

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 25, 1940

(Legislative day of Monday, March 4, 1940)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who at this glorious Eastertide hast turned the shadow of death into the morning, causing the hearts of men to exult with joy: We bless Thee for all that conspires to make us sure of Thee—the gracious sunshine, the stir of springtime, yea, the secret thrill that vibrates through the air from far-off days with its message of the risen Lord—for Thou hast conquered our last enemy, and hast revealed to us that in all pain there lies the promise of redemption.

Be with those now walking through the vale where awaits the shadow that is feared by man. Comfort them, dear Lord, with the knowledge that death is only a shadow where the glory from an endless world shines through, beyond the mind's imagining, beyond the heart's desire; for eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him. In the name of our risen Lord we ask it. 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, March 22, 1940, 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	Downey	Lee	Russell
Ashurst	Ellender	Lodge	Schwartz
Austin	Frazier	Lucas	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	George	Lundeen	Sheppard
Barbour	Gibson	McCarran	Shipstead
Barkley	Gillette	McKellar	Slattery
Bilbo	Green	McNary	Smith
Bone	Guffey	Maloney	Stewart
Bridges	Gurney	Mead	Thomas, Idaho
Bulow	Hale	Miller	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Harrison	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	Hatch	Murray	Tobey
Capper	Hayden	Neely	Townsend
Caraway	Herring	Norris	Tydings
Chandler	Holman	Nye	Vandenberg
Chavez	Holt	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Hughes	Overton	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	Walsh
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Pittman	White
Davis	King	Reed	Wiley
Donahay	La Follette	Reynolds	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are detained from the Senate on public business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] is unavoidably detained.

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

AMENDMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACT—DISPOSITION OF SECURITIES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Transportation Act of 1920, as amended, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

INSURANCE OF WORLD WAR VETERANS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to define the limitations of section 408, War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, and section 305, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

COMPACT FOR DIVISION OF WATERS OF THE YELLOWSTONE RIVER

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1759) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. WHEELER, and Mr. FRAZIER conferees on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the South Jersey Port Commission, Camden, N. J., protesting against ratification of the St. Lawrence seaway treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WALSH presented resolutions of Webster Square Post, No. 13, of Worcester, and Governor Mayhew Post, No. 242, of Oak Bluffs, both of the American Legion in the State of Massachusetts, favoring the location of a general hospital and diagnostic center in Boston, Mass., or the vicinity thereof, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TYDINGS presented resolutions of the Ninth Ward Republican Association and the Ladies' Auxiliary, Department of Maryland, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the entry of tropically refined sugar into the United States and also a reduction of the quantity of cane sugar refined in this country, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of members of Local Union No. 90, American Flint Glass Workers' Union of North America, of Baltimore, Md., praying for the imposition of higher tariff duties on glassware, and also that the control of all tariff legislation be retained in the Congress, which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. MILLER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7421) to provide for terms of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas at Fayetteville, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1339) thereon.

Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7015) to reenact section 259 of the Judicial Code, relating to the traveling and subsistence expenses of circuit and district judges, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1340) thereon.

Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 4776. An act to amend section 6 of the Organic Act of Alaska (Rept. No. 1342); and

H. R. 7612. An act for the transfer of funds to the town of Wrangell, Alaska (Rept. No. 1341).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. GIBSON:

S. 3657. A bill authorizing the appointment and retirement of John Tomlinson as a second lieutenant, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 3658. A bill authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to owners of timber and timber lands for the purpose of providing for more orderly marketing of timber holdings; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 3659. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Ben White, Arch Robinson, Lee Wells, W. S. Wells, A. J. McLaren, A. D. Barkelew, Oscar Clayton, R. L. Culpepper, W. B. Edwards, the estate of John McLaren, the estate of C. E. Wells and the estate of Theodore Bowen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 3660. A bill to aid in the establishment and administration of State health insurance plans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 3661. A bill to amend the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KING:

S. 3662. A bill for the relief of W. D. Foster; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3663. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide for the parking of automobiles in the Municipal Center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 3664. A bill to correct the military record of Mackgilbery H. Williams (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED (for Mr. WHEELER and himself):

S. 3665 (by request). A bill to regulate freight forwarders; and

S. 3666 (by request). A bill to regulate freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 3667. A bill to provide for the local delivery rate on certain first-class mail matter; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 3668. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Commerce.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 407) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PREVENTION OF COLLISIONS AND REGULATION OF MOTORBOAT EQUIPMENT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, Calendar No. 728, Senate bill 2259, to amend laws for preventing collisions of vessels, to regulate equipment of certain motorboats on the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes, which is the same as Calendar No. 898, a House bill on the same subject, has been on the calendar since June last. It is a Department of Commerce measure. The Department and I have been in disagreement on the subject throughout these

months. We have now come to a complete agreement. I am offering two amendments to the Senate bill, which I ask unanimous consent to be considered as pending if and when the Senate reaches Calendar No. 728 on a call of the calendar. I also ask that a statement regarding the amendments be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments will be received, considered as proposed, and be printed; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement referred to is as follows:

AMENDMENTS TO MOTORBOAT BILL, S. 2259

Strike out subsection (a) of section 3, lines 16 to 19 on page 2; reletter the succeeding subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) of section 3 to read (a), (b), (c), and (d), respectively.

Amend the first sentence of the new subsection (a) of section 3 on lines 19 and 20, page 2, to read as follows:

"(a) Every motorboat of classes A and 1 shall carry the following lights:"

In its present form S. 2259 states in section 3 (a) that boats of less than 16 feet in length (class A) are only required to show a bright white light mounted on the bow or stern to show around the horizon.

Boats in class A should be required to carry the combination red and green running lights as well as a white light aft.

The purpose of the motorboat bill is to promote safety afloat. The danger factor is greatly increased at night, and proper lighting is the most important means of preventing accidents.

Between sunset and sunrise, accurate calculation of a course of another craft can only be determined by the red and green running lights. This is the basic reason for these lights and the means of directional relations between boats. These facts remain the same regardless of the size of a boat and, therefore, regulations governing the use of these lights should be uniform.

Motorboats in class A have a range of speed from less than 5 miles per hour to over 45 miles per hour. The operators of these boats have the same responsibility of safety as motorboats of greater length and more speed and should be required to carry the combination red and green lights for their own protection as well as for the safety of other craft. The law requires motorboats to give way or hold a course and speed when approaching other vessels at certain angles. The only method of determining these angles is by the red and green running lights. With only a white light showing, it is not only difficult to determine the boat's course but hard to distinguish the white light from shore lights. If the class A boats are permitted to operate without the red and green running lights, other boats should be relieved of the "privileged and burdened" requirements when approaching them.

As an example of uniformity, aircraft regulations require planes operating between sunset and sunrise to carry the red and green lights on their wing tips and a white light on the tail. This law is uniform and no distinction is made between light planes or airliners. Uniformity is also found in motor vehicle lighting equipment.

Strike out the new subsection (c) of section 3, commencing on line 24, page 3, and running through line 4, page 4, and substitute in lieu thereof a subsection (c) to read as follows:

"(c) Motorboats of classes 2 and 3, when propelled by sail and machinery, or by sail alone, shall carry the colored side lights, suitably screened, but not the white lights prescribed by this section: *Provided, however,* That motorboats of all classes, when so propelled, shall carry, ready at hand, a lantern or flashlight showing a white light which shall be exhibited in sufficient time to avert collision: *Provided further,* That motorboats of classes A and 1, when so propelled, shall not be required to carry the combined lantern prescribed by subsection (a) of this section."

S. 2259 in its present form stipulates that motorboats, in classes A and 1 when propelled by sail and machinery, or by sail alone, shall carry, ready at hand, a lantern showing a white light which shall be exhibited in sufficient time to avert collision.

For the added safety of sailing craft and other boats operating at night, all boats in this class should be required to carry and exhibit the white light.

Due to the nature of a sailing vessel, it is difficult to maneuver and, therefore, dependent to a great extent on making its presence known to other approaching craft at night. This is true of small and large boats alike and, therefore, all boats of this type should be required to carry a lantern or a flashlight to be exhibited in sufficient time to avert a collision.

The word "flashlight" is added to conform with modern equipment.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, in Indiana the League of Women Voters has been giving intensive study to the reciprocal-trade agreements. After consideration of the problem they have endorsed the proposal to extend the authority of the Executive to continue the program. In their study they became convinced that the reciprocal-trade agreements had been beneficial to the country and especially to In-

diana, a State of diversified interests. A well-written, concise article by Freda L. Bridenstine, showing how the trade agreements had affected Indiana was published in the *Indiana Woman Voter*, January 1940. I ask unanimous consent that this splendid article may be incorporated in the *Record* as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

[From the *Indiana Woman Voter* for January 1940]

INDIANA AND THE TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

One of the most vital issues before the present Congress is that regarding the reenactment of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Feeling on the subject is running high. Extravagant claims are made by its advocates. Its opponents contend it is ruining the country. As voters, we should know some facts about this matter:

1. What is it?
2. Has it benefited the country as a whole?
3. How has it affected Indiana?

It is generally conceded that tariff making in the United States has been an unscientific, log-rolling procedure. Also, most students of international affairs believe that a vigorous revival of world trade would have a healthy effect on the national economy of most countries and would, therefore, greatly aid the cause of world peace. For these reasons, and for the more immediate purpose of restoring a fast-diminishing market for American agriculture and industry, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was passed June 12, 1934, effective for 3 years, and extended in 1937 for another 3-year period. Under it the Department of State may negotiate trade agreements with foreign countries without the consent of the Senate, altering tariffs to the extent of 50 percent, providing no article is taken off or put on the free list. Trade agreements have been concluded with 21 countries, including 8 European nations (of which Great Britain is the most important), 11 with American republics, and with Turkey and Canada.

Between 1929 and 1933, the year before the Trade Agreements Act was passed, the exports of the United States declined from \$5,241,000,000 to \$1,675,000,000. What is more disturbing, our trade fell off proportionately more than did the international trade of the world as a whole. Exports from the United States during 1934-35 averaged \$2,200,000,000. For the years 1937-38 they averaged \$3,200,000,000. It is not claimed that this increase was due entirely to the trade-agreements program, but it is significant that during 1937-38, exports to countries with which trade agreements were in operation averaged 61.2 percent greater than during the 1934-35 period, which is substantially a preagreement period since only one agreement was in effect for the entire year of 1935. Over the same period, our exports to non-trade-agreement countries averaged only 37.9 percent greater. It is also true that the trade-agreement countries have increased their purchases of American products more than their purchases from other countries.

Indiana has a diversity of agricultural products and a great deal of manufacturing, and foreign demand plays an important part in the successful marketing of many of its products of farm and factory. In 1929 Indiana's foreign exports amounted to \$74,000,000. By 1932 this figure had fallen to seventeen million, causing a violent dislocation in the State's economy.

It is impossible to allocate exactly the share of any one State in the increase in the foreign trade of the United States as a whole under the Trade Agreements Act. But by studying the movement of the products Indiana produces and manufactures and noting the concessions granted them in the various agreements, we may find an indication of the gain to Indiana.

The following facts about Indiana's eight leading industries are enlightening. In this table, by a concession we mean a provision by a foreign country which facilitates the export of United States goods to that country, such as the removal, lowering, or binding at the present level of a foreign duty on an American export or the fixing or increasing of the present quota which a nation will accept of a given American product. The year 1938 has been chosen with which to compare the 1931-35 and 1926-30 averages for total United States exports, as being a representative year to give a picture of the importance of the trade-agreements program in restoring foreign markets to United States products. Our exports in 1937 were greater than in 1938 and the exports for the first 11 months of 1939 also show an increase over 1938. The 1938 figures, however, show an increase over the low average for the years 1931-35 in every case except for meat products and also show a general return toward the high average for the years 1926-30.

1. Iron and steel industries: Indiana ranks third in the output of steel and rolling mills, with only Ohio and Pennsylvania outranking her.

In 1937, Indiana's output was about 11 percent of the total for the United States.

Decrease in Indiana's exports, 1929-32 was 78 percent (\$6,866,000 to \$1,512,000).

Concessions have been obtained in 15 of the 21 agreements.

Total United States exports of iron and steel mill products: 1938.....	\$184,300,000
Average for 1931-35.....	62,900,000
Average for 1926-30.....	170,700,000

2. Automotive products: Indiana ranks third in the United States as a producer of bodies and parts for motor vehicles. This industry is the third most important in the state.

In 1937, Indiana's output was over 6 percent of the total for the United States.

Decrease in Indiana's exports, 1929-32 was 83 percent (\$26,000,000 to \$4,300,000).

Concessions on automobiles and automotive products have been obtained in 17 of 21 agreements.

Total United States exports of automotive products:

1938.....	\$270,400,000
Average for 1931-35.....	146,500,000
Average for 1926-30.....	406,200,000

3. Agricultural machinery and implements: Indiana ranks third in the production of agricultural machinery and implements.

In 1937, Indiana's output was over 4 percent of the total for the United States.

Decrease in Indiana's exports, 1929-32 was 93 percent (\$4,500,000 to \$300,000).

Concessions have been obtained in at least nine agreements.

Total United States exports of agricultural machinery:

1938.....	\$75,400,000
Average for 1931-35.....	26,800,000
Average for 1926-30.....	109,900,000

4. Industrial machinery—(cranes and dredging, excavating and road-building machinery, machine-shop products, etc.): Indiana ranks sixth in production of conveying and construction machinery and machine-shop products.

In 1937 Indiana's output was over 5 percent of the total for the United States.

Decrease in Indiana's exports, 1929-32, was 90 percent (\$7,800,000 to \$840,000).

Concessions have been obtained in at least 12 agreements.

Total United States exports of industrial machinery

1938.....	\$269,900,000
Average for 1931-35.....	94,700,000
Average for 1926-30.....	214,400,000

5. Electrical machinery (including radios, phonographs, and refrigerators): Indiana ranks seventh in the production of electrical machinery, apparatus, and supplies; fourth in the production of radios and phonographs; and second only to Michigan in the production of refrigerators.

In 1937 Indiana's output of electrical machinery, including radios, was 7 percent of the total for the United States, while the production of refrigerators was 15 percent of the United States total.

Decrease in Indiana's exports, 1929-32, was 46 percent (\$1,657,000 to \$900,000).

Concessions have been obtained in 16 of 21 agreements.

Total United States exports of electrical machinery

1938.....	\$102,200,000
Average for 1931-35.....	62,600,000
Average for 1926-30.....	102,700,000

6. Meat products: Indiana is one of the first five States in production of hogs.

In 1937 Indiana's output of meat products was almost 3 percent of the total for the United States.

Decrease in Indiana's exports of lard, hams, shoulders, and other meat products in 1929-32 was 73 percent (\$10,100,000 to \$2,800,000).

Concessions on ham, bacon, pork lard, and a variety of other meat products have been obtained in 17 of 21 agreements. Cuban imports of lard increased between 1933-38 from \$500,000 to \$4,000,000.

Total United States exports of meat products: 1938, \$48,000,000; average for 1931-35, \$65,700,000; average for 1926-30, \$194,100,000.

7. Canned fruits and vegetables: Indiana ranks sixth in the United States in the canning industry as a whole, leads in the processing of tomatoes and baked beans, and is third in the canning of corn. Beans, peas, and kraut are also canned in large quantities.

In 1937 Indiana's output was over 5 percent of the total for the United States.

Concessions have been obtained on fresh, dried, or canned vegetables in 17 of 21 agreements and on various canned fruits in 20 of 21 agreements.

Total United States exports of canned fruits: 1938, \$23,200,000; average for 1931-35, \$19,600,000; average for 1926-30, \$25,600,000.

8. Chemicals and allied products: Indiana ranks third in drug production.

In 1937, Indiana's total output of chemicals and allied products was valued at \$65,863,159.

Decrease in Indiana's exports, 1929-32, was 70 percent (\$2,900,000 to \$850,000).

Concessions have been obtained in at least 15 of 21 agreements.

Total United States exports of chemicals, 1938.....

1938.....	\$128,900,000
Average for 1931-35.....	91,800,000
Average for 1926-30.....	137,400,000

Favorable concessions to the United States have also been granted by agreement countries on the following products which Indiana produces in considerable quantities: Glass, wood and wood products, textile manufactures, rubber products, musical instruments, paper and paper products.

It would seem, therefore, that the reciprocal-trade agreements have helped to reopen foreign markets for our surplus products. But these are "reciprocal" agreements. In order to sell, we must buy. In return for concessions obtained from other countries on hundreds of American agricultural and industrial items the United States has granted carefully considered concessions on certain products of which the other countries concerned are the chief or important sources of our imports and which are necessary to our economic well-being. Let it be remembered that a very small percentage of the imports on which concessions are granted are competitive with American products and most of these are fixed by quotas. It is estimated that one-fifth of the raw material used in the United States comes from foreign sources. A large proportion of our imports is used in factories and makes exports possible. For example, we are almost entirely dependent on our imports for aluminum, tin, nickel, silk, vegetable fiber, hides, skins, dyeing and tanning material, cacao beans, paper stock, and rubber. The census of manufactures for 1935 shows that over 10,000 in Indiana were engaged in factories working imported raw materials and another 10,000 factory jobs were dependent on the secondary processing of imported materials.

We may, therefore, conclude that through the trade agreements excessive restrictions on the sale of our products in foreign countries are being gradually reduced and equality of treatment is being substituted for trade discriminations. In this way the program is aiding American producers and exporters to recover and expand their foreign markets, and in this expansion Indiana shares.

N. B.—The above figures and tables have been compiled after a study of the following publications:

United States Department of Commerce: Bureau of the Census, the Census of Manufacturers, 1937; Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Foreign Trade of the United States, Calendar Year 1938, part I.

United States Department of State: Indiana and the Trade Agreements Program, August 1938 and December 1939; Status of the Trade Agreements Program, December 1939.

FREDA L. BRIDENSTINE.

JOHN NANCE GARNER—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SHEPPARD

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on JOHN NANCE GARNER, delivered by Senator SHEPPARD on March 23, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

TIMBER RESOURCES OF VERMONT

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by R. M. Evans, regional forester for the eastern region, United States Department of Agriculture, relative to the timber resources of Vermont, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY FRED BRECKMAN ON THE AGRICULTURAL SITUATION

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the agricultural situation delivered on March 16, 1940, by Fred Breckman, Washington representative of the National Grange, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY R. W. BLACKBURN ON RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of reciprocal-trade agreements delivered by R. W. Blackburn, secretary, American Farm Bureau Federation, before the Illinois League of Women Voters at Chicago, Ill., on March 19, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY MATTHEW WOLL ON RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS RESOLUTION

[Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, before the Committee on Finance, on the joint resolution for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATE BILL 785 AND DOMESTIC SILVER

[Mr. TOWNSEND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by him to Senator WAGNER, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, relative to Senate bill 785; which appears in the Appendix.]

NATION-WIDE SUPPORT FOR SILVER REPEAL BILL

[Mr. TOWNSEND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from editorials relative to the proposed cessation of purchases of foreign silver; which appear in the Appendix.]

LETTER FROM BERNARD M. BARUCH ON HOSPITALS FOR RURAL AREAS

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Bernard M. Baruch endorsing proposed legislation providing for the construction of small hospitals in rural areas, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR RELATIONS IN THE AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY—REPORT BY PROF. WILLIAM H. MCPHERSON

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release on a forthcoming report on labor relations in the automobile industry by Prof. William H. McPherson, of Oberlin College, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE FROM NATIONAL GRANGE MONTHLY ON WALTER-LOGAN BILL

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to the Walter-Logan bill for the regulation of administrative procedure, published in the National Grange Monthly for March 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIALS FROM BALTIMORE SUN AND WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS ON RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of March 25, 1940, and an editorial from the Washington Daily News of the same date, on the subject of the reciprocal-trade agreements, which appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 407) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, if I should discuss every phase of the subject matter before us, ranging from statistical data on imports and exports to and from agreement countries, as well as nonagreement countries, and their effects—beneficial or injurious—upon our own peoples and industries, to the highly controversial questions of constitutionality, congressional approval, and the most-favored-nation principle; and should I attempt to answer the many untenable and spurious arguments made by some of the opposition to the continuation of the trade-agreements program, I would burden too greatly your patience and utilize too much of the Senate's time. We all appreciate the time that is necessarily required and should be taken for a reasonable discussion of the vital phases of this question, but it is far too serious from every standpoint for partisanship to influence our judgment or blur our vision. We are still trying to meet an emergency. The reason that impelled us to enact this legislation as an emergency measure in 1934, and again in 1937, exist now to a far greater degree than in those years.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I do not want to intrude with a question if it will interfere with the Senator's plan to go forward without interruption. Does the Senator desire to yield at this time or at any time?

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, I will yield to the Senator, but I should much prefer to do so after I shall have finished. My preliminary remarks on the joint resolution will be very brief.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. I have been interested in what the Senator and others have said on this subject. I desired to ask the Senator what the emergency is, but I will omit that inquiry at present and make it later.

Mr. HARRISON. I may say to the Senator that it is apparent that the world is at war today, and, in my opinion, the present emergency is greater than the one which existed in 1934. We are still trying to meet that emergency. What we are striving to do, in the tragic circumstances of today, is to continue that trade policy, which has been helpful in the enlargement of our international trade and beneficial to our own people, and which has sustained and promoted our good relations with peoples everywhere. So, in the consideration of this question, let us, sirs, do so in the spirit of broad statesmanship, and adopt the continuation of this reciprocal-

trade policy which, in my opinion, the country believes the wisest and most constructive. That is evidenced by the overwhelming majority of the Republican press of the country, by the overwhelming majority of the Democratic press of the country, and by the resolutions passed by numerous business and civic organizations, many of which have been placed in the hearings both of the House and of the Senate.

I may say to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and to the other Senators on the other side who honor me with their presence, that the principle of reciprocity is not of Democratic origin. If one or the other of the two major political parties deserves the greater credit for the idea, it is the Republican Party. Nearly three decades ago, in the first session of Congress that I attended, in common with nearly all of my colleagues of Democratic faith in the House of Representatives, I followed the leadership of the able and unselfish President, William Howard Taft, in his espousal of the Canadian reciprocity agreement. I did it, not as a Democrat but as an American who believed in the principle and felt that it was constructively wise, through mutual concessions, to increase our trade and promote a better relationship between the two countries. At that time so strong was President Taft for the principle of reciprocity that he called the Sixty-second Congress in extraordinary session to enact his program. It also had the unqualified endorsement and enthusiastic support of Theodore Roosevelt. Indeed, on January 12, 1911, Theodore Roosevelt, then the editor of the Outlook, wrote President Taft, in which letter he said, in part:

It seems to me that what you propose to do with Canada is admirable from every standpoint.

At the close of my remarks I shall ask leave to insert in the RECORD the very illuminating correspondence which took place at that time between Mr. Taft and Mr. Roosevelt.

But, Mr. President, other great leaders of the Republican Party, nearly two decades before that event—and that was in 1911—entertained and championed the reciprocity principle. Blaine, McKinley, and Harrison all believed in the principle of reciprocal-trade arrangements.

I may say that Senators Frye and Hale—the latter the father of one of the Senators from Maine now occupying a seat in this body—entertained the same views with reference to the principles of reciprocity; and the fact has been called to my attention that Senator Frye was the grandfather of another distinguished Senator from Maine.

As far back as 1892 we find that the Republican national platform, under the heading "Triumph of reciprocity," employed this language:

We point to the success of the Republican policy of reciprocity, under which our export trade has vastly increased and new and enlarged markets have been opened for the products of our farms and workshops. We remind the people of the bitter opposition of the Democratic Party to this practical business measure and claim that, executed by a Republican administration, our present laws will eventually give us control of the trade of the world.

In 1896, under the large heading of "Reciprocity," we find the Republican national platform preaching the doctrine:

We believe the repeal of the reciprocity arrangements negotiated by the last Republican administration was a national calamity, and we demand their renewal and extension on such terms as will equalize our trade with other nations, remove the restrictions which now obstruct the sale of American products in the ports of other countries, and secure enlarged markets for the products of our farms, forests, and factories.

Again, in 1904, the Republicans in their national platform boasted:

We have extended widely our foreign markets, and we believe in the adoption of all practicable methods for their further extension, including commercial reciprocity, wherever reciprocal arrangements can be effected consistent with the principles of protection and without injury to American agriculture, American labor, or any American industry.

The kindly McKinley, in his last speech, on that tragic day at Buffalo, shortly before his assassination, uttered these broad, patriotic, thoroughly American, and constructive words:

The period of exclusiveness is past. The extension of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are un-

profitable. A policy of good will and friendly trade relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the time; measures of retaliation are not.

Oh, I know that in the course of this debate some of the opposition will attempt to differentiate the pending resolution from the kind of reciprocity championed by these great Republicans. Hairsplitting differences will be discovered. Sirs, you may deceive yourselves, but the country will not be deceived. The people will know that this joint resolution embodies the same principle and philosophy of reciprocity that ran like a golden thread through the principle and philosophy of reciprocity which these distinguished Republicans and leaders of the past advocated.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator a question. Does he desire to have us wait until he has concluded?

