis Artick; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 1638. An act for the relief of Thermal Syndicate, Ltd.; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 1643. An act to provide pensions at wartime rates for disability or death incurred in line of duty as a direct result of the conflict in the Far East; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1780. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire property for the Antietam Battlefield site in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1790. An act for the relief of the Eberhart Steel Products Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1870. An act for the relief of Dionis Moldowan; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 1962. An act granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to reopen and readjudicate the case of Carrie Howard Steedman and Eugenia Howard Edmunds; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2030. An act for the relief of Mira Friedberg (Mira Dworecka); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 2059. An act authorizing a grant to the city of Fargo, N. Dak., of an easement in connection with the construction of water and sewer systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2144. An act providing for the conveyance by the Secretary of the Navy of Lockwoods Basin, East Boston, Mass., to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2201. An act for the relief of Alabama Lewis Poole; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2209. An act for the relief of Earle Embrey; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2210. An act for the relief of the Merchants Distilling Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2212. An act to provide for the development of marketing and marketing services for farm commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2225. An act to create a new group within the Air Corps, Regular Army, with the designations of junior flight officer, flight officer, and senior flight officer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2270. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase refuge lands within the State of South Carolina for the perpetuation of the eastern wild turkey and to provide pure-blood brood stock for restocking within its native range, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2284. An act to amend the act of May 4, 1898 (30 Stat. 369), so as to authorize the President to appoint 100 acting assistant surgeons for temporary service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2295. An act authorizing the President to reappoint and honorably discharge David J. Sawyer, second lieutenant, National Army, as of May 11, 1919; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2299. An act for the relief of Hubert Richardson; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2419. An act for the relief of Walter J. Hogan and W. R. Larkin, in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2433. An act for the relief of Frank Casey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2448. An act to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

S. 2464. An act to amend the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 505), as amended (49 Stat. 1926; 34 U. S. C., Supp. IV, 496; sec. 14 of Public, No. 18, 76th Cong.), to adjust the limitations on the profits of certain contractors with the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2492. An act for the relief of Dane Goich; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 2496. An act for the relief of James E. Barry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2527. An act for the relief of Mary Nouhan; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 2529. An act for the relief of the Bell Grocery Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2531. An act for the relief of Stanley Falk, Howard Franklin, Mrs. Nathan Falk, and Rose Winter; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2560. An act for the relief of Marjorie Buchek; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2561. An act for the relief of Ina Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2572. An act for the relief of Anna M. Shea; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2578. An act to designate the lock and dam at Alton, Ill., as the Henry T. Rainey Dam; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

S. 2598. An act for the relief of Kurt Wessely; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 2608. An act authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Sgt. Samuel Woodfill a captain in the United States Army and then place him on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2609. An act to reimpose the trust on certain lands allotted to Indians of the Crow Tribe, Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 2625. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell or otherwise dispose of surplus animals inhabiting the national parks and national monuments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2627. An act to empower and authorize special agents and such other employees of the Division of Investigations, Department of the Interior as are designated by the Secretary of the Interior for that purpose, to administer oaths in the performance of their official duties; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2682. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide a special procedure for fixing minimum-wage rates for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Labor.

S. 2689. An act to amend section 33 of the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

S. 2712. An act to amend section 2803 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 2735. An act authorizing the issuance to Orville Wright of honorary aircraft pilot's certificate No. 1; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2756. An act relating to the funeral costs and transportation of bodies of certain deceased veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

S. 2798. An act for the relief of Charles H. Parr; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2843. An act granting easements on Indian lands of the Wind River or Shoshone Indian Reservation, Wyo., for dam site and reservoir purposes in connection with the Riverton reclamation project; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 2866. An act to provide for allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for examination and treatment; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

S. 2867. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., for right-of-way purposes, a small strip of land at Veterans' Administration facility, Coatesville, Pa.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

S. 2903. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution for the relief of Kam N. Kathju; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution providing for an investigation of the feasibility and desirability of fixing railroad rates

on the basis of zones; Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution making provisions for the refund of the processing tax on hogs marketed for slaughter by the raisers and producers who in fact bore all or part of the burden of such tax; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution authorizing the appointment of Harley B. Ferguson as a major general, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 139. An act to amend paragraph (1) of section 96 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code relating to method of computing annuities;

H. R. 377. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of Harry Bryan and Alda Duffield Mullins, and others";

H. R. 1428. An act for the relief of First Lt. Samuel E. Williams;

H. R. 1648. An act to provide for the refund or credit of the internal-revenue tax paid on spirits lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the floods of 1936 and 1937 where such spirits were in the possession of the original taxpayer or rectifier for bottling or use in rectification under Government supervision as provided by law and regulations;

H. R. 2049. An act for the relief of Olin C. Risinger;

H. R. 2096. An act for the relief of Lucile Snider and Cliff Snider, Jr.;

H. R. 2250. An act for the relief of Frank Malles, Jr.;

H. R. 2344. An act for the relief of James McConnachie;

H. R. 2363. An act for the relief of the estate of Harvey T. Combs;

H. R. 2440. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Smith;

H. R. 3122. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River near The Dalles, Oreg.;

H. R. 3156. An act for the relief of Anna E. Hurley;

H. R. 3172. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Fiske Warren;

H. R. 3676. An act for the relief of C. E. Hendrickson and Stephenville Hospital, Stephenville, Tex.;

H. R. 3689. An act for the relief of the Columbus Iron Works Co.;

H. R. 3853. An act for the relief of Floyd Elton;

H. R. 3927. An act for the relief of Marijo McMillan Williams;

H. R. 3933. An act for the relief of Otho L. Curtner;

H. R. 3959. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of recreational demonstration projects, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3962. An act for the relief of Grace Campbell;

H. R. 4033. An act for the relief of Albert R. Rinke;

H. R. 4062. An act for the relief of Clarendon Davis;

H. R. 4072. An act for the relief of Emmitt Courtney;

H. R. 4108. An act to provide for the transfer of United States Employment Service records, files, and property in local offices to the States;

H. R. 4117. An act to provide for the payment of attorney's fees from Osage tribal funds;

H. R. 4141. An act for the relief of Celia Press and Bernard Press;

H. R. 4252. An act for the relief of J. George Bensel Co.;

H. R. 4275. An act for the relief of Harry Vrountas and Theodore Vrountas;

H. R. 4300. An act for the relief of Anton Saganey, John J. Beatty, Frederick J. Coppenrath, Joseph R. Driscoll, Edward A. Morash, and Michael L. Siderowicz;

H. R. 4482. An act for the relief of Byron MacDonald;

H. R. 4540. An act authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Oreg., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4549. An act for the relief of William H. Radcliffe;

H. R. 4554. An act for the relief of Francis A. Leete and Sarah Leete;

H. R. 4601. An act for the relief of Paul W. McCoy;

H. R. 4606. An act for the relief of the Toledo Terminal Railroad Co., of Toledo, Ohio;

H. R. 4616. An act for the relief of M. F. Gubrud;

H. R. 4725. An act for the relief of William L. Rull;

H. R. 4726. An act for the relief of James W. Gilson;

H. R. 4831. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and interpreter of the Menominee general council, members of the Menominee advisory council, and official delegates of the Menominee Tribe;

H. R. 4872. An act to establish the Benjamin Harrison Commission to formulate plans for the construction of a permanent memorial to the memory of Benjamin Harrison, twenty-third President of the United States;

H. R. 4875. An act for the relief of Mamie Hoffman;

H. R. 4885. An act for the relief of James M. Harwood;

H. R. 4965. An act for the relief of J. Harry Walker;

H. R. 5115. An act for the relief of Harry W. Lyle;

H. R. 5129. An act authorizing and providing for the construction of additional facilities on the Canal Zone for the purposes of more adequately providing for the defense of the Panama Canal and for increasing its capacity for the future needs of interoceanic shipping;

H. R. 5259. An act for the relief of Mrs. Layer Taylor;

H. R. 5266. An act for the relief of Mina Keil;

H. R. 5333. An act to amend the acts granting increased compensation to civilian employees for the period July 1, 1917, to June 30, 1924;

H. R. 5338. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John Eckendorff and Mr. and Mrs. Alexander G. Dorr;

H. R. 5348. An act for the relief of certain postmasters;

H. R. 5350. An act for the relief of Caryl Burbank, Preston A. Stanford, and Fire Assoication of Philadelphia;

H. R. 5383. An act for the relief of H. A. Dixon;

H. R. 5405. An act authorizing the installation of parking meters and other devices on the streets of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5491. An act to pay salary of Ruth Dornsife;

H. R. 5506. An act 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.;

H. R. 5515. An act for the relief of Mrs. Virgie B. Weaver;

H. R. 5557. An act for the relief of V. H. Scheuring, Elmer Eggers, and Thomas Fahey;

H. R. 5607. An act for the relief of George A. Meffan, United States marshall, district of Idaho;

H. R. 5681. An act to authorize the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation to purchase and distribute surplus products of the fishing industry;

H. R. 5685. An act to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to define, regulate, and license real-estate brokers, business-chance brokers, and real-estate salesmen; to create a Real Estate Commission in the District of Columbia; to protect the public against fraud in real-estate transactions, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1937;

H. R. 5698. An act for the relief of H. H. Rhyne, Jr.;

H. R. 5704. An act to amend Private Law No. 310, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, an act for the relief of D. E. Sweinhart;

H. R. 5803. An act for the relief of Clyde Equipment Co.;

H. R. 5835. An act to authorize the President to render closer and more effective the relationship between the American republics;

H. R. 5845. An act to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the shore of North Carolina at or near Wrightsville Beach, New Hanover County;

H. R. 5857. An act to amend Private Act No. 286, approved June 18, 1934, entitled "An act for the relief of Carleton-Mace Engineering Corporation";

H. R. 5894. An act for the relief of John E. Garrett;

H. R. 5895. An act for the relief of James D. Larry, Sr.;

H. R. 5923. An act for the relief of Simon A. Brieger, as legal representative of the estate of Thomas Gerald Brieger, a deceased minor;