Mr. HARRISON. I prefer to wait, but I always like to have the Senator from Michigan ask me a question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. When the earlier reciprocal arrangements involved a specific legislative formula, when often there were even written into the law the precise items which could be touched and the spread of the duties which could be changed, I wonder whether the Senator thinks it is hairsplitting to differentiate between that sort of delegation of power under specifications and the present delegation of power under no specifications whatever. Is that hairsplitting?

Mr. HARRISON. Let me give the Senator a little history of the reciprocity agreements.

Back in 1890, I believe it was, Mr. Blaine was advocating reciprocity. The then Senator Hale offered a provision to the effect that, since we were permitting certain products from South and Central America to come into the United States free of duty, namely, sugar, wool, leather, and some others, specifying them, the countries from which those products came should do the right thing by us, and permit products from this country to go into their countries free of duty. Such agreements did not have to come back to the Senate for ratification.

In 1897 another provision was written into the law which gave the Executive the right to make treaties with foreign countries involving the principle of reciprocity and mutual concessions, which treaties were to be ratified by the Senate. These were the Kasson treaties, some 12 of which, I believe, were negotiated, 11 of which were sent to the Senate, and which remained before the Senate for ratification for 5 years. McKinley, in light of this experience, did not bother to submit the twelfth for ratification because he knew that it, too, would be killed.

The negotiation of those treaties gained absolutely nothing; it was not possible to get them ratified. There appeared the old logrolling process, the same kind as that referred to by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in 1932, and by President Hoover in 1932 when he vetoed a bill dealing with the tariff question.

In 1922, when the Fordney-McCumber bill was being considered, reciprocity was included in that bill as it came from the House. Section 301 provided for trade agreements subject to congressional approval. As though recognizing the political impracticality of this provision, it also added another reciprocity provision, section 303, a true reciprocal trade agreement measure differing from the present bill in that the rates could be reduced by 20 percent rather than lowered or raised by 50 percent as now provided.

I have before me what was stated at that time by a great friend of ours, a very able man, Mr. Longworth, who was then a member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives. On July 12, 1921, he said:

I believe also that it [the tariff] should be sufficiently flexible in some cases to enable us to give some countries certain advantages in their market.

Such a consummation, I concede, is difficult of attainment, and has never been hitherto satisfactorily worked out. Reciprocity has never been a success in this country and, in my judgment, never will be, requiring, as it may, the action not only of the Senate but of the House, and precipitating a general tariff discussion upon each occasion.

Thus spoke Mr. Longworth.

And while provisions for reciprocity treaties have been made in this bill I have little expectation, as I have already indicated, that many, if any, will be satisfactorily negotiated by this administration.

He was referring to the agreements which would have to come back to Congress for approval. Mr. Longworth continued:

There is, however, a provision in this bill under which trade agreements may be made which will inure both to our advantage and to the advantage of certain other nations. * * * I refer to the provision which authorizes the President to reduce the conventional duties in this bill by 20 percent in the case of any foreign nation with whom we may negotiate trade agreements in return for our receiving the benefits of their minimum tariffs on certain of our commodities. I conceive of nothing which will have a more beneficial effect upon the enlargement and retention of our export trade than inclusion in this bill of section 303 of title 3, which makes of this a bargaining tariff. * * * If other nations know that the President of the United States has it in his power to give them certain special advantages in our market in return for certain special advantages in theirs, I have every confidence that instead of discrimination against our exports there will be encouragement of them by many countries and that an era of good feeling in our international commerce will be inaugurated, unexampled in our history.

The statement which I read applied to section 303, which provided for reductions in our duties through agreements embodying mutual concessions, which did not require congressional approval, and that is what Mr. Longworth said about it.

Mr. President, as I have said, the country will not be deceived by resort to the argument that this is not the reciprocity of McKinley, Blaine, Hale, Frye, Harrison, Theodore Roosevelt, and Taft. The pending measure embodies the same principle and philosophy of reciprocity that ran like a golden thread through the principle and philosophy of reciprocity which the distinguished leaders of the past, the great men to whom I have referred, advocated.

Oh, there may be a difference in detail and a difference in phraseology, but the point I want to make is that they believed as we believe, as McKinley so well stated in that same speech at Buffalo wherein he advocated sensible trade agreements, and said:

A system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities is manifestly essential to the continued and healthful growth of our export trade.

What we are trying to do is to strengthen our economic position and enlarge our foreign trade through the exchange of mutual concessions. It may be said that one or more of these great leaders, while advocating reciprocal-trade agreements and mutual concessions to build up international trade, also advocated the carrying out of this policy without injury to American industry or American labor. With this principle I am in thorough accord. But, sirs, if one thing has been demonstrated above everything else, it is that the Interdepartmental Trade Agreements Committee, now sitting in Washington, which has negotiated these trade agreements, has zealously guarded American industry and labor from any injury resulting from the exchange of these mutually advantageous concessions.

That this policy has been successfully carried out is well attested by the fact that in many instances when witnesses appeared before us they complained not of what had been done but rather of their fear of something that might happen in the future. In this connection it is interesting to quote a colloquy between myself and Mr. Marshall, secretary of the National Wool Growers Association:

THE CHAIRMAN. Well, they have done pretty good so far as the wool people are concerned? They have not affected it?

In these trade agreements we made no reduction in the tariff on raw wool. We did make certain reductions in the tariffs on wool fabrics, waste, and rags.

I continue the quotation:

MR. MARSHALL. They have been pretty good only to us. I wish we could feel assured of as good treatment in the future.

So it had not hurt them; they were simply fearful of the future. Mr. President, those who want too much are generally fearful.

In similar vein, Mr. Besse, president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, who appeared before our committee, was asked the question by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]:

So it comes down to this, it shows that you have not been hurt yet, but you are afraid you will be hurt?

Mr. Besse replied:

Substantially that is what I am saying.

We find also that Mr. Arnold, speaking for a farmers and stockmen's group, made the following statement before the committee:

I am not here to complain of what has been done. My fears * * * relate solely to what may be done.

Mr. Holman, a representative of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, said to the committee:

We are more concerned with the possible future of the trade-agreements program than with the present or the past.

When we are dealing in trade-agreements programs with agricultural countries, if they trade with us at all on that basis, they insist upon concessions on our competitive products. It is at that point that the dairy farmers have a great fear. It is for the future.

Up to the present time we cannot say that we have suffered greatly as to these prices.

And so, running through the whole hearing, we find not injury, but fear.

Mr. W. L. Monroe, president of the American Window Glass Co., who appeared before the committee and criticized the concessions in the Czechoslovakian agreement, which is now out of the window and does not exist, admitted that the domestic production of window glass had progressively increased during the years the trade agreements have been in effect. Production of window glass in the United States had increased from 4,398,000 boxes in 1932 until in 1939 the total production rose to 11,321,000 boxes—an increase of 200 percent. It was admitted, too, that some of our domestic-glass manufacturers—the Libbey-Owens Glass Co., for instance—had shown some of the largest profits and in the financial reports of this year were in prosperous condition. Certainly they have not declined during the life of these trade agreements. I was very much interested to learn of the statement Mr. Monroe made in his report in 1938 to the membership of the American Tariff League—I need not tell the Senators on the other side what the American Tariff League is—and I congratulate him on this statement, in which he paid tribute to Mr. Hull and to those associated with him for their fairness and efficiency in the negotiation of these trade agreements. I presume the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] heard that statement before the committee.

Mr. Monroe, as president of the American Tariff League, said:

I will also stress the fact that in carrying out the trade-agreement policy by Mr. Hull great credit should be given to the fact that there has been no suspicion of political influence regarding the reduction of duties on any of the articles placed on the reciprocal-trade list. I believe that everyone who has had occasion to contact the staff that makes up the schedules must admit that, regardless of whether we approve of the policy or not, the agreements were prepared solely with a viewpoint of endeavoring to increase foreign trade with the least injury to domestic production.

When I questioned Mr. Monroe as to the accuracy of the statement that he was reported to have made to the American Tariff League, from which I have quoted, he said:

I made that statement, and I would be the last one to intimate that Mr. Hull was susceptible to any influence of any politician or anybody interested in the formation of his reciprocal-trade agreements. I do not agree with his theory, however, upon which he is working.

You on that side, as well as those on this side, recall the methods employed in writing the thousands of rates on innumerable items in the Fordney-McCumber tariff law in 1922. The sky was the limit, and for the most part rates finally adopted were based on no scientific study or factual basis. Representative Fordney, with whom I served and whom I personally admired, frequently and without reluctance stated openly and boastfully that no one was a higher protectionist than he, and was annoyed at the more modest

demands infrequently requested by an exceptionally few representatives of certain special interests. The men who wrote that tariff monstrosity—permit me to use that expression—became habitual in putting the question to those seeking higher rates, "How much do you want?" not "What do you need?"

As exorbitant and excessive in far too many instances as were the rates in the Fordney-McCumber law, within less than 8 years the same interests and the same influences drove through the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act. Those of you who were here then, and those of you who have come since, remember the tremendous opposition throughout this country to the enactment of that law. Our people never became quite so aroused as when they observed what was about to happen in the writing of that tariff legislation. Our isolationist trade policy and the injurious effects that inevitably would flow from it caused 1,028 of the leading economists of this country, Republicans, Democrats, and Independents, to petition the Congress to delay the economic blow, and pointed to the baneful effects that would result from such a policy. With unerring accuracy they prophesied that the enactment of such a law would influence retaliation and reprisals throughout the world. They saw with prophetic vision foreign countries preparing themselves, through cartels, bargaining arrangements, and every contrivance that human mind could conceive, to destroy our international trade. We know that 39 foreign nations promptly protested formally to our State Department. Why, the press of this country, hardly without exception, condemned the threatened policy, and business overnight became panicky, capital started its flight into foreign countries, and there, in the hope of saving a part of the products formerly sold in foreign countries, was invested in foreign industries, giving employment to foreign labor and adding to our own unemployment problem. Our export trade fell from 5.2 billion in 1929 to 1.6 billion in 1932. Our railroads applied to the courts for receiverships.

Our ships tied up at their docks and were useless. The millions of our former employed found themselves in bread lines. It was not long until the economic collapse was complete, and we were faced with the most tragic period in the history of our country. I would not say that the high rates in the Hawley-Smoot tariff law were the only or the major cause of the economic collapse of the country, but certainly the adoption of that policy played a very large part in creating that economic disorder.

Confronted with this emergency the administration in 1934 adopted the policy of negotiating trade agreements which, through the exchange of mutually beneficial concessions, would find for our goods necessary foreign outlets which were so vital to rebuilding the economic structure of our country. In this act Congress adopted a policy of—

Expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States * * * for "various branches of American production which require and are capable of developing such outlets by affording corresponding market opportunities for foreign products in the United States."

And the opportunities in our market were to be offered "in accordance with the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production."

The administration of this policy was left to the Executive, and he formulated a method which has admirably served the purpose of the Congress and has not exposed the country to the uncertainties and fears which have usually attended a general revision of the tariff laws. General tariff revision, with all of its uncertainty—and Senators know this is true—has always acted as a deterrent to business. The average American citizen believes in the orderly adjustment of things without abrupt or revolutionary changes.

And so, it was in 1934 that we presented this program. Under it, 22 agreements have been negotiated. Throughout the negotiation of each and every trade agreement, orderly methods have been employed and the most careful study made by experts thoroughly competent, wholly unselfish, and without any political consideration in the service they have rendered. So satisfying to the American people and to Con-

gress was this policy that in 1937 it was continued for a further 3-year period. It is our viewpoint that in the exigencies of the hour and the conditions of the world today, as an emergency measure, the program should be continued for another 3 years. There may have been some mistakes made in negotiating these trade agreements. They may not all be perfect, but following a careful study of the administration of the program since its inauguration in 1934, and after reading all the hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee, and listening to all who came before the Finance Committee of the Senate, it is my opinion that those charged with the responsibility of negotiating these trade agreements have performed a magnificent job and are deserving of the highest appreciation of the American people. I do not suppose that everybody is satisfied. Some will pick a flaw in this or that agreement. However, I feel that excellent progress has been made and that marked improvement has taken place in the administration of the program since its inception in 1934. If there were good reasons for the adoption of the trade-agreements program in the beginning—and certainly few will deny that it was constructive to adopt this policy in 1934 because of the economic dislocation of business everywhere—and if it was wise to continue the act in 1937, how much greater is the cause to continue the policy at this time for another 3 years.

The opposition in the House and some witnesses before our committee advanced the thought that with half the world at war, with millions of men in arms and more millions of citizens in the war-infested areas engaged in the production of implements and necessities of war, when peace comes this country will be flooded with foreign products, and newer and higher tariff rates will be needed. That to me is a spurious argument. I prefer to envision peace some day; and when it comes, as it assuredly will, those in foreign countries who are now engaged in the manufacture of implements and necessities of war—and it is said they number 80,000,000—and the twenty-odd million who are tramping the battlefields or bivouacking in their camps will assuredly return to their peacetime occupations and peaceful pursuits. When they do, factories forced by the war to close will again reopen, fields which remained idle will again be tilled, and with only exhausted treasuries to supply their needs, foreign nations will dedicate their energies toward increasing their productions and selling their products where they can. In those circumstances, with foreign fields and factories vying with each other and with us in the sale of their surplus products, without a definite program to pursue or a constructive policy to follow, if a trade war should ensue our country might suffer from an economic collapse.

We have given the countries of the world a sound reciprocal-trade policy. We have given them an opportunity to trade with us and with each other on just and wisely established principles. Such principles will be the greatest influence toward preserving and promoting rational international trade and the maintenance and preservation of peace. If we as a great government turn our backs upon the policy written into the joint resolution—a policy which we inaugurated—we shall throw to the winds an opportunity in the future to help the peoples of the world along rational, unselfish, and just principles of international trade. By doing so we shall invite our foreign neighbors at the close of this war to begin another one, which will be a trade war. Let no one be deceived as to the magnitude of such a trade war. Will anyone deny that the result would be injurious to our own economy? Why not keep what we have? Why desert a constructive program which has accomplished beneficial results under circumstances which have not at all times been encouraging? Perhaps the program has not accomplished everything we had hoped for, but when we consider the dark background against which the policy was inaugurated 6 years ago we must admit that marked improvement has taken place. Let us consider our country's position when this present war shall come to an end. Let us through the continuation of this program extend a helping and cooperative hand toward the goal of economic stability and peace among nations. This program should be

a beacon light to the war-torn foreign nations—a light which, when peace does come, will guide them along the paths of better international economic relationships.

Mr. President, earlier in my remarks I referred to the correspondence between President Taft and Theodore Roosevelt with regard to the proposed reciprocity arrangement with Canada. I ask that the correspondence be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[Confidential]

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, January 10, 1911.

MY DEAR THEODORE: Just at present I am in the midst of reciprocity matters and it would gratify me a great deal to talk over with you this issue. I have, as you have known, always been a low-tariff and downward-revision man, and the reason why I favored the last tariff bill and praised it as the best one we had ever had was: That the consideration of it on its passage and the efforts of those who defended it afterward to show that it was a downward revision were all a concession by the Republican Party that downward revision was necessary, and that the rule upheld by Shaw and Cannon and other stand-patters of the orthodox type that no tariff could be too high, because what you needed was a Chinese wall, had been departed from. Now, the probability is that we shall reach an agreement with our Canadian friends by which all natural products—cereals, lumber, dairy products, fruits, meats, and cattle—shall enter both countries free, and that we shall get a revision—not as heavy a one as I would like but a substantial one, and equivalent certainly to the French reciprocity treaty and probably more—on manufactures.

The truth is that the minute we adopt in convention the proposal that our tariff should be measured by the difference in the cost of production we necessarily adopt a rule which would lead us straight to reciprocity in natural products with Canada, because the conditions of the two countries are so similar that there is substantially no difference in the cost of production. Possibly labor is slightly lower in some parts of Canada than in the United States, but it is also higher in some parts, and the adoption of free trade would rapidly increase the cost of labor in those parts where it is cheaper in Canada, so that the conditions would be the same.

It might at first have a tendency to reduce the cost of food products somewhat; it would certainly make the reservoir much greater and prevent fluctuations. Meantime the amount of Canadian products we would take would produce a current of business between western Canada and the United States that would make Canada only an adjunct of the United States. It would transfer all their important business to Chicago and New York, with their bank credits and everything else, and it would increase greatly the demand of Canada for our manufactures. I see this is an argument against reciprocity made in Canada, and I think it is a good one.

The proposition is to make an arrangement by which we shall present to both Houses of Congress an identical bill and pass it as an agreement for joint legislation. In this way we would avoid the necessity for two-thirds in the Senate and would secure at once the consent of the House, which in tariff matters is generally regarded as necessary, at any rate. This will cause a great commotion, I presume. It will be unpopular in New York because of certain lumber-manufacturing interests and the dairy interests. It will be unpopular in Minnesota because of wheat; but, on the other hand, free lumber will be popular in some places, and as it includes free paper and free wood pulp we may count on the fairly good support of the press.

This letter, of course, I must ask you to regard as confidential, though I would be glad to have you discuss with your colleagues on the Outlook for such a proposition and should be glad to hear from you as to your judgment of it.

I think it may break the Republican Party for a while. As Elihu Root said when I talked with him yesterday, it may be an entering wedge against protection, although it is not inconsistent with the principle of protection as we laid it down in Chicago. Of course, it will be said against it that we are taking agriculture and making it suffer first before we tackle wool and cotton. The bill is not likely to pass the present Congress, and before the new Congress comes together I think I shall be able to make some recommendations as to the wool and cotton schedules and present a problem to the Democrats which they are not likely to find an easy one. At least it will show the hypocrisy of some people. Of course, this is not ground whatever for introducing and pressing such a measure. I believe it to be right, and if it leads, on the other hand, to a reduction in wool and cotton manufactures to the lowest figures and to what is a real measure of the difference in the cost of production, so much the better.

I shall be glad to hear from you as soon as you conveniently can write on this subject, because the matter is just at hand, and it is quite likely that within 10 days we shall reach an agreement.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. TAFT.

OFFICE OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT,

THE OUTLOOK, 284 FOURTH AVENUE,

New York, January 12, 1911.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I at once took in your letter and went over it with the Outlook editors.

It seems to me that what you propose to do with Canada is admirable from every standpoint. I firmly believe in free trade with Canada for both economic and political reasons. As you say, labor cost is substantially the same in the two countries, so that you are amply justified by the platform. Whether Canada will accept such reciprocity I do not know, but it is greatly to your credit to make the effort. It may damage the Republican Party for a while, but it will surely benefit the party in the end, especially if you tackle wool, cotton, etc., as you propose.

Ever yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

Mr. PITTMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask the Senator from Mississippi a question?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the President suspended the sugar quotas on September 11, 1939, the existing trade agreement between this country and Cuba provided, in effect, for the restoration of the \$1.50 tariff on sugar, did it not?

Mr. HARRISON. That is my understanding.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us assume that the Congress does not pass a sugar bill at this session, but permits the present law to expire, would the tariff on sugar remain at 90 cents or would it be restored to \$1.50? Can the Senator tell us?

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator means, if no sugar quota bill were passed at this session?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HARRISON. The duties in the Hawley-Smoot Act would become effective without any quota arrangement.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is there any provision in the law to prevent the State Department from entering into an agreement whereby, let us say, 2,000,000 tons of sugar from Cuba could come in at 90 cents should we fail to enact a sugar-quota law?

Mr. HARRISON. There is nothing to prevent the State Department from undertaking new negotiations with Cuba for the purpose of making a new trade agreement.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the sugar tariff could be cut in half by such agreement?

Mr. HARRISON. By agreement the rate could be reduced by 50 percent or by a lesser amount. However, I am certain that any rate made in a new agreement would give full consideration to such factors as price and domestic production, which might call for a reduction in duty, accompanied by either a customs quota or an absolute quota. I think the relationship between the duty and quota in the present agreement indicates the importance attached to such factors.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Downey	Lee	Russell
Ashurst	Ellender	Lodge	Schwartz
Austin	Frazier	Lucas	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	George	Lundeen	Sheppard
Barbour	Gibson	McCarran	Shipstead
Barkley	Gillette	McKellar	Slattery
Bilbo	Green	McNary	Smith
Bone	Guffey	Maloney	Stewart
Bridges	Gurney	Mead	Thomas, Idaho
Bulow	Hale	Miller	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Harrison	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	Hatch	Murray	Tobey
Capper	Hayden	Neely	Townsend
Caraway	Herring	Norris	Tydings
Chandler	Holman	Nye	Vandenberg
Chavez	Holt	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Hughes	Overton	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	Walsh
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Pittman	White
Davis	King	Reed	Wiley
Donahay	La Follette	Reynolds	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8202) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. TARVER, and Mr. LAMBERTSON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 407) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. Effective on the date of enactment of this act, section 2 of such act of June 12, 1934, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) No foreign-trade agreement hereafter entered into under section 1 of this act shall take effect until the Senate of the United States shall have advised and consented to its ratification, two-thirds of the Senators present concurring."

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, the act which it is proposed that Congress shall extend for a period of 3 years grants to the President the power to make tariff laws through agreements with foreign governments without the necessity of such agreements being advised and consented to by the United States Senate, two-thirds of those Senators present concurring. The Congress certainly cannot authorize the President of the United States to violate the Constitution with regard to laws made through agreements with foreign governments. The tariff laws that the President makes will be found only in such agreements. The agreements set out the law, and the agreements are to become the law. It is impossible to find in the statute any evidence or even indication as to what the law will be as made by the President in these agreements.

There are only three ways to make laws under the Constitution, namely, by congressional act, by treaties, and by amendment to the Constitution. The Constitution with reference to treaties in article II, section 2, provides:

The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

In article VI it is further provided that—

All treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

I think it is well at this time to understand exactly what the Supreme Court has construed a treaty to be.

The proponents of the joint resolution have cited five cases in which the Supreme Court held that certain agreements were not treaties; but they have not cited a single decision showing what the Supreme Court has held is a treaty. The cases which they have cited are, undoubtedly, correct; they related to agreements such as under the act of 1890, whereby the Congress authorized certain articles on the free list to be put on the dutiable list, providing if some foreign government was not treating our exports fairly; but the articles which could be transferred from the free list to the dutiable list were definitely named; the duties that should apply to those articles were also specified; and there was nothing the President of the United States could do under that act except ask certain governments if they would give concessions on certain articles, and, if they would, then he could issue a proclamation leaving the articles on the free list instead of transferring them to the dutiable list. Of course, that was not a treaty in any sense of the word.

Agreements similar to those to which reference is made as being held to be legal and not to be treaties were also provided for under the Dingley Tariff Act of 1897. There again

there was exactly the same situation. Certain articles were placed on the dutiable list at 45 percent ad valorem; the President was allowed to reduce that rate to 15 percent ad valorem on those particular articles, providing concessions were granted by foreign countries. In such a case France granted certain concessions on certain articles. The result was that there was put into effect the 15-percent ad valorem rate as to France.

There was no discretion lodged anywhere; there was no agreement for any particular length of time; the arrangement was not binding on either government; they could change it any day they desired to do so. The proponents of the joint resolution have not as yet in any of their arguments or briefs given any definition of what constitutes a treaty under the Constitution of the United States.

I wish to read a few excerpts from opinions defining what a treaty is, so as to indicate how they apply to the proposed authority to be given to the President. The Supreme Court has time and again defined what constitutes a treaty. The Supreme Court in the case of *Altman & Co. v. United States* (224 U. S. 583, 600), in its opinion with regard to treaties said:

Generally, a treaty is defined as "a compact between two or more independent nations with a view to the public welfare" (2 Bouvier's Dictionary, 1136). True, that under the Constitution of the United States the treaty-making power is vested in the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and a treaty must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of that body (art. II, sec. 2), and treaties are declared to be the supreme law of the land (art. VI).

In *Fourteen Diamond Rings v. United States* (183 U. S. 176, 182), Mr. Justice Brown in a concurring opinion stated:

A treaty in its legal sense is defined by Bouvier as "a compact made between two or more independent nations with a view to the public welfare" (2 Law Dictionary 1136), and by Webster as "an agreement, league, or contract between two or more nations or sovereigns, formally signed by commissioners properly authorized, and solemnly ratified by the sovereigns or the supreme power of each state." In its essence it is a contract. It differs from an ordinary contract only in being an agreement between independent states instead of private parties.

There have been cases in which the President, in carrying out specific statutory law, was authorized to make agreements which were held not to have the elements of a treaty. I thoroughly agree with that view as maintained in the *Altman* case and in the case of *Field* against *Clark*. The question that must be determined by the Senate is whether the agreements which the President is authorized to enter into with foreign governments making tariff laws possess the elements of a treaty.

Now let us apply the definitions of a treaty as laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States; namely, that it is a contract entered into between foreign governments affecting public welfare; that it is the same as a private contract, as the Court says:

It differs from an ordinary contract only in being an agreement between independent states instead of private parties (*Fourteen Diamond Rings v. U. S.*, 183 U. S. 176, 182).

Under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act the President is authorized to enter into a contract for a period of at least 3 years fixing the tariff rates on any and all articles imported into the United States. It is a contract that we are both legally and morally obligated to maintain for a period of at least 3 years. The agreement may be extended indefinitely at the will of the President and the other contracting party.

Is there any doubt that it affects public welfare? The framers of the Constitution of the United States, considering the power of taxation of supreme importance to the United States, provided in article I, section 7, that—

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.

Do such agreements affect public welfare less than our labor conventions? Do these agreements affect public welfare less than our treaties with the American republics relative to cultural relations and exchange of professors and students? And yet it was deemed necessary to have these

conventions and treaties ratified by the United States Senate. The Congress has authorized our Government to enter into radio conventions with various governments, and yet it has been deemed necessary to have these conventions ratified by the United States Senate.

I am interested, of course, in the unconstitutional delegation of legislative authority to the President so far as making tariffs is concerned. That should be of more interest to the House of Representatives, in which is vested the power of initiating all revenue laws. That body may be willing to abandon to the President its functions of initiating revenue laws. It may be willing to surrender to the President the authority not only to initiate revenue laws but to consummate them. Congress has not either the legal or the moral authority, however, in such delegation to the President to repeal the constitutional provision with regard to treaties and deprive the United States Senate of its constitutional functions with relation to treaties. The President does not require any authority from Congress to make treaties. The Constitution provides for that. The President could make all the proposed agreements provided for in the act without any instructions from Congress, but they would be treaties, and they would not be effective until submitted to the United States Senate and advised and consented to in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution in reference to agreements with foreign governments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very much interested in what the Senator from Nevada has been saying, and the point he makes seems to me to be so perfectly clear that I am unable to understand why anyone should seem to have any doubt about it at all. Yet there seems to be in the minds of those who are attempting to call these agreements treaties a great deal of confusion concerning the very question which the Senator is developing.

I appeared before the Finance Committee to argue for an amendment to require congressional approval by congressional act, and at the conclusion of my argument the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, who a moment ago completed his introductory remarks, offered for the record a citation from the case of *Holmes against Jennison*, which was mentioned in the House by Representative ROBERTSON, and he was evidently of the opinion that it demonstrated that these trade agreements are not treaties. Representative ROBERTSON, of Virginia, cited this case because the opinion had been written by Chief Justice Taney, which seemed to him to give particular weight to the conclusion of the Chief Justice. I agree that it does give particular weight, but, inasmuch as it harmonizes exactly with what the Senator from Nevada has been saying, may I venture to read it into the RECORD here with the Senator's consent?

Mr. PITTMAN. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The chairman, as I have said, asked that following my testimony there should be entered the remarks by Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, and these were the remarks:

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the following quotation from the case of *Holmes v. Jennison* (14 Pet. 540, at p. 571), in which the opinion was delivered by the famous Justice Taney in 1840, should settle the question that treaties and agreements are different, and the latter are not to be ratified by the Senate:

With that, of course, there is no disagreement.

Mr. PITTMAN. Not at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The quotation from Chief Justice Taney is as follows:

In the very next clause of the Constitution, the States are forbidden to enter into any "agreement" or "compact" with a foreign nation; and as these words could not have been idly or superfluously used by the framers of the Constitution, they cannot be construed to mean the same thing with the word "treaty."

With that, of course, there can be no dispute.

A few extracts from an eminent writer on the laws of nations, showing the manner in which these different words have been used,

and the different meanings sometimes attached to them, will, perhaps, contribute to explain the reason for using them all in the Constitution; and will prove that the most comprehensive terms were employed in prohibiting to the States all intercourse with foreign nations. Vattel, page 192, section 152, says: "A treaty, in Latin *foedus*, is a compact made with a view to the public welfare, by the superior power, either for perpetuity, or for a considerable time."

Section 153: "The compacts which have temporary matters for their object, are called agreements, conventions, and pactions. They are accomplished by one single act, and not by repeated acts. These compacts are perfected in their execution once for all; treaties receive a successive execution, whose duration equals that of the treaty."

That quotation, cited by Chief Justice Taney, seems to me to bear out exactly what the Senator from Nevada has been contending. He has pointed out the fact that these so-called trade agreements, which everybody normally refers to as trade treaties, are for a period of 3 years. They call for continuous action. They affect the daily lives of the people. They deal with public welfare. They are not at all in the category of conventions or agreements or pactions, so clearly defined by the authority from whom Chief Justice Taney quoted.

Mr. PITTMAN. I thank the Senator. The agreement there ratified was to carry out statutory law, exactly as in the case of *Field against Clark*. I am going to read, later on, the proclamation of President McKinley in the case of *Altman & Co. against United States* to show the agreement. There was nothing the President was authorized to do except to put in force and effect one of two acts; that was all. He put in force and effect the 15-percent tax on statuary and other merchandise. Appellant claimed that he was entitled to the benefit of the 15-percent tax on statuary, as described in the proclamation. The Court said:

No; you are not, because the act itself says that the statuary must be the work of an artist, and in the proclamation and agreement those who framed it forgot to put in that language, "the work of an artist."

So Altman paid 45 percent. In other words, the rate was governed by the act, not by the agreement. The agreement was only administrative.

There is not a case to which the proponents of this measure can refer that would sustain the right of a President to make an agreement such as is provided in the act which is sought to be extended. I will go further than that. I will say that no Congress has ever proposed such a thing as this act. Even the late Oscar Underwood, the ideal of the free-trade Democrats, who for years adorned the Ways and Means Committee of the House, who wrote the Underwood Tariff Act of 1913, would not stand for a thing like this. He did not do so. He had a proposal for reciprocity treaties, but what was the proposal? That they should be subject to approval by Congress.

I do not agree with that method. I say if the law is to be embraced in an agreement, and nowhere else, then it is a treaty, because it has the force and effect of law. No agreement on earth has the force and effect of law except a treaty. The Constitution provides the methods by which a law may be made. It may be made by Congress, with the approval of the President, or by passing a measure over his veto or disapproval, or it may be made by treaty, or it may be made by amending the Constitution of the United States. Those are the only ways in which laws may be made; and every delegation of authority which has been sustained by the courts has been sustained on the ground that only administrative power was conferred; that there were such definite standards and guides, and so forth, that it was really the act of Congress which the President executed, and not the discretionary act of the President. The proponents of the legislation cannot find anything else to save their lives.

May I further emphasize that statement? I am satisfied that there is in this act an unlawful delegation of legislative authority. I do not think any standards or guides or restraints are placed upon the President in making these laws that have ever been anticipated by any decision of the Congress of the United States with regard to legal delegation of the legislative power to an executive. As I have said, I know of no Congress that has ever proposed such a thing. In the

flexible-tariff case the Court sustained the act. It sustained it on the ground that the standards and guides were definitely laid down. I must say that I disagreed with the Court, but that is neither here nor there. That is the law. The act stated that the tariff should be based upon the difference in cost of production abroad and at home, and that the Tariff Board should find the facts as to whether there had been an increased cost or a decreased cost in a foreign country, or an increased cost or a decreased cost here, and, by percentages, should raise or lower the tariff as those facts were disclosed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. PITTMAN. I do.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should be glad to have the Senator discuss the question whether there are powers under the Constitution which create functions which are so important that they are called primary functions, and cannot be delegated at all, even though Congress tries to lay down a standard? Are there such powers?

Mr. PITTMAN. I think there are such powers. I think the provision of the Constitution which requires that revenue bills shall be initiated in the House is fundamental. It is so fundamental that Thomas Jefferson, in writing from Paris to Madison, said:

I am delighted that you have placed in the hands of the popular body the control over taxation.

He said:

While many features of that I do not like, the question of taxation is the most important of all under our Government. Therefore I approve of it.

It must be admitted that the negotiation of tariff laws is at least in the President under the act. No tariffs are laid down for him to put into force and effect. We cannot determine what will be the law until the President makes an agreement. We do not know whether he will raise or lower tariffs, because it lies within his power to raise or lower. He may impose an embargo. That lies within his power.

There are certain fundamental principles involved in this question. I think that the power of taxation is one of the most fundamental principles in the Constitution. Thomas Jefferson thought so, and Madison thought so, because they realized that the power of taxation carries with it the power of destruction, and that no one should be trusted with it except the direct representatives of the people who are to be taxed.

Is there any doubt in the mind of any Senator that we would be delegating the initiation of tariffs to the President? If he changed existing law in the amount of 1 cent he would be making law, and he would be repealing an old law. It is not possible to repeal an old law except by passing another law.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not desire to interrupt the Senator, but I am very much interested in his argument, and I should like to ask him whether it is his contention that trade agreements are treaties, absolutely, and that therefore they must be ratified by the Senate by a two-thirds vote, even though made under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Act?

Mr. PITTMAN. That is my position.

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad the Senator is insisting on that, because, of course, one begs the whole question when he admits, as has been admitted by certain Senators on the floor of the Senate, that Congress may subsequently approve treaties. I do not understand that to be the Senator's position.

Mr. PITTMAN. No. I stated a while ago that the late Senator Underwood, in the Underwood Tariff Act of 1912, provided that reciprocal-trade agreements should be ratified by Congress, and that could sustain a treaty.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to understand the Senator's position, because there are amendments lying on the table, presented by distinguished Senators, calling for the mere ratification of these trade agreements after they have been nego-

tiated. Of course, that begs the whole question the Senator is presenting, because if a trade agreement can be made valid by merely being approved by a majority vote of both Houses, after having been negotiated, it can also be authorized in advance if the statute carrying such authority is a valid one, and, in fact, vests such authority in the President. I merely wanted to get the Senator's position on that point.

Mr. PITTMAN. I think the Senator understands my position now.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not care to argue the question, but the Senator is insisting very strongly that the Trade Agreements Act deals purely with the exercise of the taxing power. Tariff duties, of course, are taxes. I desire to make the statement to the Senator in all frankness that I do not think it involves the exercise of the taxing power alone. I think the Trade Agreements Act is a regulation of commerce. The taxing power is only incidental to it. It does not depend upon that at all. It is a regulation of commerce, a power which is vested in the Congress.

Mr. PITTMAN. May I answer the Senator at that point?

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly. I merely wanted to make that statement because the Senator asked whether anyone doubted that a measure such as the one before us must originate in the House of Representatives.

Mr. PITTMAN. While the Senator is discussing the delegation of legislative power, he is discussing an entirely different subject from the matter of the validity of treaties.

Mr. GEORGE. I grant that, but I wanted to be clear about the matter. When one discusses the mere question of delegation of power, and proposes to amend the Trade Agreements Act by merely making trade agreements after they have been negotiated, subject to subsequent approval by either House or both Houses, then he is begging the whole question which I understood the Senator to be making. The Senator's insistence is that they are treaties.

Mr. PITTMAN. That is correct.

No matter under what authority the President accepts his authorization to make agreements with regard to tariffs with foreign governments, no matter from what source he gets his authority to make them, if the law is included in a definite agreement between two foreign governments, with a long time to run, it is a treaty. It is the highest law of the land, and no matter what authority the President has for his acts, when he makes an agreement under this act, then it becomes a treaty, the highest law of the land, and it must be ratified.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand the Senator's position, and of course agree with him that if a trade agreement is a treaty it must be ratified, and the mere approval of it by the Congress would be entirely nugatory.

Mr. PITTMAN. I agree to that.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator is correct. We may differ as to whether or not a trade agreement is a treaty, but if it is a treaty, I think the Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. PITTMAN. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether, if a trade agreement is not a treaty, he regards it as a law, and if it is a law, would it not come under the taxing power, and have to originate in the House of Representatives?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no, Mr. President. I tried to make that clear. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is almost exclusively, almost entirely, a mere regulation of commerce, just as the law fixing the rates on transcontinental and interstate carriers is a regulation of commerce. The taxing power is merely incidental to it. I do not think such a measure has to originate in either the Senate or the House. There might be certain jealousy between the two bodies, but fundamentally I do not think it must originate in either House.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Nevada yield so that I may ask the Senator from Georgia another question?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. KING. Assume that under the Trade Agreements Act an agreement is entered into which supersedes an existing tariff law, modifies and repeals it, and to that extent deprives the Government of revenue which it would otherwise receive.

Does the Senator conceive that it would be a mere regulation of commerce when it repeals existing law?

Mr. GEORGE. It is a mere regulation of commerce whether or not it repeals existing law. Whether or not it is a treaty, as the Senator from Nevada is debating, is of course a very different question. The Senator from Nevada correctly points out now, in the beginning of the debate, that the question whether there has been an undue or illegal or unconstitutional attempt to delegate legislative power, so far as the validity of the act is concerned, is not the really fundamental question, because he is insisting that a trade agreement is a treaty, even though negotiated as a trade agreement, and must necessarily be ratified as are all other treaties. If a trade agreement is a treaty, the Senator is entirely correct, and we would differ only as to that point.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Does the Senator know of any agreement arrived at between our country and another which, under our Constitution, has not been ratified? For instance, we make an agreement, after negotiation with other countries, which affects our commerce, or the general public policy of our Government. What kind of an agreement can be reached unless it is in the form of a treaty ratified by the Senate?

Mr. PITTMAN. I tried to explain that. If Congress passes a measure containing two different rates of duty and says to the President, "If you find that there is a discrimination against our commerce by a foreign country, you may put into force and effect the higher duties; and if they cease the discrimination, you may put into force and effect the lower duties in the act," the power would be purely ministerial. Congress would be using its discretion in fixing two different rates, one rate to be used if the President found that some foreign country was discriminating against us. Any agreement under such a condition would not be a treaty. I do not know of one agreement—and if there is one, I should like to have it shown me—which changes a law of the United States by virtue of its own force which has ever been called anything but a treaty.

Mr. President, I have read the definition of a treaty. The Supreme Court has time and time again said that a treaty is a contract between two or more sovereign powers affecting the public welfare. They have said it is the same as a private contract except that it is between sovereign powers. Every lawyer here knows what a private contract is. It is an agreement upon sufficient consideration to do or not to do a certain thing. Does not this measure provide for such an agreement? Does it not provide for a contract which the President is authorized to make? Does anyone deny it is a contract he is authorized to make? Of course, it cannot be denied that it is a contract. He is authorized to enter into contracts with any foreign government for a period of 3 years to change any duty on any article which may be imported into the United States. Is not such an agreement a contract? The Supreme Court, without exception, has held that such agreements between our Government and foreign governments are contracts; and contracts are treaties.

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

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. While it may be true, as a definition of "treaty," that it is a contract, does it necessarily follow that all contracts between nations are treaties which require ratification by the Senate?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes; absolutely.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the statement of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] that the exercise of the authority conferred under this act is a regulation of commerce. The Senator from Nevada, of course, disagrees with me in that respect.

Mr. PITTMAN. I do not think it is a regulation of commerce at all. I think it is putting into force a tariff act.

Mr. BARKLEY. Congress has the power to regulate commerce among the States and has set up the Federal Trade

Commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission to assist it.

Mr. PITTMAN. That has nothing to do with foreign commerce or foreign governments.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand. But the same constitutional power, the same sentence and line that confers upon the Congress the power to regulate commerce among the States also confers upon the Congress the power to regulate commerce between the United States and foreign countries. It is a coextensive power. It is an equal power. Does the Senator distinguish between the power of the Congress to regulate commerce among the States and between the United States and foreign governments?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes; but this power is subject to the other restrictions of the Constitution, such as the provision respecting treaties.

Mr. BARKLEY. Even the Tariff Commission is a regulatory body in a sense, and the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Tariff Commission are all established in pursuance of the commerce clause of the Constitution and not of the revenue-raising clause of the Constitution. Cannot the Congress designate the President as its agent to regulate commerce between this country and foreign countries as validly as it can set up a commission to do that very thing between the States, and does the Senator doubt that Congress could set up a commission to do what the President is authorized to do?

Mr. PITTMAN. I think it is perfectly absurd to say because we have regulations, within limits, within our own country to carry on our own business, that we can do the same thing with respect to foreign governments through contracts. The framers of our Constitution were afraid of foreign governments, and we are still afraid of foreign governments. If we can allow the President or direct or instruct him or seduce him into entering into agreements under this act, what happens? Is he obliged to stop at that point? Now that the great war has come and a grave emergency has arisen, suppose Congress were to pass an act authorizing the President, in his discretion, when he finds it necessary in the interest of the peace of this country, to enter into contracts with foreign governments in aid of the protection of the peace, what might be the result? That may be the next thing that is coming. What could the President do under such an act? He could join the League of Nations if he thought it necessary for the protection of the peace of the United States. He could join the World Court. Why not? He could do those things if he thought it in the interest of peace and the welfare of the United States. Under this precedent any agreement he entered into would not require ratification.

Mr. President, I think we have fiddled with the Constitution long enough. I do not believe we can use a little regulatory body such as the Interstate Commerce Commission as a basis for comparison when it is proposed to enact legislation providing that a foreign government shall be called in to participate with us in making our laws and that such laws cannot be changed for 3 years.

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

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The President under the Constitution is given the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties. It is necessary that two-thirds of Senators present and voting shall agree to such treaties. That is provided in a specific form in the second article of the Constitution. In the first article of the Constitution, the Congress is given the specific right to regulate commerce with foreign nations. To my mind there are two distinct provisions. One is to make what are generally known as treaties, as the Senator has properly defined them. On the other hand, the Constitution provides specifically that the Congress shall regulate commerce with foreign nations, and unless this kind of regulation takes place, what is the meaning of that provision? It seems to me that provision is surplusage; it would have no effect; and what could it be applied to other than to commercial agreements?

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I do not think so. We have in force port regulations. France and Great Britain have

port regulations in force. They are changed every week or two. They are temporary, for the purpose of carrying on business and regulating commerce. If the Congress could delegate the power to the President to make tariffs, Congress would not be needed, would it? If the constitutional provision that revenue acts shall be initiated in the House of Representatives means nothing, the majority of Congress could let the President initiate tariff acts, as is proposed to be done now. The argument of the Senator from Georgia does not appeal to me that it is not a revenue act. He says that revenue is not the purpose. The purpose of the legislation, as it exists today, is to raise revenue. Why is not legislation whose purpose is to amend the tariff act revenue legislation? Is it supposed for one instant, if the Senate of the United States had initiated a tariff measure reducing the present tariff, that the House would not protest and refuse to consider the measure?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the Senator, but I will say that I do not think we have enacted a tariff law for the purpose of raising revenue for 40 years in the United States. Such laws have been designed very largely to prevent revenue from coming into the Treasury. The Supreme Court has settled that question. I think it settled it very definitely in the University of Chicago case, in which the university contended that in importing certain articles for its use the university was not subject to tariff duties, because it was an agency of the State, and the State could not be taxed by the Federal Government. The Supreme Court of the United States, speaking through Mr. Chief Justice Hughes, in deciding that case said that our present tariff act—this is the effect of the decision—was a measure to regulate commerce between the United States and foreign nations. But not only is that true, but the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is very definitely an attempt to regulate commerce, because we had tariffs which the party then coming into power believed to be too high. We had tariffs that were thought to be impeding the flow of commerce, and the whole purpose that breathes in every line of the act is an effort to regulate commerce by stimulating the flow of commerce. It may be an unwise act, but that is the congressional purpose.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, whether that is the purpose or not, no matter what the purpose is, it would not justify violating the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh no, I am not now arguing that point with the Senator. If the Trade Agreements Act is a lawful delegation of constitutional power, in my opinion any treaty negotiated under it, in which the President stays within the terms of the act, is legal and binding.

Mr. PITTMAN. Within the terms of the act? What are its terms?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it would take a considerable time to give adequate discussion to that particular point, and I would not endeavor to take the time to do so now.

Mr. PITTMAN. In the case of the McKinley Act of 1890 the terms were absolutely definite as to what the treaty should be in one case and in another. The same is true with respect to the Dingley Tariff Act.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true. I do not want to divert the Senator from the line of his thought.

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

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. KING. I am prompted to make an observation in line with the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. The Democratic Party has affirmed over and over again that it believes in obtaining revenue from tariffs, and it has declared in favor of lowering tariff rates when, as was believed in many instances, greater revenue would be obtained, but at any rate the Democratic Party has always contended that any legislation affecting duties upon imports was a revenue measure. Whether we call it a tariff act or reciprocity act, or anything else, it is a revenue measure, and therefore the Trade Agreement Act obviously in many respects comes within the category of being a revenue measure.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I may have overspoken myself. I do not recall the provisions of the Underwood Tariff

Act. Perhaps that could be declared to be an act to raise revenue, but if so it is the only one within recent years. The others have had another very definite purpose. But in both the Fordney-McCumber Act and the Hawley-Smoot Act it is recited, among other things, that it is for the purpose of regulating commerce with foreign governments. The Supreme Court has textually held that the effect of the present tariff act is to regulate commerce with foreign countries, rather than to raise revenue.

Mr. PITTMAN. If I recollect correctly, the Court held that it was also for protection. The Supreme Court has held that the act had in view protection of industry and revenue and regulation of commerce.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. PITTMAN. But, notwithstanding that, it had to originate in the House. What it is sought to do now is to get a new system of making tariffs.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this act originated in the House, and even the joint resolution to renew it originated in the House.

Mr. PITTMAN. This measure originated in the House. It does not change the present tariff law. It does not provide any tariff law. It does not do anything at all except to say to the President of the United States, "You may make a tariff law." However, I still come back to the proposition that no matter under what subterfuge the power is granted—whether it be the interstate and foreign commerce provision of the Constitution, or emergencies and war necessities—when it comes to using the authority granted to the President to make revenue duties through contracts with foreign governments, we cannot control such contracts. We may be able to control the maximum or minimum limits of the tariff; but Congress cannot control an agreement for a definite period of time which puts a burden on this country and affects the welfare of the country if we say that the agreement does not have to be ratified by the Senate as a treaty. It is the treaty-making power which is violated.

Suppose the Congress of the United States should pass a bill saying that the President may make treaties with South American countries, and that such treaties would not have to be ratified. That is what we are proposing to do in the present instance. Would such a measure be constitutional? I do not think any Member of this body would want to grant to the President the power, without review by the Senate, to make even as mild treaties as we have made with South American countries, dealing with cultural matters, the exchange of professors and students, and the like.

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

Mr. PITTMAN. As a matter of fact, many a line could be thrown into a treaty with a South American country which we in the Senate might consider disastrous. We have the right to deal with contracts with foreign governments. However, if we set this precedent, the attitude hereafter may well be, "What is the use of bothering with those things? Leave them to the discretion of the President. We will authorize him to enter into treaties with the American republics, without ratification by the Senate, when he finds it is to the interest and welfare and peace of this country to do so." I say that if this precedent is set in the case of a plain contract affecting our public welfare for a definite period of time, then we repudiate that provision of the Constitution which requires ratification by the United States Senate.

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

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think I can give the Senator a specific example of the precise thing he has just been discussing. To me it is a confession of the use of an extra-constitutional power by the State Department. Let me read the Senator one sentence from article XI of the trade treaty with Colombia, made May 20, 1936:

As long as the present agreement remains in effect—

That is the trade agreement—

it shall supersede any provisions of the Treaty of Peace, Amity, Navigation, and Commerce between the United States and the Republic of New Granada, signed at Bogota, December 12, 1846—

And so forth. In other words, we have a frank confession of a treaty amended by an act of the Executive.

Mr. PITTMAN. We know that nothing can repeal a treaty except another treaty or an act of Congress.

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

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Following the suggestion made by the able Senator from Michigan, in the treaty with Belgium we find the identical language affecting a treaty of 1872, known as the Belge-Luxemburg Treaty.

Mr. PITTMAN. Undoubtedly such agreements are treated as laws. No agreement except a treaty is a law. These agreements are treated as treaties, which can repeal other treaties. Everyone at all familiar with constitutional law knows that the only way to repeal a treaty is by a congressional act or by another treaty, or by declaring it repealed in accordance with the terms of the treaty itself.

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

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. In line with that reasoning, does the Senator contend that treaties which have been negotiated, and which we are now told have the effect of law, and under which our commerce is being regulated, are not in fact law because they have not been ratified by the Senate?

Mr. PITTMAN. I believe that they are unconstitutional. My argument leads to that conclusion. However, my amendment applies only to agreements hereafter made. The reason for doing so, of course, is that I do not feel that we are justified in disturbing all the transactions which have gone on for years. I do not think such action would be sufficiently beneficial, and I have very grave doubt as to whether or not anyone could get into the Supreme Court to be heard on the matter. I am dealing only with agreements hereafter made.

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

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I am in complete agreement with all the Senator has said up to this point. He has argued that the agreements are in fact treaties which require Senate ratification in order to legalize them and bring them within the four corners of the Constitution. I call his attention to the fact that there is eminent authority for the further contention that even by a treaty ratified by the Senate we may not deal with our tariff rates. Apparently, Mr. Taft, the great crusader in behalf of reciprocity, held that opinion when he was President, because when he negotiated the arrangement with Canada he did not ask for ratification only by the Senate but sent legislation to both Houses of Congress in order to implement the Canadian reciprocity agreement, because it affected the revenues of the United States and involved the taxing power, which was a primary responsibility of the House of Representatives.

Mr. PITTMAN. As I say, I do not believe the delegation of authority was constitutional, but I am not arguing that question. There are others who can argue it more ably than I. However, I contend that no matter what the delegation is, the President may not make such a contract with a foreign government reducing for a period of time our revenue rates, except by a treaty. I understand that the President may make certain agreements and have understandings, which are not treaties, in respect to foreign relations.

I wish to consider the cases cited by Dr. Sayre, a distinguished professor of law. These cases were cited at the hearings before the House Committee on Ways and Means, in an attempt to show that this kind of an agreement, which may be made by the President, has been approved in other cases. If that distinguished lawyer could have found stronger cases than these, I think he would have found them.