H. R. 5931. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Hessman;

H. R. 5951. An act for the relief of the heirs of Emma J. Hall;

H. R. 5953. An act for the relief of Marie Heinen;

H. R. 5998. An act to amend section 32 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to extend the times for commencing and/or completing the construction of other bridges over the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1935;

H. R. 6021. An act to repeal the minimum-price limitation on sale of the Akron, Ohio, old post-office building and site;

H. R. 6037. An act to amend section 194 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. L. 1088);

H. R. 6099. An act for the relief of Mrs. S. F. Sewell;

H. R. 6259. An act for the relief of Jack D. Collins;

H. R. 6271. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Secretary of the Interior, the State of Washington, and the Great Northern Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate either a combined highway and railroad bridge or two separate bridges across the Columbia River, at or near Kettle Falls, Wash.;

H. R. 6362. An act for the relief of Annie Bearden, Ruth Bearden, Essie Burton, Beatrice Carter, Mary Cobb, Addie Graham, Annie Grant, Sallie Harris, Minerva Holbrooks, Omie Keese, Sallie Marett, Josie McDonald, Jessie Morris, Martha O'Shields, Mae Phillips, Leila H. Roach, Belva Surrett, and Shelley Turner;

H. R. 6441. An act authorizing the county of St. Louis, State of Missouri, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River near Jefferson Barracks, Mo.;

H. R. 6490. An act for the relief of W. R. Fuchs, former disbursing clerk, Department of Agriculture; J. L. Summers, former disbursing clerk; and G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department;

H. R. 6491. An act for the relief of Roscoe B. Huston and Simeon F. Felarca;

H. R. 6492. An act for the relief of John L. Hicks, rural rehabilitation supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Department of Agriculture, Santa Rosa, N. Mex.;

H. R. 6635. An act to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6662. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Dauphin County (Pa.) Authority to construct, maintain, and operate a highway bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Harrisburg, Pa.;

H. R. 6728. An act for the relief of Stacy C. Mosser, receiver for the Great Northern Majestic Building Corporation;

H. R. 6805. An act for the relief of Sam E. Woods;

H. R. 6808. An act for the relief of Matilda Larned Bouck;

H. R. 6898. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain helpless and dependent children of veterans of the Civil War;

H. R. 6907. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Susquehanna River from the borough of Wyoming, in the county of Luzerne, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to Jenkins Township, county of Luzerne, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 6963. An act for the relief of Buford Lee Pratt;

H. R. 7049. An act for the relief of John L. Summers, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7096. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7132. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of the Playa de Flor Land & Improvement Co.," approved May 21, 1934;

H. R. 7262. An act granting the consent of Congress to Frank O. Lowden, James E. Gorman, and Joseph B. Fleming, trustees of the estate of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.;

H. R. 7389. An act to provide for the presentation of a medal to Rev. Francis X. Quinn in recognition of his valor in saving the lives of two of his fellow citizens;

H. R. 7462. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1939, and June 30, 1940, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 320. Joint resolution to amend Public Resolution No. 46, approved August 9, 1935, entitled "Joint resolution requesting the President to extend to the International Statistical Institute an invitation to hold its twenty-fourth session in the United States in 1939";

H. J. Res. 341. Joint resolution to dissolve the United States Supreme Court Building Commission;

H. J. Res. 375. Joint resolution to authorize the sale of surplus agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 381. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance and operation of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts for the fiscal year 1940.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 628. An act to allow the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to extend the period of amortization of home loans from 15 to 25 years;

S. 796. An act for relief of Mato, Miljenko, Bozo, and Augustin Cibilic, or Zibilch;

S. 878. An act to amend the act of August 26, 1937;

S. 1042. An act for the relief of the Epes Transportation Corporation;

S. 1269. An act for the relief of Emil Friedrich Dischleit;

S. 1538. An act for the relief of Konstantinos Dionysiou Antiohos (or Gus Pappas);

S. 1540. An act to adjust the compensation of the members of the National Advisory Health Council not in the regular employment of the Government;

S. 1617. An act for the relief of John Nicholas Chicouras;

S. 1654. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pacios Pijuan;

S. 1708. An act to amend the Employers' Liability Act;

S. 1802. An act authorizing construction of water conservation and utilization projects in the Great Plains and arid and semiarid areas of the United States;

S. 1815. An act for the relief of Evelyn Mary Locke;

S. 1911. An act for the relief of Daumit Tannaus Saleah (Dave Thomas);

S. 2046. An act to change the designations of the Abraham Lincoln National Park, in the State of Kentucky, and the Fort McHenry National Park, in the State of Maryland;

S. 2141. An act to authorize acquisition of complete title to the Puyallup Indian tribal school property at Tacoma, Wash., for Indian sanatorium purposes;

S. 2240. An act to provide for a national census of housing;

S. 2271. An act for the relief of Barnet Warren;

S. 2654. An act to amend subsection (n), section 77, of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, concerning payment of preferred claims;

S. 2745. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases;

S. 2778. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924;

S. 2779. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," known as the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, approved February 27, 1929;

S. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution readmitting Mary Cohen Bienvenu to citizenship;

S. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance for public use of certain highways in the Shenandoah National Park;

S. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution giving the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the States of Iowa and Missouri establishing a boundary between said States;

S. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution to amend Public Resolution No. 112, Seventy-fifth Congress; and

S. J. Res. 185. Joint resolution to authorize The Assistant Secretary of the Navy to continue to serve as Acting Secretary of the Navy until the appointment of a Secretary, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 139. An act to amend paragraph (1) of section 96 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code relating to method of computing annuities;

H. R. 377. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of Harry Bryan and Alda Duffield Mullins, and others";

H. R. 1428. An act for the relief of First Lt. Samuel E. Williams;

H. R. 1648. An act to provide for the refund or credit of the internal-revenue tax paid on spirits lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the floods of 1936 and 1937 where such spirits were in the possession of the original taxpayer or rectifier for bottling or use in rectification under Government supervision as provided by law and regulation;

H. R. 2049. An act for the relief of Olin C. Risinger;

H. R. 2096. An act for the relief of Lucile Snider and Cliff Snider, Jr.;

H. R. 2250. An act for the relief of Frank Malles, Jr.;

H. R. 2344. An act for the relief of James McConnachie;

H. R. 2363. An act for the relief of the estate of Harvey T. Combs;

H. R. 2440. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Smith;

H. R. 3122. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River near The Dalles, Oreg.;

H. R. 3156. An act for the relief of Anna E. Hurley;

H. R. 3172. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Fiske Warren;

H. R. 3676. An act for the relief of C. E. Hendrickson and the Stephenville Hospital, Stephenville, Tex.;

H. R. 3689. An act for the relief of the Columbus Iron Works Co.;

H. R. 3853. An act for the relief of Floyd Elton;

H. R. 3927. An act for the relief of Marijo McMillan Williams;

H. R. 3933. An act for the relief of Otho L. Curtner;

H. R. 3959. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of recreational demonstration projects, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3962. An act for the relief of Grace Campbell;

H. R. 4033. An act for the relief of Albert R. Rinke;

H. R. 4062. An act for the relief of Clarendon Davis;

H. R. 4072. An act for the relief of Emmitt Courtney;

H. R. 4108. An act to provide for the transfer of United States Employment Service records, files, and property in local offices to the States;

H. R. 4141. An act for the relief of Celia Press and Bernard Press;

H. R. 4252. An act for the relief of J. George Bensel Co.;

H. R. 4275. An act for the relief of Harry Vrountas and Theodore Vrountas;

H. R. 4300. An act for the relief of Anton Saganey, John J. Beatty, Frederick J. Coppenrath, Joseph R. Driscoll, Edward A. Morash, and Michael Siderowicz;

H. R. 4482. An act for the relief of Byron MacDonald;

H. R. 4549. An act for the relief of William H. Radcliffe;

H. R. 4554. An act for the relief of Francis A. Leete and Sarah Leete;

H. R. 4601. An act for the relief of Paul W. McCoy;

H. R. 4606. An act for the relief of the Toledo Terminal Railroad Co., of Toledo, Ohio;

H. R. 4616. An act for the relief of M. F. Gubrud;

H. R. 4725. An act for the relief of William L. Rull;

H. R. 4726. An act for the relief of James W. Gilson;

H. R. 4831. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and interpreter of the Menominee General Council, members of the Menominee Advisory Council, and official delegates of the Menominee Tribe;

H. R. 4872. An act to establish the Benjamin Harrison Commission to formulate plans for the construction of a permanent memorial to the memory of Benjamin Harrison, twenty-third President of the United States;

H. R. 4875. An act for the relief of Mamie Hoffman;

H. R. 4885. An act for the relief of James M. Harwood;

H. R. 4965. An act for the relief of J. Harry Walker;

H. R. 5115. An act for the relief of Harry W. Lyle;

H. R. 5129. An act authorizing and providing for the construction of additional facilities on the Canal Zone for the purposes of more adequately providing for the defense of the Panama Canal and for increasing its capacity for the future needs of interoceanic shipping;

H. R. 5259. An act for the relief of Mrs. Layer Taylor;

H. R. 5266. An act for the relief of Mina Keil;

H. R. 5333. An act to amend the acts granting increased compensation to civilian employees for the period July 1, 1917, to June 30, 1924;

H. R. 5338. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John Eckendorff and Mr. and Mrs. Alexander G. Dorr;

H. R. 5348. An act for the relief of certain postmasters;

H. R. 5350. An act for the relief of Caryl Burbank, Preston A. Stanford, and Fire Association of Philadelphia;

H. R. 5383. An act for the relief of H. A. Dixon;

H. R. 5405. An act authorizing the installation of parking meters and other devices on the streets of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5491. An act to pay salary of Ruth Dornsife;

H. R. 5506. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to constract 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.;

H. R. 5515. An act for the relief of Mrs. Virgie B. Weaver;

H. R. 5557. An act for the relief of V. H. Scheuring, Elmer Eggers, and Thomas Fahey;

H. R. 5607. An act for the relief of George A. Meffan, United States marshal, District of Idaho;

H. R. 5681. An act to authorize the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation to purchase and distribute surplus products of the fishing industry;