Let us consider the first case. The first case is the case of Field against Clark. What was that case? That case was brought by three or four persons attacking the constitutionality of the McKinley Tariff Act of 1890. They raised a number of grounds. They wanted to obtain the lower rates

under the prior act, and they attacked the McKinley Act as unconstitutional. On what ground? In the first place, they attacked it on the ground that the act was not the measure which had passed the Senate. They tried to go behind the act and show what had happened in the Senate. The Supreme Court said, "You may not go behind the act."

The sugar schedule was also attacked as unconstitutional. Another thing which was attacked was the delegation of legislative and treaty-making power in the act. What the Court said was very interesting:

The plaintiffs in error contend that this section, so far as it authorizes the President to suspend the provisions of the act relating to the free introduction of sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, is unconstitutional, as delegating to him both legislative and treaty-making powers, and, being an essential part of the system established by Congress, the entire act must be declared null and void. On behalf of the United States it is insisted that legislation of this character is sustained by an early decision of this court and by the practice of the Government for nearly a century.

The main fight was on the question whether or not the delegation of authority was constitutional. There was nothing about treaties in the act. The appellants contended that the act was an unconstitutional delegation of legislative and treaty-making power. The Court said:

To what extent do precedents in legislation sustain the validity of the section under consideration, so far as it makes the suspension of certain provisions and the going into operation of other provisions of an act of Congress depend upon the action of the President based upon the occurrence of subsequent events, or the ascertainment by him of certain facts, to be made known by his proclamation? If we find that Congress has frequently, from the organization of the Government to the present time, conferred upon the President powers, with reference to trade and commerce, like those conferred by the third section of the act of October 1, 1890, that fact is entitled to great weight in determining the question before us.

What power was delegated to the President under the act of 1890? The right to put either one of two acts into effect. The appellants said that such a delegation of power was unconstitutional. From the very beginning of our history, whenever Congress has laid down alternative standards one providing for free trade and the other for tariffs, and has allowed the President to put either one in effect upon the occurrence of certain conditions, such delegation of power has been upheld, of course. There is no question about it.

The Court went on to say:

As the suspension was absolutely required when the President ascertained the existence of a particular fact, it cannot be said that in ascertaining that fact and in issuing his proclamation, in obedience to the legislative will, he exercised the function of making laws. Legislative power was exercised when Congress declared that the suspension should take effect upon a named contingency. What the President was required to do was simply in execution of the act of Congress.

There is no such situation here. We have not two acts of Congress; we have, in fact, no act at all. In this case there were certain goods on the free list and the President was authorized to put them on the dutiable list at certain rates specified if there was a discrimination against us by foreign countries.

What would the President do in that case? He would induce other countries to reduce some of their tariff rates under the threat that he would take certain commodities off the free list and put them on the dutiable list; but he would enter into no agreement; there was no agreement at all. No agreement can be found in this instance. It simply says that, in view of the fact that the State of Brazil has reduced its tariff on certain commodities, the United States will allow certain commodities to remain on the free list. That is all that is stated.

But in this case, the court says:

The court is of opinion that the third section of the act of October 1, 1890, is not liable to the objection that it transfers legislative and treaty-making power to the President.

That is all; there is no mention of a treaty in that act. Of course, Mr. President, all that act did was to say to a foreign country, "Reduce your tariff on certain commodities or we will take certain articles off the free list and put them on the dutiable list." That was the only thing done.

What is the other case under the Dingley Tariff Act? The proponents of the measure talk about the Altman case.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. Perhaps the Senator will not mind my suggesting that in that case the President did not fix the tariff rates, but the act itself prescribed the exact duties which should be in effect if the President made his finding?

Mr. PITTMAN. Exactly.

Mr. ADAMS. It was not left to him as to what the tariff rate should be.

Mr. PITTMAN. There was no discretion left at all. There were certain articles on the free list, such as sugar, for instance, and, of course, there was a dutiable list as to other articles and the law allowed the President to put into effect if he wanted to, the rates provided in the dutiable list on certain commodities in the event some other country was discriminating against us. That was all that was provided.

I should like to put into the RECORD at this point the reciprocal provision of the Tariff Act of 1890. I desire to put it into the RECORD because it governs the case which is cited to show that this act is constitutional. I read from section 3 of the Tariff Act of 1890:

SEC. 3. That with a view to secure reciprocal trade with countries producing the following articles, and for this purpose, on and after the 1st day of January 1892, whenever, and so often as the President shall be satisfied that the government of any country producing and exporting sugars, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, raw and uncured, or any of such articles, imposes duties or other exactions upon the agricultural or other products of the United States, which in view of the free introduction of such sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides into the United States, he may deem to be reciprocally unequal and unreasonable, he shall have the power and it shall be his duty to suspend, by proclamation to that effect, the provisions of this act relating to the free introduction of such sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, the products of such country, for such time as he shall deem just, and in such case and during such suspension duties shall be levied, collected, and paid upon sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, the product of or exported from such designated country as follows, namely—

Each item is specified. As a matter of fact, the President did not put that provision into effect. He allowed these articles to remain on the free list in consideration of the other countries reducing some of their duties. I ask that the entire section 3 of the McKinley Tariff Act of 1890 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[U. S. Stat. L., ch. 1244, 1890; McKinley Tariff Act of 1890]

SEC. 3. That with a view to secure reciprocal trade with countries producing the following articles, and for this purpose, on and after the 1st day of January 1892 whenever, and so often as the President shall be satisfied that the government of any country producing and exporting sugars, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, raw and uncured, or any of such articles, imposes duties or other exactions upon the agricultural or other products of the United States, which in view of the free introduction of such sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides into the United States he may deem to be reciprocally unequal and unreasonable, he shall have the power and it shall be his duty to suspend, by proclamation to that effect, the provisions of this act relating to the free introduction of such sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, the production of such country, for such time as he shall deem just, and in such case and during such suspension duties shall be levied, collected, and paid upon sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, the product of or exported from such designated country as follows, namely:

All sugars not above No. 13 Dutch standard in color shall pay duty on their polariscopic tests as follows, namely:

All sugars not above No. 13 Dutch standard in color, all tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice or of beet juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscopic not above 75°, seven-tenths of 1 cent per pound; and for every additional degree or fraction of a degree shown by the polariscopic test, two-hundredths of 1 cent per pound additional.

All sugars above No. 13 Dutch standard in color shall be classified by the Dutch standard of color, and pay duty as follows, namely: All sugar above No. 13 and not above No. 16 Dutch standard of color, 1½ cents per pound.

All sugar above No. 16 and not above No. 20 Dutch standard of color, 1½ cents per pound.

All sugars above No. 20 Dutch standard of color, 2 cents per pound.

Molasses testing above 56°, 4 cents per gallon.

Sugar drainings and sugar sweepings shall be subject to duty either as molasses or sugar, as the case may be, according to polariscopic test.

On coffee, 3 cents per pound.

On tea, 10 cents per pound.

Hides, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled, Angora goat skins, raw, without the wool, unmanufactured, asses' skins, raw or unmanufactured, and skins, except sheep skins, with the wool on, 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. PITTMAN. Now I invite the Senate to listen to the Altman case, which is the prize case of those who contend that when the Court stated that certain agreements were not treaties it absolutely proved that the agreements under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act are not treaties.

The decision referred to was rendered under the Dingley Tariff Act. The Dingley Act, of course, was a long act, but I will read the reciprocal provision of that act. I have already given the Senate the reciprocal provision of the 1890 act, and in the Dingley Act there was practically the same provision:

SEC. 3. That for the purpose of equalizing the trade of the United States with foreign countries—

And so forth—

the following articles: Argols or crude tartar, or wine lees, crude; brandies * * *, champagne * * *, still wines, and vermouth; paintings and statuary.

Under the act the President could reduce the tariffs on those commodities, if he wanted to, by putting into effect the rates provided under section 3 of the act. The regular rate under the Dingley tariff was 45 percent. It was provided that if certain governments made concessions to us with regard to our exports the President might impose a lower duty, down to 15 percent.

This is what the suit arose over. In the reciprocity provision of the Dingley Act it was provided that the rate on paintings in oils or water colors, pastels, pen-and-ink drawings, and statuary should be 15 percent ad valorem.

That was the rate to which the tariff might be reduced. Altman & Co. imported a piece of molded statuary from France.

The Government of France had entered into an agreement with President McKinley under the reciprocal provision of the Dingley Tariff Act. In other words, France obtained a reduction of tariff duties on brandies, statuary, and other commodities mentioned, and President McKinley proclaimed the rate under which those commodities should be allowed to come into this country. This is what the President did, and it is all he did—and I am getting down to the Altman case—the President issued a proclamation, saying:

Whereas, pursuant to section 3 of the act of Congress approved July 24, 1897, entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," the Governments of the United States and of the French Republic have in the spirit of amity, and with a desire to improve their commercial relations, entered into a commercial agreement in which reciprocal and equivalent concessions have been in the judgment of the President secured according to the provisions of said section, whereby the following articles of commerce, being the products and manufactures of the United States, are to be admitted into France on and after the 1st day of June 1898, at the minimum rate of duty, not exceeding the rates respectively appearing in the following table—

Then the articles bearing the lower rate are set forth in the table—

Therefore, in further execution of the provisions of said section, it is hereby declared that on and after the 1st day of June 1898, and during the continuance in force of the agreement aforesaid, and until otherwise declared, the imposition and collection of the duties heretofore imposed and collected upon the following-named articles, the products of France, by virtue of said act, are hereby suspended, and in place thereof the duties shall be imposed and collected thereon according to the provisions of said section 3, as follows:

Then the articles on which the lower rate of duty is to be imposed are enumerated, after which the proclamation proceeds:

Now, therefore, be it known that I, William McKinley, President of the United States of America, have caused the above-stated modifications of the customs duties of the respective countries to be made public for the information of the citizens of the United States of America.

Mr. President, let me now call attention to the fact that that was the only agreement with France; that was all of it. France simply notified President McKinley that it had reduced French tariff duties on certain articles, whereupon the President declared that the lower rates of the American tariff should go into effect on certain French articles.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, may I make an inquiry of the Senator?

Mr. PITTMAN. Certainly.

Mr. BONE. Do I understand that the cases which are relied on to which the Senator has adverted are instances in which the Congress has authorized the President to make shifts in the tariff rates only in definitely specified categories?

Mr. PITTMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BONE. And with a strict limitation on his power to make changes only in those definite categories?

Mr. PITTMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BONE. In other words, it was to some degree, then, a unilateral operation?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes; it was.

I will state that the opinion in the Altman case deals very largely with the delegation of legislative authority. The question of treaties came into this matter in only one way. Under the Circuit Court of Appeals Act of 1891, an appeal might be taken from the circuit court directly to the Supreme Court in cases affecting revenues and cases involving the construction of a statute or a treaty. That was what was provided in the act. The Court, in its opinion in the Altman case, held that it was undoubtedly the intention of Congress to allow all kinds of compacts and agreements and treaties entered into between our Government and some foreign government to come up to the Supreme Court for construction. It was impossible to tell whether or not the instrument in question was a treaty until it got there; and the Court held that in passing the Circuit Court of Appeals Act, which stated that there might be a direct appeal from the construction of a treaty to the Supreme Court, Congress evidently did not intend a narrow construction of the Constitution in relation to a treaty but meant any agreement entered into by our Government and a foreign government; and the Court held that the proclamation of the President was an agreement but not a treaty. It was not a contract because it was not binding for any definite time. It lasted only so long as either government wanted it to last and no longer. The proclamation itself stated that it should last only so long as it was not changed. There was no contract whatever. It was simply an arrangement that the President had with France that France would reduce its tariff on certain articles and the President would reduce the American tariff on certain articles; but here is the part that is pertinent to this case. The Court says in its opinion:

The bust was imported from France and was assessed a duty of 45 percent ad valorem under paragraph 193 of the Tariff Act of 1897 (30 Stat. 151, 167), which covers articles or wares, not specially provided for in the act, composed wholly or in part of metal, and whether partly or wholly manufactured. A protest was filed by the importers in which they contended that the bust should be classed as statuary—

Statuary was one of the articles on which the duty could be reduced.

under the commercial reciprocal agreement with France (30 Stat. 1774), which was negotiated under the authority contained in section 3 of the Tariff Act of 1897, to make reciprocal agreements with reference, among other articles, to "paintings in oil or water colors, pastels, pen and ink drawings, and statuary."

This is what the appellants contended in that matter: It was contended that the lower court erred—

In not holding that the commercial agreement between the United States and France, as proclaimed by the President of the United States (T. D. 19405 and 30 Stat. 1774), was to be in full scope according to its language without being in any way restricted or modified by the definition contained in paragraph 454, section 1, of the Tariff Act of July 24, 1897, but which definition was not embodied either in the commercial agreement itself or in the President's proclamation thereof.

What did the court hold? It held that the statute governed; that the so-called agreement was nothing but a

method of executing the statute; and that while the agreement merely used the word "statuary," the act itself defined what "statuary" was. It has to be a work of art, and not a molding.

Let me read the last part of the opinion. Let us be frank, and see what the court had to say about this agreement:

While it may be true that this commercial agreement, made under authority of the Tariff Act of 1897, section 3, was not a treaty possessing the dignity of one requiring ratification by the Senate of the United States, it was an international compact, negotiated between the representatives of two sovereign nations and made in the name and on behalf of the contracting countries, and dealing with important commercial relations between the two countries, and was proclaimed by the President. If not technically a treaty requiring ratification, nevertheless it was a compact authorized by the Congress of the United States, negotiated and proclaimed under the authority of its President. We think such a compact is a treaty under the Circuit Court of Appeals Act, and where its construction is directly involved, as it is here, there is a right of review by direct appeal to this Court.

That is the way the case got there, but this is the opinion of the Court in that case, in which the Court said that the so-called agreement was not binding because it was simply a device to carry out an act which was on the statute books, and I will read it to you.

The negotiation was entered into between the representatives of the two countries under the authority of section 3 of the Tariff Act of 1897, as we have seen. In that act the term "statuary" is defined as follows: "The term 'statuary' as used in this act shall be understood to include only such statuary as is cut, carved, or otherwise wrought by hand from a solid block or mass of marble, stone, or alabaster, or from metal, and as is the professional production of a statuary or sculptor only." The reciprocal agreements were authorized with reference to "paintings in oil or water colors, pastels, pen-and-ink drawings, and statuary." We think this must have reference to statuary as already defined in the act, which both parties understood was the source of their authority to negotiate the reciprocal commercial agreement in question, for the agreement provides:

"It is reciprocally agreed on the part of the United States, in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the United States Tariff Act of 1897, that during the continuance in force of this agreement, the following articles of commerce, the product of the soil or industry of France, shall be admitted into the United States at rates of duty not exceeding the following, to wit:

"Paintings in oil or water colors, pastels, pen-and-ink drawings, and statuary, 15 percent ad valorem."

Thus in its terms the agreement was made under the authority and in accordance with section 3 of the Tariff Act of 1897, in which very act the term statuary, as used therein, was specifically defined, as we have already stated.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator is reading from the Altman case?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes, from the Altman case.

Mr. ADAMS. As I understand, the case deals with two definitions. One is the term "treaty" as used in the Circuit Court of Appeals Act. The other is the term "statuary" as used in the Tariff Act.

Mr. PITTMAN. That is correct.

Mr. ADAMS. I was hoping that the Senator would point out what is contained in section 4 of the act with which he is dealing.

Mr. PITTMAN. I will.

Mr. ADAMS. Section 4 of the act, which gives a general right for reciprocity negotiations, specifically compels that they be referred back not only to the Senate but to the Congress for ratification.

Mr. PITTMAN. I will discuss that in a few minutes. I thank the Senator. I will read the closing language of the opinion:

We think that it is clear that the Board of General Appraisers and the circuit court did not err in finding that this bronze statue was not wrought by hand from metal. On the other hand, the testimony is clear that the statue was cast from metal by artisans employed for that purpose, and was very little touched, if at all, in its finishing, by the professional designer.

In that case, to which the Senator has called attention, the only attempted interpretation of the word "treaty" was in connection with the Circuit Court of Appeals Act of 1891, which stated, among other things, that there might be a direct appeal from the circuit court of appeals to the Supreme Court in the construction of constitutional questions with regard to statutes or treaties, and that while the language in the Circuit Court of Appeals Act said "treaties" the court thought the intent of Congress in allowing them to investigate these instruments to see whether or not they were treaties was to allow them to take in any agreement or compact or treaty between our Government and a foreign government, and therefore they took jurisdiction of the case; but no question of a treaty was involved. The proponents of this measure have admitted that an agreement and a treaty are two different things or just the same thing; I do not know which they admit.

Now, let me take up this act. I have read a part of the Dingley Act. I desire to call attention to something very peculiar about this matter. I said a while ago that no Congress from the beginning of our Government had ever attempted to delegate such authority as is delegated in this instance. I have already gone through the statutes down to 1890, and all the President was allowed to do in the statute of 1890 was to raise the duty on some free-list articles to a specified rate.

The Dingley Act, in section 3, dealt with the specific articles about which I have told the Senate, and all the President had to do was to proclaim what they were. He proclaimed them, and that was the end of it. Remember that section 3 of the Dingley Act dealt with certain specific articles which were on a certain dutiable list but which the President had a right to put on another dutiable list; and the duties in each list were set out in the statute. But now I shall read section 4. This is what Congress thought about agreements of this kind:

Sec. 4. That whenever the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, with a view to secure reciprocal trade with foreign countries, shall, within the period of 2 years from and after the passage of this act, enter into commercial treaty or treaties with any other country or countries concerning the admission into any such country or countries of the goods, wares, and merchandise of the United States and their use and disposition therein, deemed to be for the interests of the United States, and in such treaty or treaties, in consideration of the advantages accruing to the United States therefrom, shall provide for the reduction during a specified period, not exceeding 5 years, of the duties imposed by this act, to the extent of not more than 20 percent thereof, upon such goods, wares, or merchandise, as may be designated therein of the country or countries with which such treaty or treaties shall be made as in this section provided for; or shall provide for the transfer during such period from the dutiable list of this act to the free list thereof of such goods, wares, and merchandise, being the natural products of such foreign country or countries and not of the United States; or shall provide for the retention upon the free list of this act during a specified period, not exceeding 5 years, of such goods, wares, and merchandise now included in said free list as may be designated therein; and when any such treaty shall have been duly ratified by the Senate and approved by Congress, and public proclamation made accordingly, then and thereafter the duties which shall be collected by the United States upon any of the designated goods, wares, and merchandise from the foreign country with which such treaty has been made shall, during the period provided for, be the duties specified and provided for in such treaty, and none other.

The Altman case was under section 3 of the Dingley Act, not under section 4. Section 3 prescribes certain acts by the President, leaving goods named on the one list, or putting them on another list with the duties named. But here the reference to agreements not ratified is to those made under section 4. Agreements were negotiated by the President under section 4, and those were the only important agreements negotiated. The few articles mentioned in section 3 did not amount to much. But in section 4, Congress expressly provided, with regard to general agreements such as are prescribed in this measure, for agreements with regard to other articles of import, which agreements not only must have been ratified by the Senate, but must have been approved by Congress.

Some complaint has been made with regard to the failure to ratify the treaties which were negotiated under section 4.

Let us assume that the United States Senate did not approve them. Was it any crime that they should refuse to ratify them?

The distinguished Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Grady, when testifying before the House committee, made as his chief argument against the necessity of ratification of trade agreements by the Senate the statement that under section 4 of the Dingley Act such agreements were required to be ratified, but that they were not ratified by the Senate. I know there are governments far more expeditious than is the United States Government. Hitler's government is more expeditious than ours. Hitler can execute a man without indictment or trial. Hitler can place any tax upon his people he desires. His is an expeditious government, and there are other expeditious governments in Europe. But we do not want such expedition.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the agreements which were not ratified were all negotiated by a certain gentleman who was not in a high place, a man by the name of Kasson?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes.

Mr. ADAMS. Do the House hearings at any place disclose that these agreements should have been ratified?

Mr. PITTMAN. No; I did not find any such evidence. I found that the Assistant Secretary was very much incensed at the great delay in passing the Tariff Act.

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

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I recall, the agreements were not even voted on. The Senate did not even vote to reject them. They were just not voted upon.

Mr. PITTMAN. They could not have been very desirable, or the President or someone else would have been urging that they be taken up. The chances are that they were so absurd that the President of the United States would not ask Congress to act on them. There is no history of them.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, is it not a fact that as soon as the contents of those treaties were made known to the public there was such a storm of indignation that the President declined to urge their ratification; and, of course, the Senate declined to take any action?

Mr. PITTMAN. The history of what happened was not disclosed by the Assistant Secretary before the committee. The whole complaint was that making treaties meant delay. I think there has been more damage done our Government by hasty action than ever was done by delay. Some are impatient now because we will not surrender the constitutional power of the United States Senate. That is the whole thing.

Perhaps we are wrong. Perhaps the President of the United States should be allowed to enter into any kind of contract with foreign governments without any review by the Congress of the United States. If that is the case, let us repeal the provision with reference to treaties in the regular way, but not attempt by subterfuge and circumlocution to repeal that provision of the Constitution.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks, which are about to come to a close, the various reciprocal tariff acts, starting in 1890 with the McKinley law, so that the Senate can see that no treaty was required under any of them, except under section 4 of the Dingley Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, the little agreements which were made for the purpose of putting into force one tariff or another were merely in the form of diplomatic correspondence which Presidents had, without being binding for a moment. None of those agreements was binding. An agreement made under the pending measure would be binding for 3 years.

We passed a flexible tariff act, but no foreign government helped us make it, and we are under no obligation to any foreign government not to repeal it or to amend it or to modify it any day when we get ready to do so.

By the proposed law we would be inviting foreign governments to enter into agreements with the President of the

United States with regard to all kinds of matters. It would not make any difference whether it was a tariff matter or whether it was cultural or whether it was looking toward peace. We would be saying that we believed that this delegation to the President to make an agreement with a foreign government, which agreement would really be a law, without ratification of the Senate, would be constitutional.

If we once set that precedent, we will have a Congress which will relieve itself of responsibility in order to get expedition, which will be secured by turning over to the President power to enter into any kind of an agreement with a foreign country with regard to anything which he thinks will preserve the peace of this country.

I think that perhaps Congress would be more justified in authorizing the President of the United States to enter into agreements with foreign countries which, in his opinion, he believed would tend to maintain the peace of this country than in providing the authorization contemplated by the pending measure. But if we are to do it, we must recognize that he would have the right, in his discretion, if he proclaimed it in the interest of the peace of our Government, to put the United States into the League of Nations. Why should we delay on the floor of the Senate in considering a question of that kind, which the President might consider necessary in an emergency? It would be contended that we should act quickly. The President might favor adherence to the World Court as a means of protecting our country against war. Why not grant the power to him? Why take the time on the floor of the Senate to delay action of that kind? It might be a war emergency! Of course, such delegation would be unconstitutional.

Mr. President, I have not discussed this matter pro forma. I admit that I have made the argument somewhat wanders. But I am as intensely interested in this question as in any to which I have ever addressed myself. I believe that the enactment of this measure would be the first step toward abolishing the constitutional provision with regard to the ratification of treaties. I am sure of it.

Reference has been made to the case of United States against Curtiss-Wright. That case had nothing to do with treaties. The officers of the Curtiss-Wright Co. were indicted under a proclamation the President made under a statute prohibiting the export of arms and munitions to Bolivia and Paraguay.

After the President issued the proclamation the officers of the Curtiss-Wright Co. were indicted and convicted. There was not a word as to a treaty in the case, except in the long-winded opinion—and it was an excellent opinion, at that—in which the Court sustained the inherent power of the President in matters concerning relations between this Government and foreign governments, where not restricted by the Constitution.

In the case of United States against Belmont no question of a treaty was involved.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, if the power should be held to be inherent in the Executive, then the power must necessarily be all-inclusive.

Mr. PITTMAN. There is no doubt from the argument made in the Belmont case, which is very clear and plain, that there are certain duties and obligations falling on sovereignty, that the sovereignty must communicate with other sovereignties in various ways. There was no question of treaties involved.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. To negotiate them.

Mr. PITTMAN. No one denies the power to negotiate treaties, have understandings, make agreements, but when it comes to making treaties, that is not an inherent power, because that has been limited by the Constitution.

I should like to read the Belmont case, but will not have time to do so. However, I wish to read the concurring opinion. I think the whole matter will be settled by reading the concurring opinion in the Belmont case. The concurring opinion was written by Mr. Justice Stone, concurred in by Mr. Justice Brandeis and Mr. Justice Cardozo.

Mr. President, in that case a corporation was organized in the United States, prior to 1918, under the laws of Russia.

The corporation had a bank deposit in August Belmont's bank in New York. In 1918, when the Communists came into power, they declared the corporation dissolved and confiscated its property. Of course, it being a Russian corporation, the Communist government claimed the right to confiscate the corporation's money in the banks in New York. As a matter of fact, Americans owned the corporation and its funds. When we recognized the Soviet Republic in 1933, the Soviet Republic assigned to the President of the United States these accounts in the Belmont bank. They owned them because they had sequestered them, and they assigned them to the President of the United States. The President took them over. No treaty was involved. The President simply took over the funds.

I wish to read a few lines from the concurring opinion in that case:

It is unnecessary to consider whether the present agreement between the two Governments can rightly be given the same effect as a treaty within this rule, for neither the allegations of the bill of complaint, nor the diplomatic exchanges, suggest that the United States has either recognized or declared that any State policy is to be overridden.

So far as now relevant, the documents signed by the Soviet Government, as preparatory to a more general settlement of claims and counterclaims between the two Governments, assigns and releases to the United States all amounts "due or that may be found to be due it" from American nationals, and provides that the Soviet Government is "to be duly notified in each case of any amount realized by the Government of the United States from such release and assignment." The relevant portion of that document signed by the President is expressed in the following paragraph:

"I am glad to have these undertakings by your Government, and I shall be pleased to notify your Government in each case of any amount realized by the Government of the United States from the release and assignment to it of the amounts admitted to be due or that may be found to be due."

Of course, that was not a treaty. Naturally it was not. There was assigned to the President in trust some money in a bank. The only condition of the trust was that the President was to notify the Soviet Government from time to time of collections. Not a single case is cited that is not exactly along the same line as the cases I have read. Yet those are the only cases that can be found by Dr. Sayre in support of his contention that agreements similar to the ones now to be authorized have been approved by the Supreme Court of the United States. No case of that kind can be found. As a matter of fact, the distinction between informal communications between the President and foreign governments has emphasized the fact that trade agreements do constitute treaties. They provide for a period a years contracts for certain changes in our laws, and such contracts cannot be terminated morally or legally within 3 years.

It is strange that the United States, which has been an example of democracy for all American republics, which has taught them the safeguards that we have thrown around the citizen in our Constitution, and has induced them to adopt the same safeguards, should now desert those safeguards by enacting this legislation. But let me show that the little South American republics, to whom we have taught democracy, require ratification of these agreements. Consider this, for instance:

Agreements became effective provisionally subject to eventual legislative action in the foreign country, and such subsequent legislative action has been taken in all but three countries as noted below:

First. Canada—two agreements.

Second. Czechoslovakia—not ratified and ratification cannot now be expected.

Third. France—subsequent legislative action has not yet been taken, so agreement is in effect only provisionally.

Fourth. Netherlands.

Fifth. Switzerland.

Sixth. Turkey.

Seventh. United Kingdom.

Eighth. Venezuela—not yet ratified but ratification expected.

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

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Does not the Senator from Nevada find it to be ironical that a great, powerful Nation, whose avowed

purpose is to bring about peace throughout the world, is one of the few, if not the only nation, which does not require ratification?

Mr. PITTMAN. I think it is strange. Let me proceed further.

Agreements did not become effective until they had received legislative approval in the foreign country, as listed below (such approval has been given by all the countries): (1) Brazil, (2) Colombia, (3) Costa Rica, (4) El Salvador, (5) Finland, (6) Guatemala, (7) Haiti, (8) Honduras, (9) Nicaragua, (10) Sweden.

We have taught democracy to those countries. We have taught them that there should be certain safeguards in their constitutions, so that neither the legislative nor the executive nor the judicial could deprive citizens of their rights. Two safeguards were put in the Constitution which we considered most important. One of them was that revenue bills had to originate in the House of Representatives, and the other was that the President of the United States could not enter into treaties with foreign governments save and except by the ratification of the United States Senate, two-thirds of those present concurring.

Mr. President, I think it is pitiful that the distinguished lawyer, the former Assistant Secretary of State, submitted these few cases as a justification of the agreements under this act. There can be no comparison whatever between those cases and the matter under consideration. In the cases cited the legislation provided for carrying out specific statutes. The President had nothing to do except to correspond, exchange letters, and issue a proclamation.

I say again that if under the definition of a treaty by the Supreme Court of the United States the agreements provided for under the pending measure are not treaties, then I cannot conceive of what would be treaties. They are certainly contracts; they are certainly for periods of time; they certainly affect the public welfare; and they cannot be changed morally within the period of 3 years.

Of course, I well know that a number of us Democrats favor lower tariffs; but we do not believe that all tariffs can be lowered without destruction of industry. There is no doubt that some tariffs are too high. There is no question that it is well to encourage trade between nations by removing or lowering trade restrictions. Yet never before in our history has any Congress ever attempted to turn over to a President the supreme powers provided in this legislation.

Mr. President, I wish to place in the RECORD the text of the Underwood Tariff Act at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SECTION IV

A. That for the purpose of readjusting the present duties on importations into the United States and at the same time to encourage the export trade of this country, the President of the United States is authorized and empowered to negotiate trade agreements with foreign nations wherein mutual concessions are made looking toward freer trade relations and further reciprocal expansion of trade and commerce: *Provided, however,* That said trade agreements before becoming operative shall be submitted to the Congress of the United States for ratification or rejection.

B. That nothing in this act contained shall be so construed as to abrogate or in any manner impair or affect the provisions of the treaty of commercial reciprocity concluded between the United States and the Republic of Cuba on the 11th day of December 1902, or the provisions of the act of Congress heretofore passed for the execution of the same except as to the proviso of article 8 of said treaty, which proviso is hereby abrogated and repealed.

Mr. PITTMAN. Oscar Underwood was almost a free-trader. There is no doubt that he believed in the reduction of tariffs. But he was unwilling to trust even the President of the United States—President Wilson—whom he loved and admired, with the power to make tariff laws by agreement, because he provided that such an agreement should not become effective as law until approved by Congress. That was provided in the Underwood Act. But we are drifting away from that rapidly. We are doing away with our constitutional function, because it requires thought on our part, and because our system of government is too slow.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I respectfully wish to say to the Senator that he does not have to go back as far as the Underwood Act. Some of those who are concerned with the situation now felt a little differently awhile ago.

Mr. PITTMAN. I may say that I think the act has some great advantages.

I really think that by conference with foreign governments we can receive great aid in fixing the tariff; but I do not like the system of conferences we have with regard to these matters. A committee in the State Department, headed generally by an Assistant Secretary, with five or six subordinates under him, frames the tariffs. One has the right to appear before the committee if he sees fit to oppose any item. What is the result? He appears before four or five men who have no responsibility to any constituency or to the citizens of the United States. He makes his objections, and hears nothing. The committee sits and listens to him, and when he is through he has not the slightest idea whether the committee agrees with him or disagrees with him. I do not like that method of getting at the facts with regard to a tariff act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PITTMAN. I will yield in a moment.

However, if such an agreement came to the Senate for ratification it would be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and 23 men would sit and argue over every item in it. There would not be very many items. Such treaties usually contain only 6 or 7 items. They are not like tariff bills, which contain thousands of items and afford an opportunity for log-rolling. There would be only 6 or 7 items in such an agreement. The chances are that there would be very little opposition to any item, but if there were opposition we should have a very large committee—a cross-section of the whole United States—which probably would not be governed by any prejudice in the matter.

It is said that the treaties negotiated under section 4 of the Dingley Act were not ratified. Let us remember that conditions now are quite different from those which existed in 1897.

In 1897 the Republicans were for the highest protective tariff they could get—almost an exclusive protective tariff. On the other hand, I think the Democrats were largely free-traders. That situation does not exist today. There are now very few free-traders on the Democratic side; and I believe that today the number of extreme high protectionists is nothing like what it was in the days of 1897. Men's minds have come closer together on these subjects. We need not have the fear we then had. Of course, if there had been any violent reductions in the tariff in 1897, the make-up of the Senate at that time, which was largely Republican, would not have stood for such reductions.

I do not think we now have a situation of that kind. Each treaty involves a few articles with respect to different countries, and there would not be any mass opposition. There might be a few opposed to this item, or a few opposed to another item, but in the long run the treaties would be ratified if they were based upon common sense and reason; and if they were not based upon common sense and reason, expedition would not justify their ratification.

We are now looking to a President of the United States who favors the reduction of tariffs. Remember that the act sought to be extended allows the President to raise the tariff as well as to lower it. It allows him to place embargoes as well as to raise the tariff. Some of us are thinking of the present President. Unfortunately, a high-protective-tariff Republican might be elected at the next election. If so, what should we look for? Should we look for a reduction or should we look for an increase? Which do we want? The authority will last for 3 years.

Furthermore, today, when the world is torn apart, when no stable commercial or monetary systems exist in Europe, when exchange is fluctuating night by night, the futility of

our Government at this time attempting to enter into 3-year contracts with any government in the world must be apparent.

I wrote to the Commission to find out whether or not, in fixing a tariff, they should take into consideration the exchange value of the money of the foreign country with which they were dealing. They admitted that the exchange value of money today has more influence upon the value of the tax than the cost of labor or anything else.

Perhaps, after the war—if it shall be fought to a conclusion—or after peace shall have been established in Europe, we can come back and, on the basis of the facts then existing, intelligently work out some kind of reciprocity treaty. Today we shall be making the greatest mistake of our lives if we authorize the President of the United States to make tariff acts for periods of 3 years by agreements with foreign governments, when even now they are repudiating the agreements they have already made. War necessity compels them to repudiate them.

If the Senate wants to abolish its constitutional privilege to ratify treaties, it can do so now. It has an opportunity to vote down my amendment; but I warn the Senate that the time may come when the precedent we thus establish may be used in a manner which we do not like, and then we shall regret it.

EXHIBIT 1

[Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, approved June 12, 1934]

That the President has authority "(2) to proclaim such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions, or such additional import restrictions, or such continuance, and for such minimum periods, of existing customs or excise treatment of any article covered by foreign-trade agreements, as are required or appropriate to carry out any foreign-trade agreement that the President has entered into hereunder."

Sec. 2. (b): "Every foreign-trade agreement concluded pursuant to this act shall be subject to termination, upon due notice to the foreign government concerned, at the end of not more than 3 years from the date on which the agreement comes into force, and, if not then terminated, shall be subject to termination thereafter upon not more than 6 months' notice."

[U. S. Stat. L., ch. 1244, 1890; McKinley Tariff Act, 1890]

Sec. 3. That with a view to secure reciprocal trade with countries producing the following articles, and for this purpose, on and after the 1st day of January 1892, whenever, and so often as the President shall be satisfied that the government of any country producing and exporting sugars, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, raw and uncured, or any of such articles, imposes duties or other exactions upon the agricultural or other products of the United States which, in view of the free introduction of such sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides into the United States, he may deem to be reciprocally unequal and unreasonable, he shall have the power, and it shall be his duty, to suspend, by proclamation to that effect, the provisions of this act relating to the free introduction of such sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, the production of such country, for such time as he shall deem just, and in such case and during such suspension duties shall be levied, collected, and paid upon sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, the product of or exported from such designated country, as follows, namely:

All sugars not above No. 13 Dutch standard in color shall pay duty on their polariscopic tests, as follows, namely:

All sugars not above No. 13 Dutch standard in color, all tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice or of beet juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses testing by the polariscopic not above 75°, seven-tenths of 1 cent per pound; and for every additional degree or fraction of a degree shown by the polariscopic test, two-hundredths of 1 cent per pound additional.

All sugars above No. 13 Dutch standard in color shall be classified by the Dutch standard of color and pay duty as follows, namely:

All sugar above No. 13 and not above No. 16 Dutch standard of color, 1½ cents per pound.

All sugar above No. 16 and not above No. 20 Dutch standard of color, 1½ cents per pound.

All sugar above No. 20 Dutch standard of color, 2 cents per pound. Molasses testing above 56°, 4 cents per gallon.

Sugar drainings and sugar sweepings shall be subject to duty either as molasses or sugar, as the case may be, according to polariscopic test.

On coffee, 3 cents per pound.

On tea, 10 cents per pound.

Hides, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled, Angora goat-skins, raw, without the wool, unmanufactured, asses' skins, raw or unmanufactured, and skins, except sheepskins, with the wool on, 1½ cents per pound.

[U. S. Stat. L., ch. 11, 1897; Dingley Tariff Act of 1897]

Sec. 3. That for the purpose of equalizing the trade of the United States with foreign countries, and their colonies, producing and exporting to this country the following articles: Argols, or crude

tartar, or wine lees, crude; brandies, or other spirits manufactured or distilled from grain or other materials; champagne and all other sparkling wines; still wines, and vermouth; paintings and statuary; or any of them the President be, and he is hereby, authorized, as soon as may be after the passage of this act, and from time to time thereafter, to enter into negotiations with the governments of those countries exporting to the United States the above-mentioned articles, or any of them, with a view to the arrangement of commercial agreements in which reciprocal and equivalent concessions may be secured in favor of the products and manufactures of the United States; and whenever the government of any country, or colony, producing and exporting to the United States the above-mentioned articles, or any of them, shall enter into a commercial agreement with the United States, or make concessions in favor of the products, or manufactures thereof, which, in the judgment of the President, shall be reciprocal and equivalent, he shall be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to suspend, during the time of such agreement or concession, by proclamation to that effect, the imposition and collection of the duties mentioned in this act, on such article or articles so exported to the United States from such country or colony, and thereupon and thereafter the duties levied, collected, and paid upon such article or articles shall be as follows, namely:

Argols, or crude tartar, or wine lees, crude, 5 percent ad valorem. Brandies, or other spirits manufactured or distilled from grain or other materials, \$1.75 per proof gallon.

Champagne and all other sparkling wines, in bottles containing not more than 1 quart and more than 1 pint, \$6 per dozen; containing not more than 1 pint each and more than one-half pint, \$3 per dozen; containing one-half pint each or less, \$1.50 per dozen; in bottles or other vessels containing more than 1 quart each, in addition to \$6 per dozen bottles on the quantities in excess of 1 quart, at the rate of \$1.90 per gallon.

Still wines and vermouth, in casks, 35 cents per gallon; in bottles or jugs, per case of 1 dozen bottles or jugs containing each not more than 1 quart and more than 1 pint, or 24 bottles or jugs containing each not more than 1 pint, \$1.25 per case; and any excess beyond these quantities found in such bottles or jugs shall be subject to a duty of 4 cents per pint or fractional part thereof, but no separate or additional duty shall be assessed upon the bottles or jugs.

Paintings in oil or water colors, pastels, pen and ink drawings, and statuary, 15 percent ad valorem.

The President shall have power, and it shall be his duty, whenever he shall be satisfied that any such agreement in this section mentioned is not being fully executed by the government with which it shall have been made, to revoke such suspension and notify such government thereof.

And it is further provided that with a view to secure reciprocal trade with countries producing the following articles, whenever and so often as the President shall be satisfied that the government of any country, or colony of such government, producing and exporting directly or indirectly to the United States coffee, tea, and tonquin, tonqua, or tonka beans, and vanilla beans, or any of such articles, imposes duties or other exactions upon the agricultural, manufactured, or other products of the United States which, in view of the introduction of such coffee, tea, and tonquin, tonqua, or tonka beans, and vanilla beans, into the United States, as in this act hereinbefore provided for, he may deem to be reciprocally unequal and unreasonable, he shall have the power, and it shall be his duty to suspend, by proclamation to that effect, the provisions of this act relating to the free introduction of such coffee, tea, and tonquin, tonqua, or tonka beans, and vanilla beans, of the products of such country or colony, for such time as he shall deem just; and in such case and during such suspension duties shall be levied, collected, and paid upon coffee, tea, and tonquin, tonqua, or tonka beans, and vanilla beans, the products or exports, direct or indirect, from such designated country, as follows:

On coffee, 3 cents per pound.

On tea, 10 cents per pound.

On tonquin, tonqua, or tonka beans, 50 cents per pound; vanilla beans, \$2 per pound; vanilla beans, commercially known as cuts, \$1 per pound.

Sec. 4. That whenever the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, with a view to secure reciprocal trade with foreign countries, shall, within the period of 2 years from and after the passage of this act, enter into commercial treaty or treaties with any other country or countries concerning the admission into any such country or countries of the goods, wares, and merchandise of the United States and their use and disposition therein, deemed to be for the interests of the United States, and in such treaty or treaties, in consideration of the advantages accruing to the United States therefrom, shall provide for the reduction during a specified period, not exceeding 5 years, of the duties imposed by this act, to the extent of not more than 20 percent thereof, upon such goods, wares, or merchandise as may be designated therein of the country or countries with which such treaty or treaties shall be made as in this section provided for; or shall provide for the transfer during such period from the dutiable list of this Act to the free list thereof of such goods, wares, and merchandise, being the natural products of such foreign country or countries and not of the United States; or shall provide for the retention upon the free list of this act during a specified period, not exceeding 5 years, of such goods, wares, and merchandise now included in said free list as may be designated therein; and when any such treaty shall have been duly ratified by the

Senate and approved by Congress, and public proclamation made accordingly, then and thereafter the duties which shall be collected by the United States upon any of the designated goods, wares, and merchandise from the foreign country with which such treaty has been made shall, during the period provided for, be the duties specified and provided for in such treaty, and none other.

[Commercial agreement with France, negotiated pursuant to sec. 3 of Tariff Act of 1897, and proclaimed on May 30, 1898, 30 U. S. Stat. L. 1774:]

No. 12

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
PROCLAMATION

Whereas, pursuant to section 3 of the act of Congress approved July 24, 1897, entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," the Governments of the United States and of the French Republic have in the spirit of amity, and with a desire to improve their commercial relations, entered into a commercial agreement in which reciprocal and equivalent concessions have been, in the judgment of the President, secured according to the provisions of said section, whereby the following articles of commerce, being the products and manufactures of the United States, are to be admitted into France on and after the first day of June 1898 at the minimum rate of duty, not exceeding the rates respectively appearing in the following table, namely:

<i>Francs per 100 kilograms</i>	
Canned meats	15
Table fruits, fresh:	
Lemons, oranges, cedrats, and their varieties not mentioned	5
Mandarin oranges	10
Common table grapes	8
Apples and pears:	
For the table	2
For cider and perry	1.50
Other fruits, except hothouse grapes and fruits	3
Fruits, dried or pressed (excluding raisins):	
Apples and pears:	
For the table	10
For cider and perry	4
Prunes	10
Other fruits	5
Common woods, logs	0.65
Sawed or squared timber, 80 millimeters or more in thickness	1
Squared or sawed lumber exceeding 35 millimeters, and less than 80 millimeters in thickness	1.25
Wood, sawed 35 millimeters or less in thickness	1.75
Paving blocks	1.75
Staves	0.75
Hops	30
Apples and pears, crushed, or cut and dried	1.50
Manufactured and prepared pork meats	50
Lard and its compounds	25

Therefore, in further execution of the provisions of said section, it is hereby declared that on and after the 1st day of June 1898 and during the continuance in force of the agreement aforesaid, and until otherwise declared, the imposition and collection of the duties heretofore imposed and collected upon the following-named articles, the products of France, by virtue of said act are hereby suspended, and in place thereof the duties shall be imposed and collected thereon according to the provisions of said section 3, as follows:

On argols, or crude tartar, or wine lees, crude, 5 percent ad valorem.

On brandies, or other spirits manufactured or distilled from grain or other materials, \$1.75 per proof gallon.

On paintings in oil or water colors, pastels, pen-and-ink drawings, and statuary, 15 percent ad valorem.

It is further declared that the rates of duty heretofore imposed and collected on still wines and vermouth, the product of France, under the provisions of the United States Tariff Act of 1897 are conditionally suspended, and in place thereof shall be imposed and collected on and after the 1st day of June next, as follows, namely:

On still wines and vermouth, in casks, 35 cents per gallon; in bottles or jugs, per case of 1 dozen bottles or jugs containing each not more than 1 quart and more than 1 pint, or 24 bottles or jugs containing each not more than 1 pint, \$1.25 per case; and any excess beyond these quantities found in such bottles or jugs shall be subject to a duty of 4 cents per pint or fractional part thereof, but no separate or additional duty shall be assessed upon the bottles or jugs.

Now, therefore, be it known that I, William McKinley, President of the United States of America, have caused the above-stated modifications of the customs duties of the respective countries to be made public for the information of the citizens of the United States of America.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 30th day of May 1898, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and twenty-second.

BY THE PRESIDENT:
WILLIAM R. DAY, *Secretary of State*.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

[U. S. Stat. L., vol. 36, pt. 1, ch. 6, 1909; Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act of 1909]

Sec. 2. That from and after the 31st day of March, 1910 except as otherwise specially provided for in this section, there shall be levied, collected, and paid on all articles when imported from any foreign country into the United States, or into any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutulla), the rates of duty prescribed by the schedules and paragraphs of the dutiable list of section 1 of this act, and in addition thereto 25 percent ad valorem; which rates shall constitute the maximum tariff of the United States: *Provided*, That whenever, after the 31st day of March 1910, and so long thereafter as the President shall be satisfied, in view of the character of the concessions granted by the minimum tariff of the United States, that the government of any foreign country imposes no terms or restrictions, either in the way of tariff rates or provisions, trade or other regulations, charges, exactions, or in any other manner, directly or indirectly, upon the importation into or the sale in such foreign country of any agricultural, manufactured, or other product of the United States, which unduly discriminate against the United States, or the products thereof, and that such foreign country pays no export bounty or imposes no export duty or prohibition upon the exportation of any article to the United States which unduly discriminates against the United States or the products thereof, and that such foreign country accords to the agricultural, manufactured, or other products of the United States treatment which is reciprocal and equivalent, thereupon and thereafter, upon proclamation to this effect by the President of the United States, all articles when imported into the United States, or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutulla), from such foreign country shall, except as otherwise herein provided, be admitted under the terms of the minimum tariff of the United States as prescribed by section 1 of this act. The proclamation issued by the President under the authority hereby conferred and the application of the minimum tariff thereupon may, in accordance with the facts as found by the President, extend to the whole of any foreign country, or may be confined to or exclude from its effect any dependency, colony, or other political subdivision having authority to adopt and enforce tariff legislation, or to impose restrictions or regulations, or to grant concessions upon the exportation or importation of articles which are, or may be, imported into the United States. Whenever the President shall be satisfied that the conditions which led to the issuance of the proclamation hereinbefore authorized no longer exist, he shall issue a proclamation to this effect, and 90 days thereafter the provisions of the maximum tariff shall be applied to the importation of articles from such country. Whenever the provisions of the maximum tariff of the United States shall be applicable to articles imported from any foreign country they shall be applicable to the products of such country, whether imported directly from the country of production or otherwise. To secure information to assist the President in the discharge of the duties imposed upon him by this section, and the officers of the Government in the administration of the customs laws, the President is hereby authorized to employ such persons as may be required.

Sec. 3. That nothing in this act contained shall be so construed as to abrogate or in any manner impair or affect the provisions of the treaty of commercial reciprocity concluded between the United States and the Republic of Cuba on the 11th day of December, 1902, or the provisions of the act of Congress heretofore passed for the execution of the same.

Sec. 4. That the President shall have power and it shall be his duty to give notice, within 10 days after the passage of this act, to all foreign countries with which commercial agreements in conformity with the authority granted by section 3 of the act entitled, "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897, have been or shall have been entered into, of the intention of the United States to terminate such agreement at a time specified in such notice, which time shall in no case, except as hereinafter provided, be longer than the period of time specified in such agreements respectively for notice for their termination; and upon the expiration of the periods when such notice of termination shall become effective the suspension of duties provided for in such agreements shall be revoked, and thereafter importations from said countries shall be subject to no other conditions or rates of duty than those prescribed by this act and such other acts of Congress as may be continued in force: *Provided*, That until the expiration of the period when the notice of intention to terminate hereinbefore provided for shall have become effective, or until such date prior thereto as the high contracting parties may by mutual consent select, the terms of said commercial agreements shall remain in force: *And provided further*, That in the case of those commercial agreements or arrangements made in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Tariff Act of the United States approved July 24, 1897, which contain no stipulations in regard to their termination by diplomatic action, the President is authorized to give to the governments concerned a notice of termination of 6 months, which notice shall date from April 30, 1909.

[U. S. Stat. L., vol. 38, pt. 1, ch. 16, 1913; Underwood Tariff Act of 1913]

SECTION IV

A. That for the purpose of readjusting the present duties on importations into the United States and at the same time to encourage the export trade of this country, the President of the

United States is authorized and empowered to negotiate trade agreements with foreign nations wherein mutual concessions are made looking toward freer trade relations and further reciprocal expansion of trade and commerce: *Provided, however,* That said trade agreements before becoming operative shall be submitted to the Congress of the United States for ratification or rejection.

B. That nothing in this act contained shall be so construed as to abrogate or in any manner impair or affect the provisions of the treaty of commercial reciprocity concluded between the United States and the Republic of Cuba on the 11th day of December 1902, or the provisions of the act of Congress heretofore passed for the execution of the same except as to the proviso of article VIII of said treaty, which proviso is hereby abrogated and repealed.

[U. S. Stat. L., vol. 42, pt. 1, ch. 356, 1922; Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922]

SEC. 315. (a) That in order to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States and to put into force and effect the policy of the Congress by this act intended, whenever the President, upon investigation of the differences in costs of production of articles wholly or in part the growth or product of the United States and of like or similar articles wholly or in part the growth or product of competing foreign countries, shall find it thereby shown that the duties fixed in this act do not equalize the said differences in costs of production in the United States and the principal competing country he shall by such investigation, ascertain said differences and determine and proclaim the changes in classifications or increases or decreases in any rate of duty provided in this act shown by said ascertained differences in such costs of production necessary to equalize the same. Thirty days after the date of such proclamation or proclamations such changes in classification shall take effect, and such increased or decreased duties shall be levied, collected, and paid on such articles when imported from any foreign country into the United States or into any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the islands of Guam and Tutuila): *Provided,* That the total increase or decrease of such rates of duty shall not exceed 50 percent of the rates specified in title I of this act, or in any amendatory act.