H. R. 5685. An act to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to define, regulate, and license real-estate brokers, business-chance brokers, and real-estate salesmen; to create a Real Estate Commission in the District of Columbia; to protect the public against fraud in real-estate transactions; and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1937;

H. R. 5698. An act for the relief of H. H. Rhyne, Jr.;

H. R. 5704. An act to amend Private Law No. 310, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, an act for the relief of D. E. Sweinhart;

H. R. 5803. An act for the relief of Clyde Equipment Company;

H. R. 5835. An act to authorize the President to render closer and more effective the relationship between the American republics;

H. R. 5845. An act to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the shore of North Carolina at or near Wrightsville Beach, New Hanover County;

H. R. 5857. An act to amend Private Act No. 286, approved June 18, 1934, entitled "An act for the relief of Carleton-Mace Engineering Corporation";

H. R. 5894. An act for the relief of John E. Garrett;

H. R. 5895. An act for the relief of James D. Larry, Sr.;

H. R. 5923. An act for the relief of Simon A. Brieger, as legal representative of the estate of Thomas Gerald Brieger, a deceased minor;

H. R. 5931. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Hessman;

H. R. 5951. An act for the relief of the heirs of Emma J. Hall;

H. R. 5953. An act for the relief of Marie Heinen;

H. R. 5998. An act to amend section 32 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to extend the times for commencing and/or completing the construction of other bridges over navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1935;

H. R. 6021. An act to repeal the minimum-price limitation on sale of the Akron, Ohio, old post-office building and site;

H. R. 6037. An act to amend section 194 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. L. 1088);

H. R. 6099. An act for the relief of Mrs. S. F. Sewell;

H. R. 6259. An act for the relief of Jack D. Collins;

H. R. 6271. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Secretary of the Interior, the State of Washington, and the Great Northern Railway Company to construct, maintain, and operate either a combined highway and railroad bridge or two separate bridges across the Columbia River, at or near Kettle Falls, Wash.;

H. R. 6362. An act for the relief of Annie Bearden, Ruth Bearden, Essie Burton, Beatrice Carter, Mary Cobb, Addie Graham, Annie Grant, Sallie Harris, Minerva Holbrooks, Omie Keese, Sallie Marett, Josie McDonald, Jessie Morris, Martha O'Shields, Mae Phillips, Leila H. Roach, Belva Surrett, and Shelley Turner;

H. R. 6441. An act authorizing the county of Saint Louis, State of Missouri, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River near Jefferson Barracks, Mo.;

H. R. 6490. An act for the relief of W. R. Fuchs, former disbursing clerk, Department of Agriculture; J. L. Summers, former disbursing clerk; and G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department;

H. R. 6491. An act for the relief of Roscoe B. Huston and Simeon F. Felarca;

H. R. 6492. An act for the relief of John L. Hicks, rural rehabilitation supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Department of Agriculture, Santa Rosa, N. Mex.;

H. R. 6635. An act to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6662. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Dauphin County, Pa., authority to construct, maintain, and operate a highway bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Harrisburg, Pa.;

H. R. 6728. An act for the relief of Stacy C. Mosser, receiver for the Great Northern Majestic Building Corporation;

H. R. 6805. An act for the relief of Sam E. Woods;

H. R. 6808. An act for the relief of Matilda Larned Bouck;

H. R. 6898. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain helpless and dependent children of veterans of the Civil War;

H. R. 6907. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Susquehanna River, from the borough of Wyoming, in the county of Luzerne, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to Jenkins township, county of Luzerne, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 6963. An act for the relief of Buford Lee Pratt;

H. R. 7049. An act for the relief of John L. Summers, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7096. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7132. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of the Playa de Flor Land & Improvement Co," approved May 21, 1934;

H. R. 7262. An act granting the consent of Congress to Frank O. Lowden, James E. Gorman, and Joseph B. Fleming, trustees of the estate of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.;

H. R. 7389. An act to provide for the presentation of a medal to Rev. Francis X. Quinn in recognition of his valor in saving the lives of two of his fellow citizens;

H. J. Res. 320. Joint resolution to amend Public Resolution No. 46, approved August 9, 1935, entitled "Joint resolution requesting the President to extend to the International Statistical Institute an invitation to hold its twenty-fourth session in the United States in 1939"; and

H. J. Res. 341. Joint resolution to dissolve the United States Supreme Court Building Commission.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to join with a committee of the Senate to inform the President that the Congress had completed its labors and was ready to adjourn, and to ask him if he had any other communications to make to the Congress, has performed that duty. The President has directed us to say that he has no further communications to make to the Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication from the President of the United States:

The Clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 5, 1939.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: At this time of the adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, will you be good enough to express to the Members of the House of Representatives my good wishes for a pleasant vacation?

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 29, the Chair declares the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress adjourned sine die.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned sine die.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on Monday, August 7, 1939, present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4117. An act to provide for the payment of attorney's fees from Osage tribal funds;

H. R. 4540. An act authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Oreg., and for other purposes;

H. R. 7462. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1939, and June 30, 1940, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 375. Joint resolution to authorize the sale of surplus agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 381. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance and operation of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts for the fiscal year 1940.

APPROVAL OF HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the final adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, notified the Clerk of the House of Representatives that he had approved acts and joint resolutions of the House, as follows:

On August 3, 1939:

H. R. 1996. An act to amend the National Stolen Property Act; and

H. R. 5144. An act to authorize the board of directors of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf to dedicate a portion of Mount Olivet Road NE. and to exchange certain lands with the Secretary of the Interior, to dispose of other lands, and for other purposes.

On August 4, 1939:

H. R. 5375. An act to promote nautical education, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6268. An act to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to make certain allowances for losses by leakage and evaporation upon withdrawal of packages of brandy or fruit spirits under certain conditions;

H. R. 6746. An act to amend certain provisions of the Merchant Marine and Shipping Acts, to further the development of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6984. An act to provide a feasible and comprehensive plan for the variable payment of construction charges on United States reclamation projects, to protect the investment of the United States in such projects, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 315. Joint resolution to provide for the adjudication by a commissioner of claims of American nationals against the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

On August 5, 1939:

H. R. 543. An act for the relief of Imogene Enley;

H. R. 1436. An act for the relief of William H. Keesey;

H. R. 2102. An act for the relief of Ada Fuller;

H. R. 2514. An act for the relief of G. E. Williams;

H. R. 2750. An act to prohibit the issuance and coinage of certain commemorative coins, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2875. An act to provide that pensions payable to the widows and orphans of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, or Philippine Insurrection shall be effective as of date of death of the veteran, if claim is filed within 1 year thereafter;

H. R. 3157. An act for the relief of Franklin Lopez, administrator of the goods, chattels, and credits which were of Alice C. Lopez, deceased;

H. R. 3337. An act for the relief of the estate of Arthur Weltner;

H. R. 3345. An act for the relief of the Ninety Six Oil Mill, of Ninety Six, S. C.;

H. R. 3569. An act for the relief of J. Aristide Lafevre;

H. R. 4008. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of Labor;

H. R. 4261. An act for the relief of the estate of Frank M. Smith;

H. R. 4264. An act for the relief of Corabell Wuensch, Jackie Lee Wuensch, and Mary Rainbolt;

H. R. 4306. An act to make the United States Coast Guard Academy library a public depository for Government publications;

H. R. 4434. An act to provide for the abatement of personal taxes from insolvent building associations in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 4609. An act for the relief of Charles Enslow;

H. R. 4732. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to George M. Corriveau;

H. R. 4733. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Laura T. Corriveau;

H. R. 4783. An act to provide a right-of-way;

H. R. 4847. An act for the relief of Leland J. Belding;

H. R. 5056. An act for the relief of Nicholas Contopoulos;

H. R. 5611. An act to amend section 9 of the act of July 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 817), entitled "An act to readjust the commissioned personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes";

H. R. 5912. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to permit Salt Lake City Utah, to construct and maintain certain roads, streets, and boulevards across the Fort Douglas Military Reservation;

H. R. 6114. An act to authorize postmasters within the Territory of Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6320. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the United States Naval Academy laundry;

H. R. 6405. An act authorizing the sale of certain real estate in the District of Columbia no longer required for public purposes;

H. R. 6585. An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government;

H. R. 6872. An act to amend sections 4886, 4887, 4920, and 4929 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, secs. 31, 32, 69, and 73);

H. R. 6873. An act to amend sections 4904, 4909, 4911, and 4915 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, secs. 52, 57, 59a, and 63);

H. R. 6875. An act to amend section 4903 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 51);

H. R. 6925. An act to waive the age limit for appointment as second lieutenant, Regular Army, of certain persons now on active duty with the Air Corps;

H. R. 7093. An act to provide for the rank and title of lieutenant general of the Regular Army;

H. R. 7263. An act to permit the importation free of duty of certain literature for distribution at the Golden Gate International Exposition of 1939;

H. R. 7288. An act to perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard by authorizing the commissioning, appointment, and enlistment in the Coast Guard of certain officers and employees of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution authorizing the Librarian of Congress to return to Williamsburg Lodge, No. 6, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Virginia, the original manuscript of the record of the proceedings of said lodge;

H. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure an oil portrait of former President Herbert Hoover;

H. J. Res. 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; and

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution providing that the farmers' market in blocks 354 and 355 in the District of Columbia shall not be used for other purposes.

On August 6, 1939:

H. R. 2883. An act to amend the Federal Firearms Act (Public, No. 785, 75th Cong.) so as to more adequately define the term "ammunition" as said term is defined in said act.