(b) That in order to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States and to put into force and effect the policy of the Congress by this act intended, whether the President, upon investigation of the differences in costs of production of articles provided for in title I of this act, wholly or in part the growth or product of the United States and of like or similar articles wholly or in part the growth or product of competing foreign countries, shall find it thereby shown that the duties prescribed in this act do not equalize said differences, and shall further find it thereby shown that the said differences in costs of production in the United States and the principal competing country cannot be equalized by proceeding under the provisions of subdivision (a) of this section, he shall make such findings public, together with a description of the articles to which they apply, in such detail as may be necessary for the guidance of appraising officers. In such cases and upon the proclamation by the President becoming effective the ad valorem duty or duty based in whole or in part upon the value of the imported article in the country of exportation shall thereafter be based upon the American selling price, as defined in subdivision (f) of section 402 of this act, of any similar competitive article manufactured or produced in the United States embraced within the class or kind of imported articles upon which the President has made a proclamation under subdivision (b) of this section.

The ad valorem rate or rates of duty based upon such American selling price shall be the rate found, upon said investigation by the President, to be shown by the said differences in costs of production necessary to equalize such differences, but no such rate shall be decreased more than 50 percent of the rate specified in title I of this act upon such articles, nor shall any such rate be increased. Such rate or rates of duty shall become effective 15 days after the date of the said proclamation of the President, whereupon the duties so estimated and provided shall be levied, collected, and paid on such articles when imported from any foreign country into the United States or into any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the islands of Guam and Tutuila). If there is any imported article within the class or kind of articles, upon which the President has made public a finding, for which there is no similar competitive article manufactured or produced in the United States, the value of such imported article shall be determined under the provisions of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subdivision (a) of section 402 of this act.

(c) That in ascertaining the differences in costs of production, under the provisions of subdivisions (a) and (b) of this section, the President, insofar as he finds it practicable, shall take into consideration (1) the differences in conditions in production, including wages, costs of material, and other items in costs of production of such or similar articles in the United States and in competing foreign countries; (2) the differences in the wholesale selling prices of domestic and foreign articles in the principal markets of the United States; (3) advantages granted to a foreign producer by a foreign government, or by a person, partnership, corporation, or association in a foreign country; and (4) any other advantages or disadvantages in competition.

Investigations to assist the President in ascertaining differences in costs of production under this section shall be made by the United States Tariff Commission, and no proclamation shall be issued under this section until such investigation shall have been

made. The Commission shall give reasonable public notice of its hearings and shall give reasonable opportunity to parties interested to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard. The Commission is authorized to adopt such reasonable procedure, rules, and regulations as it may deem necessary.

The President, proceeding as hereinbefore provided for in proclaiming rates of duty, shall, when he determines that it is shown that the differences in costs of production have changed or no longer exist which led to such proclamation, accordingly as so shown, modify or terminate the same. Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize a transfer of an article from the dutiable list to the free list or from the free list to the dutiable list, nor a change in form of duty. Whenever it is provided in any paragraph of title I of this act that the duty or duties shall not exceed a specified ad valorem rate upon the articles provided for in such paragraph, no rate determined under the provision of this section upon such articles shall exceed the maximum ad valorem rate so specified.

(d) For the purposes of this section any coal-tar product provided for in paragraphs 27 or 28 of title I of this act shall be considered similar to or competitive with any imported coal-tar product which accomplishes results substantially equal to those accomplished by the domestic product when used in substantially the same manner.

(e) The President is authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 316. (a) That unfair methods of competition and unfair acts in the importation of articles into the United States, or in their sale by the owner, importer, consignee, or agent of either, the effect or tendency of which is to destroy or substantially injure an industry, efficiently and economically operated, in the United States, or to prevent the establishment of such an industry, or to restrain or monopolize trade and commerce in the United States, are hereby declared unlawful, and when found by the President to exist shall be dealt with, in addition to any other provisions of law, as hereinafter provided.

(b) That to assist the President in making any decisions under this section the United States Tariff Commission is hereby authorized to investigate any alleged violation hereof on complaint under oath or upon its initiative.

(c) That the Commission shall make such investigation under and in accordance with such rules as it may promulgate and give such notice and afford such hearing, and when deemed proper by the commission such rehearing with opportunity to offer evidence, oral or written, as it may deem sufficient for a full presentation of the facts involved in such investigation; that the testimony in every such investigation shall be reduced to writing, and a transcript thereof with the findings and recommendation of the Commission shall be the official record of the proceedings and findings in the case, and in any case where the findings in such investigation show a violation of this section, a copy of the findings shall be promptly mailed or delivered to the importer or consignee of such articles; that such findings, if supported by evidence, shall be conclusive, except that a rehearing may be granted by the Commission and except that within such time after said findings are made and in such manner as appeals may be taken from decisions of the United States Board of General Appraisers, an appeal may be taken from said findings upon a question or questions of law only to the United States Court of Customs Appeals by the importer or consignee of such articles; that if it shall be shown to the satisfaction of said court that further evidence should be taken, and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the proceedings before the Commission, said court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper; that the Commission may modify its findings as to the facts or make new findings by reason of additional evidence, which, if supported by the evidence, shall be conclusive as to the facts except that within such time and in such manner an appeal may be taken as aforesaid upon a question or questions of law only; that the judgment of said court shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the United States Supreme Court upon certiorari applied for within 3 months after such judgment of the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

(d) That the final findings of the Commission shall be transmitted with the record to the President.

(e) That whenever the existence of any such unfair method or act shall be established to the satisfaction of the President he shall determine the rate of additional duty, not exceeding 50 nor less than 10 percent of the value of such articles as defined in section 402 of title IV of this act, which will offset such method or act, and which is hereby imposed upon articles imported in violation of this act, or, in what he shall be satisfied and find are extreme cases of unfair methods or acts as aforesaid, he shall direct that such articles as he shall deem the interests of the United States shall require, imported by any person violating the provisions of this act, shall be excluded from entry into the United States, and upon information of such action by the President, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, through the proper officers, assess such additional duties or refuse such entry; and that the decision of the President shall be conclusive.

(f) That whenever the President has reason to believe that any article is offered or sought to be offered for entry into the United States in violation of this section, but has not information sufficient to satisfy him thereof, the Secretary of the Treasury shall,

upon his request in writing, forbid entry thereof until such investigations as the President may deem necessary shall be completed: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may permit entry under bond upon such conditions and penalties as he may deem adequate.

(g) That any additional duty or any refusal of entry under this section shall continue in effect until the President shall find and instruct the Secretary of the Treasury that the conditions which led to the assessment of such additional duty or refusal of entry no longer exist.

Sec. 317. (a) That the President when he finds that the public interest will be served thereby shall by proclamation specify and declare new or additional duties as hereinafter provided upon articles wholly or in part the growth or product of any foreign country whenever he shall find as a fact that such country—

Imposes, directly or indirectly, upon the disposition in or transportation in transit through or reexportation from such country of any article wholly or in part the growth or product of the United States any unreasonable charge, exaction, regulation, or limitation which is not equally enforced upon the like articles of every foreign country;

Discriminates in fact against the commerce of the United States, directly or indirectly, by law or administrative regulation or practice, by or in respect to any customs, tonnage, or port duty, fee, charge, exaction, classification, regulation, condition, restriction, or prohibition, in such manner as to place the commerce of the United States at a disadvantage compared with the commerce of any foreign country.

(b) If at any time the President shall find it to be a fact that any foreign country has not only discriminated against the commerce of the United States, as aforesaid, but has, after the issuance of a proclamation as authorized in subdivision (a) of this section, maintained or increased its said discriminations against the commerce of the United States, the President is hereby authorized, if he deems it consistent with the interests of the United States, to issue a further proclamation directing that such articles of said country as he shall deem the public interests may require shall be excluded from importation into the United States.

(c) That any proclamation issued by the President under the authority of this section shall, if he deems it consistent with the interests of the United States, extend to the whole of any foreign country or may be confined to any subdivision or subdivisions thereof; and the President shall, whenever he deems the public interests require, suspend, revoke, supplement, or amend any such proclamation.

(d) Whenever the President shall find as a fact that any foreign country places any burdens upon the commerce of the United States by any of the unequal impositions or discriminations aforesaid, he shall, when he finds that the public interest will be served thereby, by proclamation specify and declare such new or additional rate or rates of duty as he shall determine will offset such burdens, not to exceed 50 percent ad valorem or its equivalent, and on and after 30 days after the date of such proclamation there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon the articles enumerated in such proclamation when imported into the United States from such foreign country such new or additional rate or rates of duty; or, in case of articles declared subject to exclusion from importation into the United States under the provisions of subdivision (b) of this section, such articles shall be excluded from importation.

(e) Whenever the President shall find as a fact that any foreign country imposes any unequal imposition or discrimination as aforesaid upon the commerce of the United States, or that any benefits accrue or are likely to accrue to any industry in any foreign country by reason of any such imposition or discrimination imposed by any foreign country other than the foreign country in which such industry is located, and whenever the President shall determine that any new or additional rate or rates of duty or any prohibition hereinbefore provided for do not effectively remove such imposition or discrimination, and that any benefits from any such imposition or discrimination accrue or are likely to accrue to any industry in any foreign country, he shall, when he finds that the public interest will be served thereby, by proclamation specify and declare such new or additional rate or rates of duty upon the articles wholly or in part the growth or product of any such industry as he shall determine will offset such benefits, not to exceed 50 percent ad valorem or its equivalent, upon importation from any foreign country into the United States of such articles and on and after 30 days after the date of any such proclamation such new or additional rate or rates of duty so specified and declared in such proclamation shall be levied, collected, and paid upon such articles.

(f) All articles imported contrary to the provisions of this section shall be forfeited to the United States and shall be liable to be seized, prosecuted, and condemned in like manner and under the same regulations, restrictions, and provisions as may from time to time be established for the recovery, collection, distribution, and remission of forfeitures to the United States by the several revenue laws. Whenever the provisions of this act shall be applicable to importations into the United States of articles wholly or in part the growth or product of any foreign country, they shall be applicable thereto whether such articles are imported directly or indirectly.

(g) It shall be the duty of the United States Tariff Commission to ascertain and at all times to be informed whether any of the discriminations against the commerce of the United States enumerated in subdivisions (a), (b), and (e) of this section are practiced by any country; and if and when such discriminatory acts

are disclosed, it shall be the duty of the Commission to bring the matter to the attention of the President, together with recommendations.

(h) The Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, shall make such rules and regulations as are necessary for the execution of such proclamations as the President may issue in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(i) That when used in this section the term "foreign country" shall mean any empire, country, dominion, colony, or protectorate, or any subdivision or subdivisions thereof (other than the United States and its possessions), within which separate tariff rates or separate regulations of commerce are enforced.

Sec. 318. (a) That in order that the President and the Congress may secure information and assistance, it shall be the duty of the United States Tariff Commission, in addition to the duties now imposed upon it by law, to—

(1) Ascertain conversion costs and costs of production in the principal growing, producing, or manufacturing centers of the United States of articles of the United States, whenever in the opinion of the Commission it is practicable;

(2) Ascertain conversion costs and costs of production in the principal growing, producing, or manufacturing centers of foreign countries of articles imported into the United States, whenever in the opinion of the Commission such conversion costs or costs of production are necessary for comparison with conversion costs or costs of production in the United States and can be reasonably ascertained;

(3) Select and describe articles which are representative of the classes or kinds of articles imported into the United States and which are similar to or comparable with articles of the United States; select and describe articles of the United States similar to or comparable with such imported articles, and obtain and file samples of articles so selected, whenever the Commission deems it advisable;

(4) Ascertain import costs of such representative articles so selected;

(5) Ascertain the grower's, producer's, or manufacturer's selling prices in the principal growing, producing, or manufacturing centers of the United States of the articles of the United States so selected; and

(6) Ascertain all other facts which will show the differences in or which affect competition between articles of the United States and imported articles in the principal markets of the United States.

(b) When used in this section—

The term "article" includes any commodity, whether grown, produced, fabricated, manipulated, or manufactured.

The term "import cost" means the price at which an article is freely offered for sale in the ordinary course of trade in the usual wholesale quantities for exportation to the United States plus, when not included in such price, all necessary expenses, exclusive of customs duties, of bringing such imported article to the United States.

(c) In carrying out the provisions of this section the Commission shall possess all the powers and privileges conferred upon it by the provisions of title VII of the Revenue Act of 1916, and in addition it is authorized, in order to ascertain any facts required by this section, to require any importer and any American grower, producer, manufacturer, or seller to file with the Commission a statement, under oath, giving his selling prices in the United States of any article imported, grown, produced, fabricated, manipulated, or manufactured by him.

(d) The Commission is authorized to establish and maintain an office at the port of New York for the purpose of directing or carrying on any investigation, receiving and compiling statistics, selecting, describing, and filing samples of articles, and performing any of the duties or exercising any of the powers imposed upon it by law.

(e) The United States Tariff Commission is authorized to adopt an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

(f) The second paragraph of section 706 of the Revenue Act of 1916 is amended to read as follows:

"Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such documentary evidence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing. And in case of disobedience to a subpoena the Commission may invoke the aid of any District or Territorial court of the United States or the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence, and such court within the jurisdiction of which such inquiry is carried on may, in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any corporation or other person, issue an order requiring such corporation or other person to appear before the Commission, or to produce documentary evidence, if so ordered, or to give evidence touching the matter in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof."

Sec. 319. That on and after the day when this act shall go into effect all goods, wares, and merchandise previously imported, for which no entry has been made, and all goods, wares, and merchandise previously entered without payment of duty and under bond for warehousing, transportation, or any other purpose, for which no permit of delivery to the importer or his agent has been issued, shall be subjected to the duties imposed by this act and to no other duty upon the entry or the withdrawal thereof: *Provided*, That when duties are based upon the weight of merchandise deposited in any public or private bonded warehouse said duties shall be levied and collected upon the weight of such merchandise at the time of its entry.

Sec. 320. That nothing in this act shall be construed to abrogate or in any manner impair or affect the provisions of the treaty of commercial reciprocity concluded between the United States and the Republic of Cuba on December 11, 1902, or the provisions of the act of December 17, 1903, chapter 1.

RATIFICATION BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

The United States has entered into 22 reciprocal-trade agreements under the authority of the act of June 12, 1934. The action of the foreign contracting government in each case separates such agreements into the following three categories.

I. Agreements became effective without any requirement of subsequent legislative action in the foreign country.

1. Belgium.
2. Cuba.
3. Ecuador.

II. Agreements became effective provisionally subject to eventual legislative action in the foreign country, and such subsequent legislative action has been taken in all but three countries as noted below.

1. Canada (two agreements).
2. Czechoslovakia—not ratified and ratification cannot now be expected.
3. France—subsequent legislative action has not yet been taken, so agreement is in effect only provisionally.
4. Netherlands.
5. Switzerland.
6. Turkey.
7. United Kingdom.
8. Venezuela—not yet ratified but ratification expected.

III. Agreements did not become effective until they had received legislative approval in the foreign country. (Such approval has been given by all the countries.)

1. Brazil.
2. Colombia.
3. Costa Rica.
4. El Salvador.
5. Finland.
6. Guatemala.
7. Haiti.
8. Honduras.
9. Nicaragua.
10. Sweden.

Mr. GUFFEY obtained the floor.

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

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCARRAN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Downey	Lee	Russell
Ashurst	Ellender	Lodge	Schwartz
Austin	Frazier	Lucas	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	George	Lundeen	Sheppard
Barbour	Gibson	McCarran	Shipstead
Barkley	Gillette	McKellar	Slattery
Bilbo	Green	McNary	Smith
Bone	Guffey	Maloney	Stewart
Bridges	Gurney	Mead	Thomas, Idaho
Bulow	Hale	Miller	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Harrison	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	Hatch	Murray	Tobey
Capper	Hayden	Neely	Townsend
Caraway	Herring	Norris	Tydings
Chandler	Holman	Nye	Vandenberg
Chavez	Holt	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Hughes	Overton	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	Walsh
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Pittman	White
Davis	King	Reed	Wiley
Donahey	La Follette	Reynolds	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, we have before us the bill for renewal of the law authorizing reciprocal-trade agreements between the United States and the governments of foreign nations.

These agreements, which have been brilliantly executed by Secretary Hull, constitute an important factor in our foreign policy.

Historically, contending political forces in our Nation have divided into two camps on the question of foreign trade. For many years, particularly when American industry was experiencing its early period of growth, the doctrine of protection was dominant.

It eventually became apparent, however, that this doctrine was being carried to a dangerous point and that it was establishing barriers which restricted normal commercial relations with other countries.

Under high protective tariffs American consumers of manufactured products were, in many instances, penalized in order to provide excessive profits for small groups of industrialists.

The benefits accruing from this policy of protection were not reflected in higher standards of living for labor, but instead resulted in those fabulous concentrations of wealth which were such a conspicuous outgrowth of our early industrial history under protective tariffs.

In opposition to this system there emerged a school of thought which held that the best interests of the country would be served, not by economic isolation, but by a carefully regulated policy which would keep open the channels of foreign trade without subjecting American industry and agriculture to unfair competition in the domestic markets.

In this broad division of thought on a major national question it was inevitable that the Republican Party, because of the influence exerted upon it by large industrialists, should champion the protective tariff.

It was just as inevitable that the Democratic Party, concerning itself with the broader interests of the average citizen, should advocate trade expansion.

While the broad division of policy between the parties has been clear down the years neither side has clung strictly to an extreme position.

Advocates of unrestricted free trade in the Democratic Party gradually adjusted their position to meet the problem created by trade barriers in foreign countries.

Republican champions of extreme protection began to realize that economic isolation was neither wise nor profitable for America.

Republican Presidents and other public officials faced with the practical problems of foreign policy found themselves opposing the traditional high-protection policy of their party, with the result that we have on the record statements by many Republican Presidents and statesmen in support of reciprocal trade.

It was early apparent that the fixing of specific tariffs by the Congress resulted inevitably in so much logrolling that the schedules adopted were unscientific and often economically demoralizing.

It was eventually realized that the task of framing schedules was one requiring great technical knowledge, and I doubt that anyone in Congress today would seriously contend that the old-fashioned method of tariff writing by Congress should replace the present flexible system whereby Congress lays down specific and clear-cut policies and limitations, prescribes rules of procedure, and then delegates a certain portion of its authority over the details of tariff matters to the administrative branch of the Government.

It has been said that American industry flourished and became great under a system of protective tariffs.

Whether it would not have flourished as well under a different system is an academic question, with advocates of both systems bringing forth proof.

However, it cannot reasonably be argued, because American industry prospered in the past—either because of or in spite of high tariffs—that such a policy is justified under present conditions.

Since the World War America's position among the nations of the world has considerably changed. Before that war America was a debtor Nation.

After the war we became a creditor nation. That one fact has had a profound effect upon our entire internal economy and it forms a basic consideration in our foreign affairs.

When we were a debtor nation we sent our goods abroad to pay debts we owed to foreigners.

Now that we are a creditor nation we must accept goods from abroad if we are to be paid for our exports and if we are to receive any payments on debts foreigners owe us.

No one will dispute the fact that America wants and needs foreign trade.

We have both agricultural and industrial surpluses as well as the capacity to produce even greater surpluses over domestic needs should foreign markets be available for them.

With that point established we move to the problem of expanding our world markets.

If we sell abroad we expect something of value in exchange.

In fact, there are only three ways in which it is possible for us to conduct foreign trade at all: First, by exchanging goods; second, by extending credit; and third, by accepting gold or some other medium of exchange.

The free interchange of goods, without any trade barriers whatever, is something for which we cannot hope in the present state of world affairs.

The advancing of virtually unlimited credit has obvious disadvantages. It was practiced in open-handed fashion after the war, with the result that American investors lost billions of dollars abroad.

The third method has definite limitations, for we are now steadily acquiring possession of most of the world's gold and are beginning to wonder what we are going to do with it, for unless gold can be resumed as a basis for the world's currencies, its value must depreciate sharply, in which event we will again lose.

Learning by the trial-and-error method we inevitably come back to the one simple truth of foreign trade, which is that we cannot continue to sell unless we also buy.

James G. Blaine stated that very vehemently 50 years ago in a committee hearing in Washington.

Secretary Hull has spent most of his lifetime preaching that doctrine.

Since the act was passed giving him authority to negotiate trade agreements, he has brilliantly demonstrated its validity.

In the hearings on this subject, we have had presented on both sides the arguments as to the desirability of continuing the trade-agreement program.

I find no merit in contentions concerning the probable or possible future effect if agreements hereafter negotiated are unwisely drafted.

This has been the theme of many an opponent of the bill. It is clear that we may confidently expect our administrative departments to conduct their operations wisely, in accordance with the intentions of Congress, until such time as we have positive evidence to the contrary.

The only true test of the wisdom of this legislation, and of the intelligence exercised in its administration, is in the results which have been obtained during the comparatively short period during which it has been in effect.

It is natural that in making a readjustment of our foreign trade, we may during the process of adjustment disturb some part of our own internal economy.

It is regrettable, but true, that not all will enjoy equal benefits. In fact, some who have been heavily protected by tariff barriers in the past may find themselves temporarily at a disadvantage.

It is natural and proper that these groups should express their protests; but in its final judgment the Senate must remember that the greatest good for the greatest number can be the only proper basis for action.

In this connection, I wish to call particular attention to the President's message of January 3 on the state of the Nation, in which he said:

For many years after the World War, as we know today, blind economic selfishness in most countries, including our own, resulted in a destructive mine field of trade restrictions which blocked the channels of commerce among nations.

Indeed, this policy was one of the contributing causes of existing wars. It dammed up vast unsalable surpluses, helping to bring about unemployment and suffering in the United States and everywhere else.

To point out the way to break up the log jamb, our Trade Agreements Act was passed.

Our present trade-agreement method provided a temporary flexibility, and is, therefore, practical in the best sense.

It should be kept alive to serve our trade interests—agricultural and industrial—in many valuable ways during the existing wars.

* * * I emphasize the leadership which this Nation can take when a time comes for a renewal of world peace. Such an influence will be greatly weakened if this Government becomes a dog in the manger of trade selfishness.

We must recognize that too often in the past it was the selfishness of small groups in our country which was responsible for tariff policies completely at variance with the welfare of the general public.

The Hawley-Smoot tariff gave rise to a succession of trade barriers throughout the world. It was in many ways responsible for the drying up of the stream of commerce between nations.

While it would be unjust to place entire responsibility for our own economic collapse upon this tariff, no one can reasonably deny that it was an important factor, and it will be recalled that the leading economists of the country urged President Hoover to veto it.

It may be said that American industry collapsed despite the high-protection schedules of the Hawley-Smoot tariff, but it is my own conviction that in part it collapsed because of them.

Economic history has placed a large share of responsibility on that excessive-tariff policy.

Any proper judgment of a national policy must be based upon its results. Between 1929 and 1933 our exports declined from \$5,241,000,000 to \$1,675,000,000.

After the trade-agreement program was enacted in 1933 our exports rose steadily, reaching \$3,123,869,000 in 1939.

There can be no doubt that here we have a direct case of cause and effect. Export trade does not increase without good reasons.

The increase of our trade with trade-agreement countries was far greater in proportion than the increase in our trade with nonagreement nations.

In 1936, exports to agreement countries rose 14 percent, whereas they increased only 4 percent in the case of other countries.

In 1937, exports to countries concluding agreements were 60 percent greater than in 1935, whereas the increase over the same period in the case of other countries was only 39 percent.

In the 2-year period 1938-39, annual average exports from the United States to trade-agreement countries were 63 percent, and to nonagreement countries only 38 percent greater than annual average exports to the same countries in the 2-year period 1934-35.

It is perfectly clear from the statistics, which have not been challenged, that America has enjoyed a far greater export trade as a result of the agreements concluded under the direction of Secretary Hull.

This is generally admitted; yet there are many who insist upon this very sizable cake of export trade and still wish to hold on to the penny by placing drastic restrictions upon import trade.

They still fail to see that we cannot sell without also buying.

Admitting that this increasing export trade is a very nice thing to have, they insist that we pay too high a price by opening the way for foreign competition in our domestic markets.

The facts, however, do not bear out their contention, nor do they give any basis for fears that imports permitted under the agreements adversely affect American agriculture and industry.

United States imports rose \$375,000,000 in 1936 and \$661,000,000 higher in 1937. During 1936, imports from the 14 trade-agreement countries increased 22 percent over 1935, while imports from nonagreement countries rose 16 percent.

In 1937 our imports of raw materials for industrial expansion, mostly from nonagreement countries, reversed this trend, the increase being 18 percent for agreement countries and 34 percent for nonagreement countries.

While average exports of manufactured goods to trade-agreement countries were \$353,000,000 more in 1937 and 1938 than they were in 1934 and 1935, dutiable imports of manufactured goods from these countries increased only \$88,000,000 in the same period.

As we study item after item of these imported goods, we find that through intelligent bargaining the Department of State has been able to do a splendid work of reconciling proper protection of American industry with expansion of export trade.

In many instances our imports from agreement countries consist of materials not available here in sufficient quantities to meet the needs of the domestic market.

Reliable testimony presented before the Finance Committee demonstrated that America has obtained by far the best of the bargain.

Much has been made of the argument that under these agreements the American worker's job is being threatened by a flood of cheaply made competitive foreign articles.

Mr. Isador Lubin, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, has refuted this contention with a well-documented statement buttressing his conclusions, which are as follows:

1. Trade agreements have opened the way for a very considerable increase of exports of manufactured goods, thereby providing additional employment in the production of these goods.
2. The additional employment created in export industries by the trade agreements has exceeded any displacement of labor in other industries which might conceivably have resulted from concessions made by the United States to foreign countries.
3. Concessions granted by the United States on the products of foreign countries have displaced far less labor in this country than is often claimed.
4. Wage rates in the export industries which have benefited from trade agreements are, by and large, considerably higher than the wages in those industries which have claimed injury as a result of trade agreements.

Certainly it is obvious, without delving too deeply into statistics, that if the agreements have increased manufactured exports \$353,000,000 and imports only \$88,000,000, the balance is preponderantly in favor of the American worker.

In fact, the Department of Commerce estimates that from 1933 to 1937 the number of those directly employed in the production of exported manufactures increased by approximately 300,000.

This is exclusive of the additional employment indirectly created in transportation, production of raw materials, and the like.

It is clear that the trade-agreement program has created many more jobs here than it could possibly have displaced.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Lubin's statistics show that industries complaining against so-called cheap labor competition under the agreements normally have a lower average wage—54.8 cents an hour in 1937—than other industries which are primarily on an export basis, and therefore unsheltered by any tariff, the latter group having an average hourly wage of 75.2 cents.

It is a fact that the trade agreements have not only helped in the recovery of foreign trade, but thus have helped to reduce domestic unemployment.

The outstanding success of the trade-agreement program is the best reason in the world for its continuance; yet we find many who still insist that this question be made a political issue, even though outstanding Republicans, among them industrialists and financiers, as well as political leaders, are enthusiastically in accord with the program.

In fact, for many years Republican statesmen have supported the principles upon which the trade-agreement program rests. I should like to call attention in this connection to a statement made by Charles P. Taft, son of the former President:

Blaine, McKinley, and my own father spoke and worked for reciprocity.

Said Mr. Taft:

Chief Justice Hughes, as Secretary of State, made the most-favored-nation clause a part of our foreign policy.

What Secretary Hull has added is the method of writing tariffs without congressional politics.

Mr. Taft merely called attention to a well-established fact, which is that some of the most eloquent statements of the case for the basic principles of this trade-agreement program were made by distinguished Republicans.

President McKinley, in the last speech of his life, which I had the good fortune to hear, made only a few hours before his assassination, summed up the situation in his address at the Pan-American Exposition at Buffalo on September 5, 1901:

By sensible trade arrangements which will not interrupt our home production—

He said—

we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus. A system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities is manifestly essential to the continued and healthful growth of our export trade.

We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing.

If such a thing were possible, it would not be best for us or for those with whom we deal.

We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor.

Reciprocity is the natural outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established.

What we produce beyond our domestic consumption must have a vent abroad.

The excess must be relieved through a foreign outlet, and we should sell everywhere we can and buy wherever the buying will enlarge our sales and productions, and thereby make a greater demand for home labor.

The period of exclusiveness is past. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable.

A policy of good will and friendly trade relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not.

If, perchance, some of our tariffs are no longer needed for revenue or to encourage and protect our industries at home, why should they not be employed to extend and promote our markets abroad?

It is interesting to note that the Republicans who use the statement of President McKinley to support their opposition to the present modern reciprocity program generally go back to his inaugural address of 1897.

It should be remembered that this was before his experience in attempting to get his "reciprocity treaties" through the Senate.

It is well known that he was sadly disappointed in his efforts to obtain a reasonable measure of reciprocity because the Senate balked on him, and thus his outright utterance already quoted.

President Taft made a valiant fight, in the face of strenuous opposition within his own party, to negotiate a reciprocal-trade agreement with Canada in 1911.

With the aid of the Democrats, he succeeded to the extent that the treaty was ratified by the United States Senate, and had it not been for the failure of Canada to accept the treaty it is likely that reciprocity would have been an established policy of the United States Government long before Franklin Roosevelt became President and Cordell Hull became Secretary of State.

Taft looked upon the defeat of the measure as a "real loss to both countries." Nor was that defeat of reciprocity the end of his attempt to provide more equitable tariffs.

With the establishment of his tariff board, he took the first major step toward scientific solution of a highly complex problem, and throughout the latter part of his administration he was insistently demanding sounder tariff measures.

The entire question had been left on his doorstep by Theodore Roosevelt, who also favored reciprocity, but was persuaded by Speaker Cannon to avoid making an issue of it.

Taft's battle clarified the issue, however, and the new Congress swept into office with President Wilson was a Congress elected on a platform of "tariff for revenue only."

The Republican opposition to reciprocity in Taft's time was widely at variance with the position taken by that party in previous years.

It has been brought out in debate in the House of Representatives that the Republican Party had a reciprocity plank in its platform of 1892, and repeated substantially the same demands in its platforms of 1896 and 1904.

President Taft, while battling his own party on the Canadian issue, wrote to Theodore Roosevelt, his predecessor, and asked his opinion of the situation. Taft pointed out that the Republican Party had been forced to concede the necessity for downward revision of tariffs and that it had departed from—

The rule upheld by Shaw and Cannon and other standard bearers of the orthodox type that no tariff could be too high, because what you needed was a Chinese wall.

Theodore Roosevelt wrote back at once, commenting that:

What you propose to do with Canada is admirable from every standpoint. I certainly believe in free trade with Canada for both economic and political reasons.

The failure of the efforts made in behalf of reciprocity by such Republican Presidents as McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft marked the end of the effort to liberalize Republican

tariff policies, for when the Republican Party returned to power after the Wilson administration the old guard again had its way. The Fordney-McCumber tariff of 1922 raised rates to one of the highest levels in our tariff history, but even this was not enough for the greedy industrialists who controlled the Republican organization, and I am sorry I must admit that the most shameful tariff ever devised, the Hawley-Smoot tariff of 1930, originated in my own State of Pennsylvania. It was written by Joe Grundy, then and now the leading figure in the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, and vice president of the American Tariff League.

It is interesting to observe that Joe Grundy and his associates, the traditional enemies of labor, developed this monstrous legislation to safeguard their special privileges on the pretext that it protected the worker. The benefits obtained under this and other high tariffs did not go to the worker, as the worker well knows. He was exploited and kept in subjection, forced to labor under inhuman conditions for mere subsistence, while Joe Grundy and others of his kind siphoned off the rich profits accruing from this "protection."

Yet even during this Harding-Coolidge-Hoover era of prohibitive tariffs, there were Republican leaders who viewed with apprehension the effect of such policies upon American economic life. President Harding himself wrote to Chief Justice Hughes, former Secretary of State, in defense of reciprocity.

I am well convinced—

The President wrote—

that the adoption of unconditional most-favored-nation policy is the simpler way to maintain our tariff policy in accordance with the recently enacted law—Tariff Act of 1922—and is probably the sure way of effectively extending our trade abroad.

Frank Knox, the Republican Vice Presidential candidate only 4 years ago, stated last year:

To sell American farm products abroad, we must buy some of what our foreign customers have to sell.

You cannot always sell and never buy in foreign markets.

Various features of the present trade-agreement legislation have in the past received the support of outstanding Republican leaders.

When it was argued that the placing of such authority in the Department of State was an unconstitutional delegation of power, Hon. Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of State, declared:

I am not impressed with the objection that it would give undue or dictatorial powers to our Executive.

It does not seem to me that such objections are well founded.

At the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee in 1937, Hon. William S. Culbertson stated:

The Republicans themselves in the Tariff Acts of 1890 and 1897 established so far as our commercial policy was concerned, the principle of systematic reciprocity; namely, a law on which Congress defined the principle on which reciprocity is to proceed and develop, and then leaves it to the Executive to carry out the details.

In the same year the argument that reciprocity endangered the American standard of living was answered by the well-known Republican financial writer, Roger W. Babson. He wrote:

The best protection for the American standard of living is to stimulate world commerce.

Tariffs, quotas, and other trade barriers must be lowered if the world is to escape a complete economic and moral break-down.

Hence I believe that Secretary of State Hull's reciprocal-trade policy is the most encouraging development in world affairs today. The only way the trade barriers can be eliminated is by mutually lowering them over a period of time.

Two Republican Governors from New England, widely separated in time but not in beliefs, defended the principle of reciprocity. One was former Governor and Senator McCall, of Massachusetts, who in 1902 made an impassioned speech for the bill establishing reciprocal-trade relations with Cuba. Another was former Governor Winant, of New Hampshire, whose annual report to the international labor office last year stated:

Economic isolation is not the solution of the problem presented by the unequal distribution of natural resources and by the needs for markets unless the workers are prepared to work longer hours, eat less and lower quality of food, and live in poor dwellings.

The Republican Party would do well to consider not only these views of well-known Republicans on specific phases of the problem but also the summation of another Republican, Nicholas Roosevelt:

Wise and courageous Republican leadership—

He said—

must be prepared, in dealing with this problem—foreign trade—to cast aside hide-bound traditions of the party and to act, not in accordance with the heritage of Mark Hanna and Boies Penrose but rather with a view to the needs of the United States of today and tomorrow.

I have raised the question that the Hawley-Smoot tariff by erecting barriers to shut off our trade with foreign nations shared in no small measure the responsibility for those economic dislocations which intensified bitterness between nations, a bitterness which is now finding its expression on the battlefields of Europe.

Just as a bad tariff breeds conflict, so can a good tariff promote peace.

Nations which enjoy friendly and profitable trade relations with each other do not incline toward warfare.

Again I refer, not to what Democrats have said on this subject, but to what leading Republicans have said. One of these was James P. Warburg.

You have started the world on the way to peace for the first time since 1914.

Mr. Warburg wrote to Secretary Hull in 1936:

You have held fast to your beliefs and principles, and, thanks to your patience and perseverance in the face of frequent opposition within and without the administration, you have made progress.

Another leading Republican, Thomas W. Lamont, made the same point in an address before the Economic Club of New York at the end of 1938. He said:

Peace will not be maintained unless a very distinct effort is made. * * * In that connection, may I, as a life-long Republican, associate myself with what Dr. Van Zeeland, Mr. Young, and Mr. Aldrich have said as to the Hull treaties—I am very strongly for the work that Mr. Secretary Hull, the present Secretary of State, has done. * * * His are distinct and helpful steps in building up the trade which is necessary to peace.

I have dwelt at length upon opinions expressed by prominent Republicans in favor of such a program as we are now considering because they indicate with finality that this question is, or should be, nonpartisan.

Yet, as we review the testimony which has been placed in the RECORD by responsible and qualified persons, partisanship appears to be the only remaining barrier to passage of this legislation.

The evidence shows that the trade-agreement program has worked and worked well. It has greatly increased American foreign markets.

It has provided employment at home for hundreds of thousands of American workers.

In no case has it been clearly and unquestionably demonstrated that in any way it has unjustly discriminated against or penalized American industry or agriculture.

It has set in motion those forces of peaceful world trade which offer the only remaining hope for any enduring peace among nations.

It has contributed in heroic measure to the solution of domestic economic problems arising from our creation of large industrial and agricultural surpluses.

Its advantages are manifest, for they have been demonstrated by experience.

I see no reason, under such circumstances, why the obstacle of partisanship should be opposed to this legislation, particularly in view of the position taken by so many outstanding Republican leaders in both the past and the present.

I would warn those who wish to throw this issue into the political arena that such a policy is dangerous, not only to our country but to the Republican Party as well.

Let the Republican leadership remember that just such partisan blindness in the early years of this century helped to bring about the election of Woodrow Wilson.

Let that leadership remember that the Republican tariffs promulgated after the World War were in a certain measure—and no one will ever know how great a measure—responsible for the financial collapse which very nearly destroyed not only the Republican Party but the country as well.

I ask in all sincerity that the lessons of the past be remembered and that this legislation be judged impartially upon the record of its past operation.

Upon that record it should pass unanimously.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I shall support wholeheartedly the Pittman amendment now pending before the Senate. As I see it, this is a great day for those who believe in free trade. I am a protectionist, always expect to be a protectionist, and I have always supported the protective principle, because I believe the American market belongs to the American farmer, the American worker, and the American manufacturer.

I have before me a letter written by Richard P. Brown, the secretary of commerce of Pennsylvania, in which he says:

The pamphlet, dated December 1939, issued by the Department of State, Washington, D. C., entitled "Benefits to Pennsylvania From Reciprocal Trade Agreements," implies that there have been only benefits to Pennsylvania from the reciprocal-trade agreements and no injurious results:

This pamphlet contains the following statement:

"Since the Trade Agreements Act was approved, agreements have been negotiated with 21 countries. With so many variables in the economic situation here and abroad affecting the movement of trade, it is impossible to determine precisely the extent to which trade agreements have helped to restore the increased foreign markets for American farm and factory products."

The statement would be more accurate if it read:

"It is impossible to determine precisely the extent to which trade agreements have injured American farms and factories."

Mr. Brown goes on to say:

In 1939, a better business year than 1938, our exports increased only 3 percent, including the tremendous volume of materials shipped abroad in connection with the war, yet imports increased 18 percent. This condition certainly indicated that reciprocal-trade agreements are injurious rather than beneficial to Pennsylvania farms and factories.

Sixty percent of our imported products are noncompeting products, such as bananas, coffee, rubber, tin, etc., which come in duty-free. The other 40 percent are dutiable products competing with American farms and factories and it is to this 40 percent that the reciprocal-trade agreements apply, to the injury of Pennsylvania agriculture and industry.

The old and long-established Pennsylvania industries, such as agriculture, mining, and textiles, have suffered most from the reciprocal-trade agreements in competing with the products of low-wage countries. The newer industries such as electrical equipment and automobiles, in which the technique of manufacture has been largely the result of American development and which are equipped with the latest labor-saving devices, naturally suffer the least in competition with the products of low-wage countries.

What do we need from Europe? Certainly not coal, steel, and agricultural products, yet we have been buying large quantities of these products under the reciprocal-trade agreements.

Still quoting Mr. Brown, the secretary of commerce of Pennsylvania:

Take anthracite coal for example. Pennsylvania produces 99 percent of the anthracite coal mined in the United States. Production has fallen to approximately half of what it formerly was because of competition with other fuels and other causes, with thousands of Pennsylvania miners unemployed or on short time, yet under an agreement with Russia, that country is permitted to ship in, duty-free, up to 400,000 tons of anthracite coal per year.

The following tonnage of Russian anthracite was imported duty-free into the United States since this agreement with Russia was executed:

	Tons
1937 (last 6 months)	93,245
1938	200,482
1939	212,442

Mr. Brown goes on to state what other industries have been affected.

I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of Mr. Brown's letter be placed in the RECORD as part of my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Pennsylvania is a great steel-producing State, yet we have been importing large quantities of steel products under the reciprocal-trade agreements during a period when thousands of Pennsylvania steel workers were idle.

Of what advantage was it to the Pennsylvania steel industry and Pennsylvania steel workers that 3,883,573 pounds of Swedish wire rods were imported in 1937 under the reciprocal-trade agreements at only 4-percent duty?

What help is being afforded to Lehigh and Northampton Counties, the centers of the American cement industry, when, after a reduction of 4½ cents per hundred pounds in the duty, we imported in 1 year 377,613,000 pounds of Portland cement from Belgium and 49,449,619 pounds from Holland?

Leaf tobacco is an important Pennsylvania agricultural commodity, the export of which showed a very sharp decrease during 1939. From a value of \$139,418,000 in the first 11 months of 1938, exports of unmanufactured tobacco fell to \$72,429,000 in the same period of 1939, a decrease of \$66,989,000. Most of the decrease occurred in shipments to the agreement group of countries.

Our foreign trade in dollars increased under the reciprocal-trade agreements only because we were willing to exchange our goods at a discount for gold bought by us in huge quantities at a premium. Add gold into the total of imports and exports and we have had an unfavorable balance of trade to an average value of more than a billion dollars a year, for every year since 1933, and this is the first period since 1833, 100 years, when that has been true.

If this was to enable Europe to pay back its debts to us it might be justified. But Europe has defaulted on those debts. Yet we are now buying of the world a billion dollars more than we sell, and that import balance against us is chiefly with Europe and largely with the trade-agreement countries.

It must be remembered that the cost of unemployment relief reflected in the American tax bill and in our growing public debt is a rising burden on all American commerce. Unemployment is aggravated by the competition in our markets of the products of low-labor-costs countries which these treaties are constantly extending both as to agriculture and industry.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD P. BROWN,
Secretary.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the American people have repeatedly gone on record against one-man government. There is no question about the way in which they react against it. From first to last, the history of our people shows undying opposition to the arbitrary authority of political despotism. This feeling is not less pronounced today than in the past. In fact, Mr. President, I question if there ever was a time when our citizens have been more alert than now to detect the encroachments of arbitrary power.

This affords an explanation of the growing distrust over the way in which the reciprocal trade agreements program has been administered. It is an outstanding example of unrestrained increase of Executive authority without the full knowledge of the people. It is now our obligation thoroughly to consider the implications of this excessive grant of power to the Executive, lest there become fixed and established traditions and precedents which will mark the beginning of the downfall of our representative institutions of government.

Let it be made clear at the start that there are a number of points that are not really involved in the present controversy. Essentially we are not concerned with the question of whether or not these trade agreements are technically treaties. We are not discussing the relative value of foreign trade. We have no protest to register against the true principle of reciprocal trade. We are not for or against these trade treaties because we are for peace, for this relationship has been shown to be only an incidental one and not basically fundamental. We do not advocate any special view of tariff, because we believe in sectional advantage for one part of the United States at the expense of some other part. We believe that agriculture, labor, and industry are equally interested in an American plan of tariff protection and its efficient administration. The issue at stake rises much higher than the views of any special line of business or of firms engaged in the export business.

The solution of this problem cannot be regarded as a panacea for all the ills of the Nation. We are not quibbling over divergent sets of statistics on the import and the export trade. We are thoroughly opposed to any attempt to bar from the court of public opinion the findings of research experts and tariff specialists. In the United States every citizen should have a right to be heard.

Our concern is primarily that the Congress shall maintain its right of approval of trade treaties, whether such approval is given individually or collectively. The very fact of our congressional consideration of the measure now before us is indisputable evidence that the authority for making these treaties resides in Congress rather than in the Executive. The President or the Secretary of State, or their associates, have authority to negotiate these international agreements only insofar as that authority is delegated to them by Congress.

This grant of power was made in 1934. I was not in favor of it. The grant of power was renewed in 1937. Again I was opposed to it. Now an extension of the authority is sought, and again I am opposed to it. In fact, I am more opposed than ever before, because with the passing years it becomes clearer that in the enactment of this legislation Congress is divesting itself of a duty which it alone can discharge if it is to retain the authority granted to it in the Constitution. If Congress has the right—and I believe this to be beyond all peradventure of a doubt—to make a collective grant of tariff-writing authority, it has the right to retain to itself the authority to approve or withhold approval of individual trade treaties. The question before us is the practical necessity of congressional action on the individual trade treaties that are subject to negotiation by our Government.

When the Reciprocal Trade Act was first proposed, Secretary Hull appeared before the Senate Committee on Finance, which was conducting hearings on House bill 8687, which was a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930. On Thursday, April 26, 1934, Secretary Hull said, as a part of his testimony before the committee:

There should, I repeat, be no misunderstanding as to the nature or the purpose of this measure. It is not an extraordinary plan to deal with ordinary or normal conditions. Its support is only urged as an emergency measure to deal with a dangerous and threatening emergency situation. I would venture, in these circumstances, to express the hope that the bill be considered and acted upon in this light. I am well aware of the controversial possibilities of any proposal that might, in the least, affect the most prohibitive or embargo features of customs and other trade barriers.

Mr. President, that was the clearly defined position of Secretary Hull 7 years ago. The new trade program was to be considered exclusively as an emergency measure. It was not to be regarded as a plan to deal with ordinary or normal conditions. Since then, however, the reasons advanced for the continuation of this program have changed. The psychology of emergency has come to be regarded as one of permanence. In the name of international stabilization and world peace, this emergency program is advanced on a basis which permanently accomplishes the most ardent hopes of those who believe in free trade and a hit-and-run trade attack by low-wage competitors.

Mr. President, the urgency of the issue before us is beyond dispute. Under the 22 trade treaties negotiated to date our tariffs have been sharply reduced on over 1,000 products. These reductions affect 42 percent of our dutiable imports. The average reduction in rates has been 39 percent. Not for a single moment do I believe that such a guerilla attack on American trade protection represents the will of the great majority of our thoughtful citizens. In fact, it appears little short of international plunder that such a drastic revision of our tariff downward should have been permitted. When the full significance of these little-understood negotiations have fully been brought to the attention of the people I have no doubt as to their refusal to grant an extension of this program; for in the final analysis, although the American people are generous—possibly generous to a fault—it is not in my heart to believe they will consistently favor a policy of self-destruction.

The present program is inconsistent with the true intent of tariff reciprocity as it has been established in trade customs over a long period of time. It is inconsistent with the cherished national ideal that reciprocity demands that we confine our exchange of surpluses to the products we need but do not ourselves produce. This standard was never intended to permit the importations of low-wage foreign products in the case of articles which we already produce in great

abundance at standards of work and wages incomparably higher than the generally accepted standards familiar in international trade.

The United States is the only country which has long established and permanently held to these higher standards. No other nation begins to measure up to our productive standards of living. If there were three or four other nations that maintained economic and trade standards comparable to our own, there would then be a substantial measure of realism on which to base a practical program of elastic international exchange. However, this is a condition which does not exist. There is little possibility that it will exist in the near future; and until such a condition is developed it is nothing short of national suicide for the United States to continue its present policy of giving away in piecemeal fashion the earnings of American labor, industry, and agriculture. This high-handed national charity, dispensed in the name of international peace at a time when war rages uncontrolled throughout the areas to which we have granted the most liberal trade reductions, does little credit to the judgment and prudence of the American people. It is unwise, inexpedient, misleading, and calculated to embroil us in the strife which we should in every way seek to avoid.

The question before us is not a technical one. It is not one of fine-spun distinctions in constitutional law. It is not a subject which requires the rarefied scholarship of some academic mind. It is nothing less than a matter of plain common sense which should be submitted to the Representatives of the people in Congress.

Congress has the right to pass upon these treaties collectively. If Congress has sufficient wisdom to make a full delegation of authority in this very important issue, Congress also has enough wisdom to judge the fundamental worth of each individual trade agreement as it shall arise. This is not a denial to the expert and the specialist of a proper place in the gathering of data and the presentation of factual findings. This is not a plea that Congress has a greater wisdom in matters pertaining to tariff than in other fields. It is a plea that congressional intelligence and prudence be not arbitrarily pushed aside or allowed to seem less sane than the intellectual endeavors of departmental officials.

The matter comes down to exactly this choice. Either the Representatives of the people in Congress are to be trusted with a determination of the development of our foreign-trade policy a step at a time, from first to last, and all along the line, or else Congress is not worthy to be trusted with the decision which it is now called upon to make. If departmental bureaucrats, acting under the direction of one man, can manage to gain dominance in this field, they will be equally justified in seeking dominance in every other field of public policy which has been entrusted to Congress under the Constitution, in which event we shall have no need for popular representations in the halls of Congress. Congress can be permanently retired to make way for the all-powerful state under executive control such as is found in Communist Russia or Fascist Italy or Nazi Germany.

There are those that say that these trade agreements represent a complexity of understanding too removed from the limited intellectual comprehension of Members of Congress. Mr. President, I am not making a plea for the erudition of the Members of these two worthy Chambers, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. Such a plea need not be made. It is sufficient to say that those who are elected to membership in Congress come as representatives of the people, and the combined intelligence of the many will, over a period of time, be found to exceed the value of any single intelligence, irrespective of what brilliance it may exhibit at any given time. If Congress does not know enough to pass on questions of tariff, Congress does not know enough properly to deal with the issues of taxes, education, labor, naval affairs, post offices, post roads, pensions, or any other of the many momentous problems which here daily confront us.

Mr. President, I wish to make clear that a congressional review of trade agreements would not in any way interfere

with a full development of specialized information by existing agencies which currently study this field. Congress would welcome the presentation of all pertinent data in hearings before appropriate committees. Such information, together with the points of view of the representatives of agriculture, labor, industry, and transportation, should be made fully available to the public as well as to congressional committees. There is no place for star-chamber proceedings in the negotiation of trade agreements. The development of these agreements represents, in practically every instance, a development of our foreign-trade policy. Each treaty is a step in this development. Congress not only has the right to review these agreements before they are put into effect; Congress has the responsibility of doing so. It is inexpedient and disastrous to delegate this authority. A continuation of the present method of administering this phase of our foreign policy will inevitably lead to a development of one-man government, which will have its repercussions in every field of domestic activity. The tie-in between foreign and domestic affairs is inseparable. The conduct of foreign affairs affects domestic policy and domestic procedure. To give ground to one-man control on trade agreements may lead to an exercise of arbitrary power at some future date, under some other President, resulting in a domestic problem far beyond anything which we can now imagine or foresee. There is not merely such a possibility, it is a probability, and it is one which should "give us pause." We should coolly reflect upon this fundamental problem before we again make a delegation of congressional authority which would be entirely out of line with all past precedents and procedure of our National Government.