On August 7, 1939:

H. R. 777. An act for the relief of Banks Business College;

H. R. 1428. An act for the relief of First Lt. Samuel E. Williams;

H. R. 1875. An act for the relief of the Women's Board of Domestic Missions;

H. R. 2096. An act for the relief of Lucile Snider and Cliff Snider, Jr.;

H. R. 2178. An act to amend sections 6 and 7 of the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, Territory of Alaska, who are citizens of the United States," approved June 29, 1936;

H. R. 2250. An act for the relief of Frank Malles, Jr.;

H. R. 2344. An act for the relief of James McConnachie;

H. R. 2363. An act for the relief of the estate of Harvey T. Combs;

H. R. 2642. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, Territory of

Alaska, who are citizens of the United States," approved June 29, 1936, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2738. An act providing for the disposition of certain Klamath Indian tribal funds;

H. R. 2990. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1937, as amended;

H. R. 3025. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to reserve lands to the Territory of Alaska for educational uses, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214–15);

H. R. 3084. An act for the relief of Violet Dewey;

H. R. 3104. An act for the relief of Kyle Blair;

H. R. 3122. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River near The Dalles, Oreg.;

H. R. 3156. An act for the relief of Anna E. Hurley;

H. R. 3215. An act to amend the act of March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 536);

H. R. 3375. An act to authorize M. H. Gildow to construct a free, movable, pontoon footbridge across Muskingum River Canal at or near Beverly, Ohio;

H. R. 3676. An act for the relief of C. E. Hendrickson and the Stephenville Hospital, Stephenville, Tex.;

H. R. 3933. An act for the relief of Otho L. Curtner;

H. R. 3962. An act for the relief of Grace Campbell;

H. R. 4033. An act for the relief of Albert R. Rinke;

H. R. 4062. An act for the relief of Clarendon Davis;

H. R. 4085. An act for the relief of certain disbursing agents and employees of the Indian Service;

H. R. 4115. An act for the relief of W. C. and James Latane and Willie Johnson;

H. R. 4141. An act for the relief of Celia Press and Bernard Press;

H. R. 4275. An act for the relief of Harry Vrountas and Theodore Vrountas;

H. R. 4300. An act for the relief of Anton Saganey, John J. Beatty, Frederick J. Coppenrath, Joseph R. Driscoll, Edward A. Morash, and Michael L. Siderowicz;

H. R. 4606. An act for the relief of the Toledo Terminal Railroad Co., of Toledo, Ohio;

H. R. 4616. An act for the relief of M. F. Gubrud;

H. R. 4725. An act for the relief of William L. Rull;

H. R. 4875. An act for the relief of Mamie Hoffman;

H. R. 4983. An act to amend sections 712, 802, and 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relative to the requisitioning of vessels;

H. R. 5115. An act for the relief of Harry W. Lyle;

H. R. 5259. An act for the relief of Mrs. Layer Taylor;

H. R. 5266. An act for the relief of Mina Keil;

H. R. 5383. An act for the relief of H. A. Dixon;

H. R. 5557. An act for the relief of V. H. Scheuring, Elmer Eggers, and Thomas Fahey;

H. R. 5684. An act amending the act of Congress of June 25, 1938 (C. 710, 52 Stat. 1207), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and interpreter of the Klamath general council, members of the Klamath business committee, and other committees appointed by said Klamath general council; and official delegates of the Klamath Tribe;

H. R. 5698. An act for the relief of H. H. Rhyne, Jr.;

H. R. 5764. An act to provide for the establishment of a cemetery within the Crab Orchard Creek Dam project, Williamson County, Ill.;

H. R. 5775. An act for the relief of Michael M. Cohen;

H. R. 5803. An act for the relief of Clyde Equipment Co.;

H. R. 5845. An act to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the shore of North Carolina at or near Wrightsville Beach, New Hanover County;

H. R. 5894. An act for the relief of John E. Garrett;

H. R. 5895. An act for the relief of James D. Larry, Sr.;

H. R. 5951. An act for the relief of the heirs of Emma J. Hall;

H. R. 5988. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938 (Public Law No. 583, 75th Cong., 3d sess.);

H. R. 6037. An act to amend section 194 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. L. 1088);

H. R. 6049. An act authorizing the village of Cassville, Wis., or its assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Cassville, Wis., and to a place at or near the village of Guttenberg, Iowa;

H. R. 6271. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Secretary of the Interior, the State of Washington, and the Great Northern Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate either a combined highway and railroad bridge or two separate bridges across the Columbia River, at or near Kettle Falls, Wash.;

H. R. 6273. An act to exempt certain motorboats from the operation of sections 4 and 6 of the Motor Boat Act of June 9, 1910, and from certain other acts of Congress, and to provide that certain motorboats shall not be required to carry on board copies of the pilot rules;

H. R. 6353. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Connecticut, acting by and through any agency or commission thereof, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Connecticut River at or near Hartford, Conn.;

H. R. 6362. An act for the relief of Annie Bearden, Ruth Bearden, Essie Burton, Beatrice Carter, Mary Cobb, Addie Graham, Annie Grant, Sallie Harris, Minerva Holbrooks, Omie Keese, Sallie Marett, Josie McDonald, Jessie Morris, Martha O'Shields, Mae Phillips, Leila H. Roach, Belva Surrett, and Shelley Turner;

H. R. 6441. An act authorizing the county of St. Louis, State of Missouri, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River near Jefferson Barracks, Mo.;

H. R. 6475. An act to authorize the city of Duluth, in the State of Minnesota, to construct a toll bridge across the St. Louis River, between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6479. An act amending section 2857 of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 6491. An act for the relief of Roscoe B. Huston and Simeon F. Felarca;

H. R. 6538. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938;

H. R. 6539. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938;

H. R. 6540. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938;

H. R. 6541. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938;

H. R. 6555. An act to amend the act of March 28, 1928 (45 Stat. 374), as amended, relating to the advance of funds in connection with the enforcement of acts relating to narcotic drugs, so as to permit such advances in connection with the enforcement of the Marihuana Tax Act of 1937, and to permit advances of funds in connection with the enforcement of the customs laws;

H. R. 6662. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Dauphin County (Pa.) Authority to construct, maintain, and operate a highway bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Harrisburg, Pa.;

H. R. 6878. An act to amend section 4894 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 37);

H. R. 6907. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Susquehanna River, from the borough of Wyoming, in the county of Luzerne, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to Jenkins Township, county of Luzerne, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 6963. An act for the relief of Buford Lee Pratt;

H. R. 7089. An act to provide for the presentation of a medal to Howard Hughes in recognition of his achievements in advancing the science of aviation;

H. R. 7096. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes";

H. R. 7262. An act granting the consent of Congress to Frank O. Lowden, James E. Gorman, and Joseph B. Fleming,

trustees of the estate of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.;

H. R. 7320. An act to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1939, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 320. Joint resolution to amend Public Resolution No. 46, approved August 9, 1935, entitled "Joint resolution requesting the President to extend to the International Statistical Institute an invitation to hold its twenty-fourth session in the United States in 1939"; and

H. J. Res. 341. Joint resolution to dissolve the United States Supreme Court Building Commission.

On August 9, 1939:

H. R. 2346. An act for the relief of Virgil Kuehl, a minor;

H. R. 2971. An act for the relief of certain Indians of the Winnebago Agency;

H. R. 3224. An act 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.;

H. R. 3795. An act to provide a right-of-way through the Chilkoot Barracks Military Reservation, Alaska;

H. R. 4100. An act to amend the naturalization laws in relation to an alien previously lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence and who is temporarily absent from the United States solely in his or her capacity as a regularly ordained clergyman or representative of a recognized religious denomination or religious organization existing in the United States;

H. R. 4322. An act giving clerks in the Railway Mail Service the benefit of holiday known as Armistice Day;

H. R. 4549. An act for the relief of William H. Radcliffe;

H. R. 4554. An act for the relief of Francis A. Leete and Sarah Leete;

H. R. 4601. An act for the relief of Paul W. McCoy;

H. R. 4638. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare plans for the eradication and control of the pink bollworm, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4726. An act for the relief of James W. Gilson;

H. R. 4784. An act to provide a right-of-way (to the Atlantic Refining Co. for oil pipe lines across the Fort Mifflin Military Reservation, Pa.);

H. R. 4872. An act to establish the Benjamin Harrison Commission to formulate plans for the construction of a permanent memorial to the memory of Benjamin Harrison, twenty-third President of the United States;

H. R. 4885. An act for the relief of James M. Harwood;

H. R. 4938. An act to amend the act approved June 26, 1935, entitled "An act to create a national memorial military park at and in the vicinity of Kennesaw Mountain in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes";

H. R. 5625. An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in seeds; to require labeling and to prevent misrepresentation of seeds in interstate commerce; to require certain standards with respect to certain imported seeds; and for other purposes;

H. R. 5835. An act to authorize the President to render closer and more effective the relationship between the American republics;

H. R. 6021. An act to repeal the minimum-price limitation on sale of the Akron, Ohio, old post-office building and site;

H. R. 6259. An act for the relief of Jack D. Collins;

H. R. 6556. An act to provide for the seizure and forfeiture of vessels, vehicles, and aircraft used to transport narcotic drugs, firearms, and counterfeit coins, obligations, securities, and paraphernalia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6641. An act for the relief of the Arkansas State Penitentiary;

H. R. 6874. An act to repeal section 4897 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 38), and amend sections 4885 and 4934 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, secs. 41 and 78);

H. R. 7086. An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7462. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1939, and June 30, 1940, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution authorizing the selection of a site and the erection thereon of the Columbian Fountain in Washington, D. C.

On August 10, 1939:

H. R. 139. An act to amend paragraph (1) of section 96 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code relating to method of computing annuities;

H. R. 377. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of Harry Bryan and Alda Duffield Mullins, and others";

H. R. 875. An act for the relief of Okie May Fegley;

H. R. 2452. An act for the relief of George Slade;

H. R. 2610. An act for the relief of G. W. Netterville;

H. R. 2752. An act to include within the Kaniksu National Forest certain lands owned or in course of acquisition by the United States;

H. R. 3172. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Fiske Warren;

H. R. 3409. An act to amend the act of June 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1516), authorizing the extension of the boundaries of the Hot Springs National Park, in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3853. An act for the relief of Floyd Elton;

H. R. 4072. An act for the relief of Emmitt Courtney;

H. R. 4260. An act for the relief of J. Milton Sweney;

H. R. 4540. An act authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Oreg., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4742. An act to provide for the establishment of the Chalmette National Historical Park in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4965. An act for the relief of J. Harry Walker;

H. R. 4998. An act to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921;

H. R. 5333. An act to amend the acts granting increased compensation to civilian employees for the period July 1, 1917, to June 30, 1924;

H. R. 5338. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John Eckendorff and Mrs. Alexander G. Dorr;

H. R. 5348. An act for the relief of certain postmasters;

H. R. 5607. An act for the relief of George A. Meffan, United States marshal, district of Idaho;

H. R. 5685. An act to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to define, regulate, and license real-estate brokers, business-chance brokers, and real-estate salesmen; to create a real-estate commission in the District of Columbia; to protect the public against fraud in real-estate transactions; and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1937;

H. R. 6099. An act for the relief of Mrs. S. F. Sewell;

H. R. 6435. An act to authorize cancelation of deportation in the case of Louise Wohl;

H. R. 6490. An act for the relief of W. R. Fuchs, former disbursing clerk, Department of Agriculture; J. L. Summers, former disbursing clerk; and G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department;

H. R. 6546. An act for the relief of Benno von Mayrhauser and Oskar von Mayrhauser;

H. R. 6614. An act to amend the Government Losses in Shipment Act;

H. R. 6635. An act to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6664. An act to admit the American-owned barges *Prari* and *Palpa* to American registry and to permit their use in coastwise trade;

H. R. 6728. An act for the relief of Stacy C. Mosser, receiver for the Great Northern Majestic Building Corporation;

H. R. 6747. An act relating to the retirement of employees to whom the provisions of section 6 of the act approved June 20, 1918 (40 Stat. 608; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 33, sec. 763), as amended, apply;

H. R. 6805. An act for the relief of Sam E. Woods;

H. R. 6803. An act for the relief of Matilda Larned Bouck;

H. R. 7049. An act for the relief of John L. Summers, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7090. An act to amend section 4488 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 46, sec. 481);

H. R. 7091. An act to amend section 4471 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 46, sec. 464);

H. R. 7132. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of the Playa de Flor Land & Improvement Co.," approved May 21, 1934;

H. R. 7389. An act to provide for the presentation of a medal to Rev. Francis X. Quinn in recognition of his valor in saving the lives of two of his fellow citizens;

H. J. Res. 272. An act to provide for the observance and celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the settlement of the city of Gallipolis, Ohio; and

H. J. Res. 381. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance and operation of the administrative office of the United States courts for the fiscal year 1940.

On August 11, 1939:

H. R. 1648. An act to provide for the refund or credit of the internal-revenue tax paid on spirits lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the floods of 1936 and 1937 where such spirits were in possession of the original taxpayer or rectifier for bottling or use in rectification, under Government supervision, as provided by law and regulations;

H. R. 1693. An act to confer jurisdiction on the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood at or near Bean Lake in Platte County, and Sugar Lake in Buchanan County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934;

H. R. 2440. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Smith;

H. R. 3689. An act for the relief of the Columbus Iron Works Co.;

H. R. 4108. An act to provide for the transfer of United States Employment Service records, files, and property in local offices to the States;

H. R. 5129. An act authorizing and providing for the construction of additional facilities on the Canal Zone for the purposes of more adequately providing for the defense of the Panama Canal and for increasing its capacity for the future needs of interoceanic shipping;

H. R. 5350. An act for the relief of Caryl Burbank, Preston A. Stanford, and Fire Association of Philadelphia;

H. R. 5491. An act to pay salary of Ruth Dornsife;

H. R. 5506. An act 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.;

H. R. 5515. An act for the relief of Mrs. Virgie B. Weaver;

H. R. 5681. An act to authorize the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation to purchase and distribute surplus products of the fishing industry;

H. R. 5704. An act to amend Private Law No. 310, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, an act for the relief of D. E. Sweinhart;

H. R. 5747. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Wenatchee National Forest;

H. R. 5857. An act to amend Private Act No. 286, approved June 18, 1934, entitled "An act for the relief of Carleton-Mace Engineering Corporation";

H. R. 6266. An act providing for the incorporation of certain persons as Group Hospitalization, Inc.;

H. R. 6492. An act for the relief of John L. Hicks, rural rehabilitation supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Department of Agriculture, Santa Rosa, N. Mex.;

H. R. 6634. An act amending previous flood-control acts, and authorizing certain preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution authorizing the delegation of certain authority within the Department of Agriculture; and

H. J. Res. 375. Joint resolution to authorize the sale of surplus agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

DISAPPROVAL OF HOUSE BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the final adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, transmitted to the Clerk of the House of Representatives a list of House bills and a joint resolution disapproved by him, with his reasons for such action, as follows:

On August 7, 1939:

H. R. 1881. I have withheld my approval of H. R. 1881, Seventy-sixth Congress, An act for the relief of Anne Boice.

Section 2 (a) of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended (38 U. S. C. 592), provides, in part, as follows:

> The term "veterans" includes any individual, a member of the military or naval forces of the United States at any time after April 5, 1917, and before November 12, 1918; but does not include (1) any individual at any time during such period or thereafter separated from such forces under other than honorable conditions, * * *.

The records of the War Department indicate that Leonard Theodore Boice was separated from the military service August 10, 1918, under other than honorable conditions. Approval of the bill, therefore, would have the effect of making eligible for adjusted-compensation benefits the widow of this veteran notwithstanding the requirements of the aforesaid section 2, thus discriminating against other cases similarly situated where claims for benefits have been or would be denied on account of the character of the veteran's discharge.

This case has received sympathetic consideration but no facts or circumstances have been found which would warrant singling it out for preferential treatment.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 7, 1939.*

H. R. 2049. I have withheld my approval of H. R. 2049, an act for the relief of Olin C. Risinger.

This bill is based upon the act of December 17, 1919, which provides, in the event of death, not the result of his own misconduct, of an enlisted man in the Regular Army, for payment to his widow, child, or children, or, if there be none of these, to any other dependent relative previously designated by the decedent, a gratuity in a sum equal to 6 months' pay at the rate received at time of death.

It appears that Fred Risinger, Army serial number 6266309, at his enlistment August 22, 1935, designated as his beneficiary under the act above cited, Quilla Oswald, mother, General Delivery, Batesburg, S. C. He died December 26, 1935, in line of duty and not as a result of any misconduct. Upon his death a voucher to cover payment of the gratuity, in the sum of $126, was sent to "Quilla Oswald, General Delivery, Batesburg, S. C.," and was returned unclaimed. Subsequently it was learned that Quilla Oswald was the maiden name of Fred Risinger's mother, and that she had died in 1916.

I accept the assumption set forth in the report of the House Committee on Claims that the designation by Fred Risinger of his long-deceased mother as beneficiary was simply an error by a confused or excited country boy. Nevertheless, during his short period of Army service, Fred Risinger made no contribution through the Army allotment system to any one person, and there is no evidence that Olin C. Risinger, his father, was in any degree dependent upon him for support.

In view of these circumstances, Olin C. Risinger appears in no way to qualify as a proper recipient of this gratuity, and I do not feel that I should be justified in approving this bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 7, 1939.*

H. R. 5516. I have withheld approval of H. R. 5516, an act for the relief of Charlotte E. Hunter.

The purpose of the bill is to place Miss Hunter, a former teacher in the public schools of the District of Columbia, on the list of retired teachers, and to pay her, from the teachers' retirement fund, an annuity computed as provided by existing law relating to retirement of teachers in the District of Columbia public schools.

This teacher entered the service on February 5, 1895, and her service was terminated by voluntary resignation on April 12, 1919, prior to the establishment of a retirement system for District teachers by the Teachers' Retirement Act of January 15, 1920, which became effective on March 1, 1920.

The report on this bill, made by the District Commissioners to the chairman of the House District Committee, states that there are a number of former teachers now living in the District of Columbia who are in the same position as Miss Hunter, in that they retired from the service prior to the passage of the Teachers' Retirement Act, have not contributed to the teachers' retirement fund, and are not, therefore, entitled to retirement benefits. There are likewise other former employees of the District, as well as the Federal Government, who resigned prior to the establishment of a retirement system for such employees, and are, therefore, excluded from retirement benefits.

In spite of the apparently excellent service record of the employee in this case, I do not feel that I would be justified in approving a bill which would single her out for preferred consideration to the exclusion of other cases of a similar character.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 7, 1939.*

H. R. 5923. I have withheld my approval from H. R. 5923, a bill for the relief of Simon A. Brieger as legal representative of the estate of Thomas Gerald Brieger, a deceased minor.

The bill provides for the payment of $5,000 in full settlement of a claim against the United States on account of the death of a 4-year-old child. While I do not think that the record in the case establishes any high degree of negligence on the part of the employee who was driving the truck, my main objection to the bill is what I consider the excessive amount of the proposed settlement.

I have before me H. R. 5259, for the relief of Mrs. Layer Taylor, in settlement of her claim against the United States for the death of an 18-year-old son. The amount involved in that claim is $1,360. The Congress estimated the probable loss of income for a period of 3 years, and made an allowance for medical and funeral expenses and for mental suffering and loss of companionship. It seems to me that the Congress adjudicated this claim on an equitable basis.

In another bill now before me, H. R. 5698, for the relief of H. H. Rhyne, Jr., the sum of $3,000 is provided in settlement for the death of his 9-year-old daughter.

In these circumstances, I consider the proposed settlement of $5,000 for the death of the 4-year-old son of Mr. Brieger as excessive, and therefore feel constrained to withhold approval of this bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 7, 1939.*

H. R. 6899. I have withheld my approval of H. R. 6899, Seventy-sixth Congress, an act granting pensions to certain veterans of the Civil War.

This bill provides:

> That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension rolls, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—
>
> The name of Alfred Daugherty, late of Capt. Richard F. Taylor's Company C, Middle Green River Battalion, Kentucky State Troops, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.
>
> The name of William H. Jones, late of Capt. John R. Curry's Company D, South Cumberland Battalion, Kentucky State Troops, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The above-described persons are ineligible for military pension from the Federal Government because of the fact that they were never mustered into the Federal service, their entire period of duty having been performed for the State of Kentucky.

A number of semimilitary companies were organized in Kentucky during the last year of the Civil War to take the place of the regular State militia, which had been mustered into the Federal service. These companies were organized under the authority of the State for the sole purpose of affording police protection to life and property in certain parts of the State during the absence of the regular State military forces. They were not mustered into the Federal service and rendered no military service in connection with the Civil War.

Approval of the enrolled bill would have the effect of granting benefits which are denied in other cases where facts are similar. Since there are no circumstances which would warrant granting preferential treatment to the persons named in the bill, I find myself unable to give my approval to this enactment.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 7, 1939.*

On August 9, 1939:

H. R. 4831. I have withheld approval from H. R. 4831, a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and interpreter of the Menominee General Council, members of the Menominee advisory council, and official delegates of the Menominee Tribe.

This measure authorizes an annual expenditure from the tribal funds of the Menominee Indians in Wisconsin without further Budget or congressional review. It seems to me that the bill is contrary to one of the principal purposes of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act of 1934, that is, to bring before the Congress the estimated expenditures for a given agency. Moreover, a provision is contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1940, for defraying the expenses of tribal councils or committees thereof. It seems to me that annual expenditures from Indian tribal funds should be scrutinized by the Congress with the same care that proposed expenditures from the Federal Treasury are examined.

For the foregoing reasons, I have withheld approval of this bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 9, 1939.*

H. R. 5743. I have withheld my approval of H. R. 5743 entitled, "An act for the relief of Walter C. Holmes."

The indebtedness to the United States represented in this bill resulted from the payment to Mr. Holmes of the compensation of two positions, covering the same period of time, in contravention of the act of May 10, 1916, as amended. In view of the correspondence between the Lighthouse Service and Mr. Holmes regarding the position of lamplighter, I am of the opinion that Mr. Holmes could not have been completely ignorant of the existence of a limitation on the compensation which a Government employee occupying more than one position could receive, even if he were not aware of the actual amount of such limitation. This being so, he was under a duty to inquire into the matter when his compensation from the Coast Guard was increased. A disregard of the law in this case, if condoned by the relief here sought, would result in the establishment of a precedent tending to induce disregard of this and other laws enacted for the purpose of limiting and restricting the expenditure of public funds.

For these reasons I am unable to approve this measure.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 9, 1939.*

H. R. 1177. I am withholding approval from H. R. 1177, a bill for the relief of Bessie Bear Robe. The bill provides the payment of $3,000 to the claimant by reason of the death of her son.

On page 5 of House Report 750, Seventy-sixth Congress, on this bill is a reproduction of a claim for damages signed by Bessie Bear Robe. The amount stated in the claim is $2,000. Hospitalization and burial expenses in connection with the son of Mrs. Bear Robe were borne by the Government. No reason is given for the enactment of legislation authorizing

an amount in excess of the sum stated by the claimant as being satisfactory to her.

The bill provides that the amount is to be subject to expenditure for the benefit of Bessie Bear Robe. I have been advised, however, that she died on June 16, 1939.

In the circumstances, I have withheld my approval from this bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 9, 1939.*

H. R. 5953. I am withholding my approval from H. R. 5953, a bill for the relief of Marie Heinen.

Approval of the bill would authorize payment in the sum of $100 to Marie Heinen, Kaukauna, Wis., on account of burial expenses of Robert B. Heinen, a World War veteran.

The records of the Veterans' Administration show that Robert B. Heinen died January 1, 1937, and was buried January 4, 1937, at Kaukauna, Wis.; that claim for reimbursement on account of burial expenses was executed by Marie Heinen under date of January 23, 1939, and received in the Veterans' Administration January 27, 1939.

Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, provides for the payment of burial allowance in an amount not to exceed $100 in the case of honorably discharged war veterans where the requirements of the regulation are met. Paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, provides, in part, "Claims for reimbursement must be filed within 1 year subsequent to the date of burial of the veteran."

Claim for reimbursement on account of burial expenses not having been filed within 1 year after the veteran's burial, such allowance cannot be paid under existing laws and regulations.

There are no circumstances in this case which would distinguish it from many other cases where reimbursement on account of burial expenses has been denied because claim therefor was not seasonably filed. This enactment would grant Mrs. Heinen a benefit which must be denied to many others similarly situated.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 9, 1939.*

H. R. 6528. I have withheld approval of H. R. 6528, a bill "to provide for the creation of the George Rogers Clark National Memorial, in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes."

Public Resolution No. 51, approved May 23, 1928 (45 Stat. 723), provided as one of the requirements for Federal participation in the construction of a permanent memorial commemorating the achievements of George Rogers Clark, the cost of which participation has amounted to approximately $2,000,000, "that the State of Indiana shall assume, without expense to the Federal Government, the perpetual care and maintenance of said site and the memorial constructed thereon after such memorial shall have been constructed."

I have not been advised of any changed conditions that would justify a repeal of this provision of existing law.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 9, 1939.*

H. R. 6898. I am withholding my approval from H. R. 6898, a bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain helpless and dependent children of veterans of the Civil War.

The purpose of this bill is to grant pension at the rate of $20 per month to 160 helpless children of Civil War veterans; increased pension from $12 to $20 per month to 7 such children, and increased pension from $18 to $20 per month to 1 such child; a total of 168 cases. The ages of the beneficiaries vary from 33 to 81 years, and come within the following age groups:

Age 30–39	5
Age 40–49	17
Age 50–59	67
Age 60–64	40
Age 65–69	29
Age 70 and over	10
Total	168

According to the committee reports, in the great majority of cases in which the bill proposes to grant an original pension, there is no entitlement under general laws because the children were over 16 years of age at the time of the veteran's death, there being 156 cases in this category. In 5 cases the child's name had not been placed on the pension rolls prior to reaching the age of 16.

Under the act of June 27, 1890 (26 Stat. 182–183; 38 U. S. C. 281), pension is denied a helpless child of a veteran of the Civil War, Indian war, or Spanish-American War who attained the age of 16 prior to the death of the veteran.

This provision reads in part as follows:

> * * * in case of the death or remarriage of the widow, leaving a child or children of such officer or enlisted man under the age of 16 years, such pension shall be paid such child or children until the age of 16: *Provided,* That in case a minor child is insane, idiotic, or otherwise permanently helpless, the pension shall continue during the life of such child, or during the period of such disability, and this proviso shall apply to all pensions heretofore granted or hereafter to be granted under this or any former statute. * * *

In addition to the fact that each of the beneficiaries named in the bill is ineligible for pension on account of the above-quoted limitation, certain of the beneficiaries are ineligible on other grounds. Enactment of the bill, therefore, would establish special eligibility not only by waiving the above-quoted requirement but other general statutory requirements. While generally the cases covered by the bill invoke sympathy, there appears to be no compelling reason why they should be singled out for preferential treatment, excluding others who may be similarly situated. Moreover, it would seem that many of the persons named in the bill are eligible or will shortly be eligible for old-age assistance or other forms of assistance under the Social Security Act of August 14, 1935.

In view of the discriminations which the bill represents I find myself unable to approve it.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 9, 1939.*

On August 10, 1939:

H. R. 4252. I have withheld approval of H. R. 4252, an act for the relief of J. George Bensel Co.

In the work of moving safes under contract, Tlpb–1266, dated December 1, 1936, with the Procurement Division, Treasury Department, the contractor caused his employees to work more than 8 hours per day in violation of the 8-hour law of June 19, 1912 (ch. 174, 37 Stat. 237; U. S. C., title 40, secs. 324, 325). For 28 apparent violations, at the stipulated rate of $5 each, the sum of $140 was deducted from the amount due the contractor.

The contractor claims that he worked overtime to accommodate the Chief of the Mechanical Engineers of the building, who requested on December 31, 1936, to have the safes moved to their new positions prior to the opening of the Department Monday morning, January 4, 1937, so that there would be no delay in the Government business.

Nevertheless, further inquiry reveals that the contractor not only violated the 8-hour law but also failed to obtain all of his employees from the United States Employment Service and failed to pay the prevailing rate of wages. The Procurement Division of the Treasury Department required the contractor to pay the sum of $163.70 as a wage adjustment before receiving the balance due on the contract.

In view of the fact that the contractor regularly engaged in business must be deemed to have had knowledge of the requirements of the 8-hour law and of the absence of authority in the Chief of the Mechanical Engineers to permit work in excess of 8 hours, and in view of his other violations of law and Government regulations, I feel obliged to veto this enactment.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 10, 1939.*

H. R. 5450. I am withholding my approval of H. R. 5450, Seventy-sixth Congress, an act to extend the time within

which applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, may be filed.

This act would have provided an additional 5 years for filing claim for adjusted-compensation benefits; that is, from January 2, 1940, to January 2, 1945.

The World War Adjusted Compensation Act, which became law May 19, 1924, provided that application for benefits should be made on or before January 1, 1928. The amendatory act of May 29, 1928, extended the final date for filing application for benefits to January 2, 1930. The act of June 5, 1930, further extended the final date for filing application for benefits to January 2, 1935, and the act of August 23, 1935, extended the final date for filing application for benefits to January 2, 1940.

Under the original act the veterans and their dependents were granted approximately 3½ years and by subsequent liberalization have been given a period of over 15 years from the date of enactment of the original act in which to claim these benefits. During this period much publicity was given the original act and amendments, including the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, as amended, with every reasonable opportunity to file claim. This opportunity still exists and will continue to January 2, 1940.

Further extension of the period for filing claim in my opinion is not justified.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 10, 1939.*

On August 11, 1939:

H. R. 3927. I have withheld my approval of H. R. 3927, a bill for the relief of Marijo McMillan Williams. The indebtedness to the United States represented in this bill resulted from the payment to Mrs. Williams the compensation of two positions, covering the same periods of time, in contravention of the act of May 10, 1916, as amended, notice of which act had been repeatedly given throughout the Postal Service by published bulletins of that Service. Such disregard of the law in this case, if condoned by the relief here sought, would result in the establishment of a precedent tending to induce disregard of this law and other laws enacted for the purpose of limiting and restricting the expenditure of public funds.

For these reasons I do not feel justified in approving this bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1939.*

H. R. 3959. I have withheld my approval of H. R. 3959, an act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of recreational demonstration projects, and for other purposes.

While the objective of this legislation is good, I am inclined to think that certain safeguards should at least be studied at the next session of the Congress.

It should probably be made more clear that equitable arrangements with local communities taking over such recreational projects should involve the Federal Government in no legal or moral commitments.

There should probably be a provision allowing departments of the Government to take over for their purposes such projects as it seems desirable for the Interior Department to part with.

Probably the approval of the President should be given to any transfers of these properties to local communities or other departments, as this is the general rule in similar cases.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1939.*

H. R. 4117. I have withheld my approval of H. R. 4117, a bill to provide for the payment of attorney's fees from Osage tribal funds.

Briefly stated, this bill would authorize the payment of attorneys' fees in an amount not to exceed 12½ percent of the funds collected as a result of any suit or suits brought under a contract between the Osage Tribe of Indians and certain attorneys named in said contract.

The customary percentage allowed by the Government to attorneys is not to exceed 10 percent. This bill, however, calls for 12½ percent, despite the fact that the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House of Representatives amended the bill to reduce the fees to 10 percent.

I agree with the recommendation of the committee and, therefore, cannot approve the bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1939.*

H. R. 4482. I am withholding my approval of H. R. 4482, for the relief of Byron MacDonald.

The bill proposes to pay to Byron MacDonald the sum of $2,500 in full settlement of his claim against the United States for the death of his minor son, Richard MacDonald, who was killed on July 21, 1937, by a truck in the service of the Civilian Conservation Corps. An examination of the record in this case fails to disclose negligence on the part of any employee of the United States. The report of the inquest on the death of Richard MacDonald indicates that the boy met an accidental death. The report of the associate medical examiner states that the boy lost his balance and fell between the front and rear wheels of the truck. It is apparent from the record that the driver of the vehicle was proceeding at a reasonable rate of speed and that he used caution in attempting to pass the boy.

While the accident is regrettable, I find no justification for any claim against the United States as a result thereof.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1939.*

H. R. 5405. I am withholding my approval of H. R. 5405, authorizing the installation of parking meters and other devices on the streets of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

This bill would authorize the Commissioners of the District in their discretion to secure and install, at no expense to the District, mechanical parking meters or devices on the streets, avenues, roads, highways, and other public spaces under the jurisdiction and control of the Commissioners; to make and enforce rules and regulations for the control of parking of vehicles on such public ways and other public spaces; and to prescribe fees for the privilege of parking vehicles where said meters or devices are installed. The bill also would provide that, in purchasing meters, the Commissioners may purchase 50 percent of the manually operated type meter, subject to specifications to be approved by the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce.

While I have no objections to the general purpose sought to be accomplished by the bill, I believe its provisions as to the manner in which meters may be secured and funds made available for their payment are sufficiently vague and ambiguous to render the measure inoperative, if approved. Therefore, I am withholding my approval.

I would not object to future legislation to accomplish this same general purpose with all fees collected from such parking meters to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the gasoline tax and motor-vehicle fees, highway fund, District of Columbia, and with authorization for the submission of estimates of appropriations, payable from such fund, for the purchase and installation of meters.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1939.*

H. R. 5931. I have withheld my approval of H. R. 5931, a bill for the relief of Elizabeth Hessman.

The purpose of the bill is to pay the sum of $1,665 to Mrs. Elizabeth Hessman in settlement of her claim against the United States for personal injuries sustained when the car in which she was a passenger was struck, on April 27, 1936, by a Government car driven by an employee of the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture.

The record in this case indicates that there appears to be no serious disability or permanent injury which can be

attributed to the accident. Mrs. Hessman's actual medical expense was $165.45, and while it is felt that the pain and suffering as well as personal inconvenience caused by the unfortunate accident clearly warrant a reasonable gratuity, I feel that the approval of H. R. 5931 would result in the payment of an excessive amount to the claimant. Therefore I do not feel justified in giving my approval to this bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1939.*

H. R. 5998. I have withheld my approval of H. R. 5998, a bill entitled "An act to amend section 32 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to extend the times for commencing and/or completing the construction of other bridges over the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved August 30, 1935."

The bill would amend the act approved August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1074), to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Niobrara, Nebr., for 1 and 3 years, respectively, from August 30, 1939.

The bill also would amend said act of August 30, 1935, by granting to Knox County, Nebr., its legal representatives and assigns, the right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all rights, powers, and privileges conferred by the act. Any corporation to which, or any person to whom, such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred would be authorized to exercise the same rights granted to Knox County as fully as though conferred directly by law upon such corporation or person.

The bill further provides that any mortgage, assignment, or transfer of the franchise granted to Knox County, heretofore made by the governing body of said county, would be validated and of full legal force and effect.

Neither the original act of August 30, 1935, nor the bill H. R. 5998 gives assurance that the proposed bridge would be made free after the tolls shall have provided sufficient funds to amortize its cost of construction in addition to meeting the annual maintenance, repair, and operation costs during the toll period. I do not recall the enactment into law of any bridge bills in recent years that have not contained such an assurance; and it seems to me that this is a wise policy to follow. The bill H. R. 5998 is objectionable also because of its authorization to Knox County, Nebr., to alienate to private corporations or persons the rights granted to it by Congress for the construction of a public bridge.

I am, therefore, disapproving this bill in its present form and suggest that it be revised to limit appropriately the right of the county to dispose of its powers and privileges with respect to this bridge, and also to require definitely that the bridge shall be maintained and operated free of tolls after the recovery through the toll system of its cost of construction and the annual costs of maintenance, repair, and operation during the toll period.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1939.*

H. R. 7411. I withhold my approval of H. R. 7411, an act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

I have already signed one bill for the examination of a large number of additional river and harbor and flood-control projects. These projects, together with many other projects which have been examined and approved by the Army engineers, will take a long time to complete after future appropriations are made by the Congress, and I think it is time to go more slowly in the examination and authorization of these river and harbor projects.

It has always seemed to me that projects should be examined and authorized primarily on the basis of the greatest good to the greatest number of people. I understand the urge to get Federal money for expenditure in every congressional district in the United States—but I believe, as I have often recommended to the Congress, that instead of taking a bite here and a bite there, there should be a well-considered and well-rounded plan for projects to be undertaken in a definite order of human and national preference and desirability instead of putting them only on a local geographical basis.

Furthermore, this bill, unlike the other which I have signed today, contains no express provision recognizing the authority of the Federal Power Commission under existing law relative to making investigations and reports regarding potential power development and similar matters.

I find it therefore necessary to give it my disapproval.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1939.*

H. J. Res. 283. I have withheld my approval of House Joint Resolution 283, to establish the Major General William Jenkins Worth Memorial Commission to formulate plans for the construction of a permanent memorial to the memory of Maj. Gen. William Jenkins Worth.

On May 2, 1847, Congress recognized his distinguished service by presentation of a sword.

I feel that the action now proposed raises definitely the broad question of how far the Federal Government should be expected to go in sponsoring and sharing the costs of permanent memorials to be erected throughout the country in honor of men and women whose services to the Nation are comparable in value to those of General Worth. Our national history is rich in similar examples of worthy service, and action such as contemplated in House Joint Resolution 283 might easily pave the way to numberless similar memorials, heavy expenditures, and to such relaxation of the standards which should govern national memorials as would defeat the high purpose they should serve.

In the light of these considerations I feel that I should not be justified in approving this resolution.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1939.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1062. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 24, 1939, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on reexamination of Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee Drainage Areas, Fla., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted January 24, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 469); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1063. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 29, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of, and review of reports on, Miami Harbor, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935, and requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted March 24, 1937, and the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted April 19, 1934 (H. Doc. No. 470); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1064. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 24, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Columbia River at The Dalles, Oreg., with particular reference to the improvement of Hungry Harbor, Oreg., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved June 20, 1938; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1065. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 24, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination of channel from the Intracoastal Waterway to, and turning basin

at, Holly Hill, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved June 20, 1938; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee of conference. H. R. 4117. A bill to provide for the payment of attorney's fees from Osage tribal funds (Rept. No. 1464). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Committee of conference. H. R. 7462. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1939, and June 30, 1940, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1470). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 6535. A bill authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Delaware Tribe of Indians on account of permanent annuities under treaty provision; with amendments (Rept. No. 1471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee of conference. S. 1911. An act for the relief of Daumit Tannaus Saleah (Dave Thomas) (Rept. No. 1465). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee of conference. S. 796. An act for the relief of Mato, Miljenko, Bozo, and Augustin Cibilic, or Zibilich (Rept. No. 1466). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee of conference. S. 1269. An act for the relief of Emil Friedrich Dischleit (Rept. No. 1467). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee of conference. S. 1538. An act for the relief of Konstantinos Dionysiou Antiohos (or Gus Pappas) (Rept. No. 1468). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee of conference. S. 1654. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pacios Pijuan (Rept. No. 1469). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

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. 7476) for the relief of Hugh M. Whidden; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

A bill (H. R. 7497) granting an increase of pension to Abigail Daughrity; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 7527. A bill to make effective the provisions of the Minimum Age (Sea) Convention (Revised), 1936, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 7528. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS of Colorado:

H. R. 7529. A bill to authorize the construction of works for flood control and other purposes on Cherry Creek and tributaries in Colorado; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7530. A bill to transfer the site and buildings of the Tomah Indian School to the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. R. 7531. A bill limiting charges made by certain banks on account of delinquency in payment of loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 7532. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire property for the Moores Creek National Military Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H. R. 7533. A bill to assist the States in the improvement of highways; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. GEYER of California:

H. R. 7534. (by request). A bill to amend an act to prevent pernicious political activity; 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 Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Memorial No. 16, with reference to Admiralty Island on the coast of Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution with reference to a statue of Commodore John Barry; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 7535. A bill for the relief of George W. Gerlach; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 7536. A bill for the relief of J. Furman Richardson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 7537. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Goldberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H. R. 7538. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Deo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 7539. A bill for the relief of Regis Moxly and Frances Moxly; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 7540. A bill authorizing and directing the Railroad Retirement Board to pay an annuity to Mrs. S. N. Alford, the widow of Samuel Naaman Alford, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 7541. A bill for the relief of Harry M. Fife; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

5279. By Mr. ANDERSON of California: Petition signed by Anna S. Johnson, of San Jose, Calif., and others, urging the

Seventy-sixth Congress to enact House bill 5620, the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5280. Also, petition signed by D. M. Risley, of San Jose, Calif., and others, urging the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact House bill 5620, the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5281. Also, petition signed by Catherine H. Smith, of Burlingame, Calif., and others, urging the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact House bill 5620, the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5282. By Mr. CONNERY: Resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress in favor of the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry, "The Father of the United States Navy"; to the Committee on the Library.

5283. By Mr. CULKIN: Petition of Mary Galda Armstrong, of Oswego, N. Y., and 29 others, asking for enactment of House bill 5620, the proposed General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5284. Also, petition of Fred C. Hartigan, of Oswego, N. Y., and 29 others, asking for enactment of House bill 5620, the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5285. Also, petition of H. W. Wagoner, of Oswego, N. Y., and 119 others, asking for enactment of House bill 5620, the proposed General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5286. Also, petition of Christina Rebber, of Oswego, N. Y., and 29 others, asking for enactment of House bill 5620, the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5287. Also, petition of James P. Cahill, of Oswego, N. Y., and 29 others, asking for enactment of House bill 5620, the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5288. Also, petition of Peter Schneider, of Oswego, N. Y., and 29 others, asking for enactment of House bill 5620, the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5289. Also, petition of William Burns, of Oswego, N. Y., and 29 others, asking for enactment of House bill 5620, the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5290. Also, petition of George F. Brady, of Oswego, N. Y., asking for enactment of House bill 5620, the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5291. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of M. H. Hill and numerous other citizens of Waterloo, Iowa, urging the enactment of the General Welfare Act, House bill 11 as perfected by House bill 5620; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5292. Also, petition of Gertie Clemens and numerous other citizens of Waterloo, Iowa, urging the enactment of the General Welfare Act, House bill 11 as perfected by House bill 5620; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5293. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of William S. Welch and 589 other residents of the Thirty-fifth Congressional District of New York, favoring the enactment of House bill 5620, the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5294. By Mr. HARTER of New York: Petition of 30 citizens of Erie County, N. Y., favoring House bill 5620; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5295. By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of Nona Tubbs, of Pasadena, Calif., and containing the signatures of 179 other residents of the Eleventh Congressional District of California, urging Congress to consider changes in House bill 5620, the proposed General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5296. Also, petition containing 1020 signatures of residents of the Eleventh Congressional District of California, urging Congress to consider changes in House bill 5620, the proposed General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5297. By Mr. McCORMACK: Memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress in favor of the presentation to Eire of a statute of Commodore John Barry, "The Father of the United States Navy"; to the Committee on the Library.

5298. By Mr. PIERCE of New York: Petition circulated by Samuel Loree and 30 other citizens of Ogdensburgh, N. Y., 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.

5299. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress in favor of the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry, "The Father of the United States Navy"; to the Committee on the Library.

5300. By Mr. VAN ZANDT: Petition of E. U. Wells, E. W. Breon, and others, residents of DuBois, Pa., and vicinity, urging enactment of the improved General Welfare Act, House bill 11 as perfected by House bill 5620, as an aid to the relief of the suffering of needy citizens over 60 years of age, and providing prosperity for all and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5301. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of John R. Gordon, of Los Angeles, and 311 others, protesting against the discrimination shown single men in being refused Works Progress Administration jobs, and requesting Congress to recognize their right to work and earn a livelihood; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5302. Also, petition of John B. Stinson, of Orange, Calif., and 64 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5303. Also, petition of Henry Shield, of Long Beach, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5304. Also, petition of Charles W. Home, of North Hollywood, Calif., and 16 others endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5305. Also, petition of Maggie T. Park, of San Bernardino, Calif., and 24 others endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5306. Also, petition of Myrtle E. Beryman, of San Pedro, Calif., and 24 others endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5307. Also, petition of Gladys White, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 21 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5308. Also, petition of Oren K. Barker, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5309. Also, petition of Edward H. Reeves, of San Francisco, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers, and requesting the Banking and

Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5310. Also, petition of John E. Francis, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5311. Also, petition of Roy Reynolds, of Walnut Creek, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5312. Also, petition of Vivian Pavich, of Long Beach, Calif., and 23 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5313. Also, petition of Guy M. Maxon, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 25 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5314. Also, petition of Thomas B. Redden, of Long Beach, Calif., and 25 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5315. Also, petition of Fred Watt, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 25 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5316. Also, petition of Earl J. Eller, of Azusa, Calif., and 15 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5317. Also, petition of James A. Rower, of San Francisco, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5318. Also, petition of John W. Martin, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5319. Also, petition of A. Eldred, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5320. Also, petition of A. J. Linnartz, of Olive, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5321. Also, petition of Marvin J. Noble, of Oakland, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5322. Also, petition of Celia Wilby, of Alhambra, Calif., and 20 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5323. Also, petition of Mary F. Malloy, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 19 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5324. Also, petition of George Stein, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 17 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5325. Also, petition of Mary C. Sruber, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 14 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5326. Also, petition of Louis A. Glenn, of Porterville, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5327. Also, petition of O. T. Thompson, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 10 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5328. Also, petition of W. J. H. Barnes, of Fairfield, Calif., and 19 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5329. Also, petition of H. B. Whitaker, of Long Beach, Calif., and six others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5330. Also, petition of R. B. Ballantyne, of Salt Lake City, Utah, and 25 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5331. Also, petition of George Craig, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 69 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency

Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5332. Also, petition of William H. Cochrane, of Berkeley, Calif., and eight others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5333. Also, petition of Michael Gilleran, of Fontana, Calif., and seven others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5334. Also, petition of William E. Phillips, of Alhambra, Calif., and 15 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5335. Also, petition of Oliver G. Cromwell, of Wilmar, Calif., and 10 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5336. Also, petition of Douglass D. Gordon, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 12 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5337. Also, petition of A. H. E. Chitty, of Sheridan, Mo., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5338. Also, petition of George F. Heim, of Sonora, Calif., and 67 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5339. Also, petition of E. Miner, of Jonestown, Calif., and 19 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5340. Also, petition of Charles A. McGrath, of Venice, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5341. Also, petition of Edna O. Beum, of San Pedro, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5342. Also, petition of Charles H. Maroon, of Vallejo, Calif., and 17 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5343. Also, petition of Albert H. Lafayette, of Daly City, Calif., and 14 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5344. Also, petition of Esther M. Dixon, of San Jose, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5345. Also, petition of H. R. Calkins, of Montebello, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5346. Also, petition of Helen R. Dorwart, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5347. Also, petition of Herbert N. Carpenter, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5348. Also, petition of James M. Jones, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5349. Also, petition of George A. Moss, of Riverside, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5350. Also, petition of John S. Gragy, of Riverside, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5351. Also, petition of Nevin Campbell, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5352. Also, petition of Joe Stoney, of Van Nuys, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5353. Also, petition of A. T. Warner, of Redlands, Calif., and 79 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency

Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5354. Also, petition of John Keller, of San Luis Obispo, Calif., and 26 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5355. Also, petition of R. Perrs, of Berkeley, Calif., and 54 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5356. Also, petition of J. W. Ray, of Galesburg, Ill., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5357. Also, petition of Karl Johnson, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 13 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5358. Also, petition of C. R. Combs, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5359. Also, petition of Christian Johnson, of Colfax, Calif., and 23 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5360. Also, petition of Leslie H. Lowe, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5361. Also, petition of John Matekovich, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 49 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5362. Also, petition of Harry Huse, of Escadon, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5363. Also, petition of W. E. Lovett, of Altadena, Calif., and five others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5364. Also, petition of Earl G. Gilbert, of Los Angeles, Calif,. and 15 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks, and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5365. Also, petition of Frank S. Spires, of Fullerton, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional montary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5366. Also, petition of Ernest Rust, of Nowalk, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5367. Also, petition of C. H. Cushman, of Decatur, Ill., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5368. Also, petition of W. H. Quant, of Riverside, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee of Banking and Currency.

5369. Also, petition of Benjamin W. Rollins, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 37 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5370. Also, petition of Marie A. Reardon, of Tulare, Calif., and 25 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5371. Also, petition of Frederick F. Fridgerson, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 49 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5372. Also, petition of John W. McKinley, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 19 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5373. Also, petition of L. S. Kegarise, of North Hollywood, Calif., and 20 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5374. Also, petition of Arthur B. Clough, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5375. Also, petition of George E. Carson, of El Cajon, Calif., and seven others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and

Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5376. Also, petition of C. F. Hamlin, of Santa Cruz, Calif., and 18 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5377. Also, petition of Don Ewers, of Hollywood, Calif., and 15 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5378. Also, petition of Walter Anderson, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5379. Also, petition of L. W. Curtis, of Long Beach, Calif., and 14 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5380. Also, petition of Reynolds Cota, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5381. Also, petition of Harry P. McCoal, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5382. Also, petition of Eugene Wehn, of North Hollywood, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5383. Also, petition of C. Catanzariti, of Vallejo, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5384. Also, petition of Stanley Garvey, of Corona, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5385. Also, petition of N. A. Manning, of San Francisco, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5386. Also, petition of C. S. Egbert, of Santa Paula, Calif., and 13 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5387. Also, petition of Margaret McCarn, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5388. Also, petition of C. Clifford, of Wilmar, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5389. Also, petition of Jacob Hullen, of Santa Rosa, Calif., and 12 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5390. Also, petition of Mrs. R. E. Stearns, of Pasadena, Calif., and seven others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5391. Also, petition of W. Sutton, of Pasadena, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5392. Also, petition of Earl E. Bobier, of Culver City, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5393. Also, petition of Grant E. Kellogg, of San Francisco, Calif., and 43 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5394. Also, petition of Irene Baker, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5395. Also, petition of Ferdinand Kaufmann, of South Pasadena, Calif., and 21 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5396. Also, petition of Ruby R. Crane, Bakersfield, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5397. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Wilkerson & Wilkerson, Chattanooga, Tenn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the memory of the late Judge McReynolds; to the Committee on Memorials.