Mr. President, much has been said by the advocates of this measure about the evils of logrolling. They refer to the practice of bringing about political arrangements whereby an attempt is made to secure benefits for one section of the country in exchange for a different set of benefits for some other section. Those who talk about logrolling in tariff agreements at the present time have been strangely silent about political arrangements of this nature which have been carried on during the last 7 years in relation to the distribution of the vast sums of money which have been expended by the Federal Government. Does anyone believe that these funds were not disbursed in such a way as to give political preferment? The fact is that that has been taken for granted to such a large degree that scarcely any mention has been made of it. Now, however, when an administration measure is proposed which has prompted the opposition of red-blooded Americans the cry of logrolling is raised.

Mr. President, I am not seeking to justify the political maneuvers of this or any other administration. It is well recognized that there have been and there continue to be political abuses which cannot be explained away. It seems more than unfair, however, that the spotlight of public attention should be riveted on these developments solely in relation to the adjustment of tariff rates, for they pertain just as readily to a dozen other fields of governmental procedure.

Only profitable production in the United States is sufficient to bring dependable prosperity to this land. I do not intend to discuss the relative values of foreign and domestic trade. It must be apparent that our home market is our most vital and productive market, the one which holds the largest measure of hope for all our citizens, even though foreign trade may bring a benefit to a fractional minority. Our exports would have to be doubled to equal in volume an increase of much less than 5 percent in our home business. The free-trade war cry, "We must import if we want to export," is raised to cover the important fact that our country regularly imports rubber, coffee, sugar, vegetable oils, tin, silk, and other items in enormous quantities. Rubber, coffee, tin, silk, and many other products enter free of any duty. Nearly two-thirds of all imports pay no tariff charges at all. In addition to that, we buy from the world vast quantities of silver and gold at artificial prices; and yet there is no law in heaven or on earth which can compel foreign nations to use the benefits which they derive from us to make a fair return to us. American dollars go abroad;

more often than not they are spent abroad for products of foreign nations rather than being returned for the purchase of American-made goods. In an open market the lowest offer sets the price. In the case of many products a 1-percent increase of imports can break the scale of American prices. A small rift in the lute will make the music mute.

Mr. President, the disparity between American prices and world prices continues to be a source of loss to American producers and wage earners. So long as the United States has underpaid farmers, and 9,000,000 unemployed, we cannot afford to give our markets to foreign producers. Our markets are the best in the world; they are a prize; they belong to the people who have developed them—the American people—and our farmers, workers, manufacturers, and investors should have the first claim upon them. This is a sane point of view. It is the accepted point of view of every trading nation in the world. It is a point of view which we must maintain or go down in defeat before the hit-and-run attack of low-wage-scale foreign competitors who are using the idealism of peace-minded internationalism to plunder the American markets at the expense of every man, woman, and child in our land.

Secretary Morgenthau has made a proposal which bears upon this issue. He says:

The best way to reduce our gold inflow on commodity and service account is for us to have full recovery so that our imports will rise more rapidly than do our exports.

Last year the excess of agricultural imports over exports was \$462,207,000. If the proposal of the Secretary of the Treasury is to use this gold to pay for imports, it would appear that we have about \$12,000,000,000 of excess gold available for that purpose. We have \$12,000,000,000 more of commodities than we export. That \$12,000,000,000 would be sufficient to pay the wages of 10,000,000 men at an average of \$1,200 a year.

Take, for instance, the pottery industry and see how the reciprocal-trade program works. More than 60 percent of the total cost of pottery is the labor cost. The average wage paid in American pottery is 75 cents an hour. The chief competitor in American markets of the American pottery industry is Japan, and the Japanese potter is paid an average wage of 4 cents an hour. How can we expect to keep our potteries going and our potters employed if we insist on reducing the tariff on pottery, as was done in the British trade agreement, a reduction which the Japanese had a right to claim and which they quickly did claim?

Or consider, again, the operation of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in regard to fuel oil. Recently a trade agreement was negotiated with Venezuela by the terms of which the excise tax of one-half cent a gallon on fuel oil was reduced to one-fourth cent a gallon. Fuel oil has been and is perhaps the greatest competitor of all the other fuels. This arrangement has the damaging effect of driving down the price of American-produced oil. This results in displacing millions of tons of American-produced coal, throwing thousands of coal miners out of jobs, and keeping the coal industry in poverty. This is a condition of grave importance to the State of Pennsylvania. It is equally of importance to many sister States where coal miners are now having a desperate struggle for existence.

The hearings of the Senate Committee on Finance show that during the negotiation of the Venezuelan agreement no opportunity was given the independent oil producers of this country to present to the negotiators their facts about excise taxes. The representatives of the Independent Petroleum Association were referred to a committee. That committee was unwilling to give information as to whether or not petroleum was to be considered in the formulation of the agreement. No light whatever was thrown on the plans of the State Department. The names of those who were engaged in the actual negotiations were withheld. It was impossible to learn whether or not anyone was supporting the inclusion of excise taxes, although Congress had made definitely clear its intent that the authority to reduce tariffs should not apply to these excise taxes.

It was only when the conclusion of the Venezuelan agreement was announced that the representatives of the independent petroleum producers learned that the State Department had granted the 50-percent reduction in these taxes on an amount of imports not more than 5 percent of the domestic refinery runs in the preceding year. They then asked the President for an opportunity to be heard, but no such opportunity was granted.

That Congress intended to reserve to itself authority over these excise taxes was expressed in the records of congressional action on the original Trade Agreements Act. I quote the identical language of the report of the House Ways and Means Committee on the act of 1934, which said:

In order that the necessary reciprocity may be accorded, the President is empowered to promise that existing duties which affect imported goods will not be increased during the term of any particular agreement. It should be carefully noted, however, that the President is given no right to reduce or increase any excise duty. His power of reduction of duties is limited to those which are in fact customs duties.

That portion of the Venezuelan trade agreement which deals with petroleum excise taxes is not in harmony with the intent and purposes of the act. The benefits flowing from this excise-tax reduction do not go to Venezuela, but go to the European or American companies which hold Venezuela's oil. The agreement, therefore, so far as this portion of it is concerned, is an agreement between the State Department acting for the Nation, on one side, and the big importing oil companies on the other.

Mr. President, this oil agreement reminds me of a very great, noble, and distinguished Democrat who, speaking at a Democratic national convention, said, "Show me an oil well, and I will show you a Republican policy." I say to you today, "Show me an oil well in connection with this Venezuelan trade treaty, and I will show you a free-trade Democratic policy."

Factory-wage rates and finished-goods prices have been artificially lifted far above the prices of farm products. As a result, the purchasing power of the farmer has been severely reduced. When the farmer is not able to buy, there is an inevitable reduction in factory sales and factory employment. I have been saying for years that fat farms make full factories. Depressed factory sales mean unemployment in our great industrial centers. That means less demand for farm products. With a depressed industry and mass unemployment comes a drying up of job opportunities. When unemployment is bad, we have additional problems of relief and work relief. This calls for a vast spending program on the part of the Government. This, in turn, means large deficits and increased borrowing or taxes. As long as farm prices are so greatly out of line with industrial costs and prices, we shall have this problem. The answer to it is in the field of economics, and no amount of political juggling will solve it.

In the field of foreign trade we are faced with a similar condition, but one which is worse and much more confusing. Again it is a matter of labor costs and industrial prices. These are expressed in terms of ever-changing currencies. Our Government is giving away the American market to traders who shuffle around their currencies for their own advantage. Their standards of living, prices, and wages are so much lower than our own that we always take a licking. These are economic realities. Unfortunately, however, they are ignored by Utopian-minded idealists and theorists who insist that by playing Santa Claus the United States can bring peace in the world. We have had the reciprocal trade agreements program for 6 years, but it did not bring peace; nor does it have power to restore peace at the present time.

Some persons advocate the importation of foreign coal so that consumers in this country may have cheaper coal. They seem to forget, however, that in order to compete with foreign prices American miners would have to submit to servitude and economic slavery. To have that cheaper coal we would sacrifice more than a proportionate share of the miners' purchasing power. The importation of 6,188,000 tons of coal during the past 9 years has deprived our miners

of the right to produce that amount. This has reflected in the loss of wages and returns to workers and operators; and this has occurred at a time when the bituminous and anthracite industries have been crying aloud for relief for their depressed condition. One merely has to ride through some of the coal towns of Pennsylvania and West Virginia to realize that they are truly becoming ghost towns. Everybody in America loses when that happens. Since we must import goods to pay for our exports, let us not import coal, but only goods incapable of being produced here.

To those who urge tearing down our protective-tariff barriers and throwing trade open to indiscriminate free trade, let me say that their proposal comes about 175 years too late. They should have been around in the era when our industries had not been developed. Then, however, for purposes of home defense, and to remove strife with Great Britain and other countries, we encouraged and protected our industries so as to permit them to thrive and develop. When we assumed the responsibility for encouraging infant industries, we also assumed the future responsibility of maintaining adequate protection for them. That which has been built up through the years cannot be undone in a year or a dozen years without undermining and destroying our established economy.

Our high standard of living and our high wages have been built upon the present system of tariff protection, inadequate as it is. Our tariff walls have been, and should continue to be, the first line of defense against the encroachments of economic servitude. If we have to compete with foreign costs of production, we shall have to submit to foreign standards of low wages and low standards of living. To this I am unwilling to subscribe. I do not believe the American people are willing to subscribe to it if they fully understand what is wrapped up in the present proposal.

Economic sanity and political principle unite to demand that the representatives of the people in Congress retain the right to review tariff agreements which so vitally affect the maintenance of our economic life and our constitutional form of government.

Mr. President, in the beginning of the present tariff program Secretary Henry Wallace directly suggested that the United States had certain inefficient industries which must be sacrificed on the altar of international trade. He specifically mentioned the lace industry. Since that time the American lace industry has suffered the most extreme difficulties because of the policy adopted. The American lace-manufacturing industry today is working at less than 50 percent of its capacity as a direct result of the operations of the Franco-American Reciprocal Trade Treaty. While our lace industry has been dwindling in output and employment, imports of laces from France have increased up to 33 times the amount entering this country prior to the ratification of the trade treaty. Nine-tenths of the total French output is finding a market in the United States, at prices against which the American lace-manufacturing industry cannot compete. As a result of these increasing imports, there are in the United States more than 5,000 lace workers who have been deprived of their employment. Production by American lace mills at the present time is little more than half that of 1935, the last year prior to the operation of the treaty with France.

The French are naturally jubilant over the advantages gained in this way. French gains are increased by the depreciation of the franc since 1936. The American dollar today buys French lace, in terms of francs, at one-third the cost which prevailed when the treaty was signed. The American lace-manufacturing industry maintains average weekly wages for different operations which range on an average from \$20 a week to \$55 a week. French wages, operation for operation, average 25 percent and less of the American wage, and all other costs, including investment and continuing overhead costs, are on a similar scale. Despite these differences in the cost of production and wages, and despite the tremendous depreciation in the value of the franc, the State Department has made no move toward

either amending or abrogating the reciprocal-trade treaty with France. As a result, American lace workers go unemployed in large numbers.

Mr. President, many of these workers live in Pennsylvania; they are my constituents. I am trying to voice their opposition to the way in which this trade policy has wrecked their industry, and put them out on the street, and forced many of them to go on relief.

Then, Mr. President, there is the pulp and paper industry. Following the trade agreement with the Netherlands, the imports of wrapping paper into our country rose from 5,000 to 24,000 tons the first year. Thirteen thousand tons of it were of the very best grade of wrapping paper. This was machine-glazed paper, and it amounted to some 27 percent of the machine-glazed, highest-grade wrapping paper used here. The result is that this increased import tonnage actually meant that the wrapping-paper industry for a period of time was operating at below cost. This is but one small segment of the American paper industry. The same kind of losses are being sustained in other fields of the same industry.

The peculiar conditions in this industry, particularly in analyzing tariffs, should be given consideration. Normally, at congressional hearings all sides of a question are permitted to be expressed. Without hearings injustice is bound to occur, and against this star-chamber procedure the representatives of small industries have no recourse whatsoever. They take losses which place them in jeopardy, and increase the ever-growing number of the unemployed in sectors of business which normally should offer the greatest opportunity to provide new employment.

The labor movement is destroyed in most of the countries of the world. If the war shall continue for a few years, what is left of the labor movement in the European countries will be destroyed there also. This will mean that the markets of the world will be drawn down, and cheap labor will be forced upon organized labor, and will be used against it. Economic conditions in the United States will feel the repercussions of this economic warfare long after the shot and shell have been forgotten.

Recently I received a letter from a very prominent labor leader in Britain who said that if the war continues he expects Europe to be reduced to pestilence and famine. Under these conditions the United States will need to take strong measures to uphold our American standards of living, or they will be overwhelmed in the deluge of world troubles about which we are not able to do much in a constructive way at the present time. Our best service to the rest of the world should continue to be to demonstrate the practical value of high work and wage standards, and this we cannot continue to do unless we uphold the basic economic standards on which our present work structure has been built.

These trade treaties are referred to as reciprocal-trade treaties. The fact is that we have made duty reductions which are almost world-wide in their application, whereas the reductions which have been promised in return are restricted to the countries making direct agreements with us. Only if other countries should make treaties among themselves all around, and not with us, would we receive free benefits from other countries as they are now receiving them from us. In other countries, however, such agreements are not being made; and, as a result, we are in the position of giving away our market to many countries which do not directly participate in our trade negotiations. This is a means of lowering our duties in general, but it is not reciprocity.

Mr. President, the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act does not pretend to lay down any basis for determining on what grounds concessions in duties may be made. It becomes obvious that differences between costs of production of an article in the United States and those in competing foreign countries are not of any importance to those who negotiate these agreements. With the greatly increased costs of wages and the shortened hours of labor in this country, naturally a producer in the United States must be greatly concerned if

the tariff protection on the articles he produces is not sufficient to equalize the difference between costs of production.

Take, for example, the plate-glass industry, which is a very important industry in Pennsylvania. Half the window-glass factories of this country were compelled to close down in the period between 1932 and 1936, yet every box of window glass that is imported and sold here consists of merchandise which could be readily produced by the domestic industry, which has the capacity to produce from eighteen to twenty million boxes of glass a year. At no time has the industry been able to market a quantity in excess of 12,000,000 boxes, yet we still continue to import from abroad.

Compare wage schedules of window-glass workers in foreign countries with our own. In Czechoslovakia at the end of 1935 an ordinary glass producer operator received 17 cents an hour, while here he received 64 cents an hour. At the close of 1937 a Belgian glass worker received 19 cents an hour, while we were paying 72 cents for the same work. These are differentials which cannot be ignored without throwing thousands of American workers out of jobs. Foreign labor in the glass industry is paid a pittance of what our labor is paid. Foreign labor works incomparably longer hours. Foreign labor works under standards of living we would regard as criminally insufficient. Why should we uplift our American standards of wages and hours through domestic legislation and at the same time undermine those standards through the further enactment of legislation which strikes straight at the heart of American labor?

Mr. President, the lot of the dairyman is placed in jeopardy under the present program. There are many dairymen in Pennsylvania, and my attention has especially been called to their protests against the way in which the reciprocal-trade policy is being administered. Dairying is not like a great many agricultural industries, such as the production of cotton, wheat, and tobacco. Dairying is still a domestic industry. Our total farm production of milk is something over 100,000,000,000 pounds. About half of this amount, or a little more, is manufactured into butter or cheese or evaporated cream. This milk is produced under sanitary standards immeasurably higher than those which prevail in the greater part of the rest of the world. We are practically free from tuberculosis, and yet we allow the dairy products from foreign countries to come into our country without any sanitary standard at all. I am informed that 50 percent of the cows in England, for example, have tuberculosis, and that tuberculosis is rampant all through the western European nations with the exception of the Scandinavian countries. In the course of 23 years the Federal, State, and county governments have expended more than \$260,000,000 to control bovine tuberculosis here; yet as the trade agreements are now administered our Nation has no protection from the ravages of this dread disease from abroad because of uncontrolled imports of milk products from disease-ridden areas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President—

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

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very much interested in the Senator's statement about the existence of tuberculosis in England among cattle. Has the Senator statistics to show what our butter and milk imports from England amounted to last year?

Mr. DAVIS. I think the Senator will find the statistics in the hearings. I shall be glad to gather them and give the information to the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought the Senator had them at his fingertips.

Mr. DAVIS. No; I do not have them at my fingertips.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD as part of my remarks an extract from the minutes of the meeting of the Philadelphia Board of Trade held February 19, 1940.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

PHILADELPHIA BOARD OF TRADE,
Bourse Building, Philadelphia.

EXTRACT FROM MINUTES OF STATED MEETING, PHILADELPHIA BOARD OF
TRADE, HELD FEBRUARY 19, 1940

Your committee having considered House Joint Resolution 407, being a bill proposing further extension of the Trade Treaty Act, and for other purposes, respectfully represents:

It is needless to recite that our onetime industrial prosperity, the healthful competition prevailing in our domestic as well as our export markets, was justifiably attributed to the successful application of our protective tariff—the McKinley tariff. As sponsor for his initial tariff bill Mr. McKinley declared: "The end in view is always to be opening up of new markets for the products of our country by granting concessions to the products of other lands that we need and cannot produce ourselves, and which do not involve any loss of labor to our own people but tend rather to increase their employment."

Therefore emphasis should be placed upon the fact that under the Hull-Roosevelt reciprocal trade treaty policy the current administration has flouted both the Constitution of the United States and the fundamentals of that reciprocity McKinley defined; it has effected drastic concession on foreign products, both farm and factory, which we ourselves produce; it has thus gratuitously extended such concessions virtually to all countries of the world, except Germany, without securing to our export trade any equivalent in reciprocal advantages.

Thus practicing a strange internationalism (styled the "good neighbor policy") this camouflaging of a drastically downward revision of the tariff is exposing our farms and factories to a ruthless foreign competition, the evidence of which fact will become the more obvious with the return of peace in Europe. Then it may naturally be expected that swords will be beaten into plowshares and the millions of men now in the trenches will have returned to their workbenches.

Proponents of this program now couch their appeal for its further extension in a spirit of philanthropy. They propose that by this means we shall assure peace throughout the world; by thus stimulating trade between nations we will inspire gainful employment among the peoples of the earth and so advance the cause of a common humanity.

For reasons hereinbefore cited, your committee recommends emphatic opposition to any further extension of the Trade Treaty Act as submitted in House Joint Resolution 407. The report was unanimously adopted.

THE PHILADELPHIA BOARD OF TRADE,
GEO. L. MARKLAND, Jr., President.

True copy.
Attest:

H. W. WILLS, Secretary.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I desire to conclude by repeating that I am wholeheartedly in favor of the Pittman amendment. In view of the conditions I have recited, I am opposed to the continuation of an administrative policy of foreign trade that does not give first consideration to the welfare of American workers, farmers, business, and the purchasing public. We have had a sufficiently long experience with this program to see what it has produced and can produce. I am not opposed to foreign trade, I am not opposed to reciprocal trade, but I am opposed and shall continue to be opposed to any policy that ignores the rights of our own citizens and makes them subservient to the low-wage and cut-throat competitive policies of any foreign power, for I hold it to be our first duty to maintain our American standards of work and wages.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND CIRCUIT JUDGES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I understand it is not expected that any further speeches will be made in respect to the pending legislation at this time. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7079, to provide for the appointment of additional district and circuit judges, which is Calendar No. 1377.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7079) to provide for the appointment of additional district and circuit judges.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That the President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional circuit judges, as follows:

- (a) One for the sixth circuit;
- (b) One for the eighth circuit.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, six additional district judges, as follows:

- (a) One for each of the following districts: Southern district of California, district of New Jersey, western district of Oklahoma, eastern district of Pennsylvania;
- (b) One for the southern district of New York;
- (c) One, who shall be a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, that is the amendment which I asked to have considered.

I think I should make a statement with respect to the matter before action is taken. I propose to offer a certain amendment to the substitute amendment. This measure is a House bill. Last year the Senate passed a bill creating certain additional judgeships, which went to the House but was not acted upon. At this session the House enacted its own bill, and it was sent to the Senate. The Senate Committee on the Judiciary struck out all in the House bill after the enacting clause, and inserted in lieu of the House provision the identical bill which the Senate passed at the last session.

Since the bill to which I have referred was passed by the Senate at the last session, there have been certain developments which would suggest that the original Senate bill, now proposed as a substitute, be changed. For instance, the Senate bill and the House bill provide for an additional judge for the sixth circuit. We are informed that conditions have changed considerably since that provision was made.

At the judicial conference the judges of that district were of the opinion that an additional judge was not needed there. Therefore, in order that that question may go to conference, which it could not do without amendment, because both bills contain the provision for such judge, I ask that on page 2, line 9, the provision for an additional judge in the sixth circuit be stricken out.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator mean that he is moving to strike from the Senate bill, which he seeks to substitute for the bill which passed the House, provision for an additional judge for the sixth circuit?

Mr. HATCH. Yes. There is a question whether that judgeship is needed. The provision is included in both the House and the Senate bills, and unless it is stricken out there will be nothing to confer about. We wish to look further into the question. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. The need for that judge was looked into at the last session and the judgeship was included in the Senate bill. The same provision having passed both Houses, although in separate bills, it would be rather difficult to explain to the people of that circuit why it is now desired to strike out the judgeship for the sixth circuit. I did not understand that that was to be done, or I might not have given my consent.

Mr. HATCH. I should have told the Senator that. I overlooked the fact that the Senator comes from the sixth circuit. If the Senator wishes to have the matter go over, I shall have no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want to see the provision for that circuit judgeship stricken out. It has been passed on by both the House and the Senate, although in separate bills.

Mr. HATCH. The reason for my statement was that representations were made to me this week that the judicial conference at its last session came to the conclusion that the judges of that circuit were rapidly catching up with their work, which was not true a year ago; and it was their opinion that it was not necessary to have that judge included in the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have talked with at least one of the judges of that circuit, and certainly his opinion does not coincide with that view. I know that the district bar and the bench itself have expected that the House would act on the bill, as it was passed by the Senate. Now, that it has passed its own bill, as it sometimes does, whether through caprice

I do not know or say, it would be quite strange and quite a disappointment to the people of that circuit to strike the judgeship out at this time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator is quite correct. The provision is now in both the House bill and the Senate bill, and my reason for suggesting that it be stricken from the Senate bill is that the matter may be considered in conference. If this action is not taken, it will leave the provision for the judgeship in the legislation, and there will be nothing about which to confer.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not like to consent to that without some further knowledge of the situation. I did not have the slightest information that anything like this would happen. The people of that circuit have been looking forward to the enactment of this law, and I know the judges feel, unless they have changed their minds, that another judge is needed. I hope the Senator will not eliminate that provision.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have no objection to letting the matter go over and the Senator can investigate further.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have not been able to follow the discussion. I should like to inquire if the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico has been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been agreed to. The Senator from New Mexico called up House bill 7079 and asked for its present consideration. He then asked to amend the committee amendment by striking out line 9 on page 2, which provides for a judge for the sixth circuit. The Senator from Kentucky has objected to that, and the Chair has not been able to follow the colloquy back and forth between the Senators.

Mr. HATCH. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that the sixth circuit is the circuit in which the Senator from Kentucky resides. Personally I would not want to strike the judgeship from the bill now, especially until the Senator from Kentucky has had full opportunity to advise himself as to the conditions in that circuit at this time.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Since we acted as a committee on this matter, I have had additional and new information which leads me to change my opinion about this judgeship. I would not feel justified in passing the bill with that judgeship in it, certainly not without a clear knowledge by the Senate of the new circumstances. So I suggest that the matter go over until the majority leader has had an opportunity to make further investigation.

Mr. HATCH. Very well. I think that should be done. I withdraw my request for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico withdraws his request for consideration of House bill 7079, and, without objection, the bill will be returned to the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the fact that I reside in that circuit is no reason for including a new judge merely because I happen to be in favor of it. However, the procedure strikes me as a little strange. A bill is passed by both the House and the Senate after hearings by both the House and Senate committees, and only within the past day or two the Senate committee reports a bill with a judgeship in it for the sixth circuit. Now we are asked to eliminate the judgeship, which has been in both bills. I am at least curious to know what additional facts have been developed in the past day or two which make it unnecessary to provide the judgeship for the sixth circuit, when a year ago the Senate passed a bill providing for the additional judge, and the House has done likewise, and the Senate committee has approved such a bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that so far as I know nothing sensational has happened. I made reference to the Senator's residence in the circuit merely because I think a Senator who resides in a circuit should be consulted. He has information about affairs in the circuit which

other Senators do not have. My only purpose in asking that the provision be stricken out was that then the matter could go to conference. I am not altogether convinced one way or the other about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the House had passed the Senate bill instead of passing its own bill, the matter would not be in conference. The judgeship would have been established. The mere fact that the House saw fit to ignore the Senate bill and pass a practically identical bill of its own and send it to the Senate does not seem to me to give good reason for eliminating the judgeship, to which both Houses have agreed.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield the floor. I have no desire to discuss the matter further, but I am a little surprised.

FINANCIAL AND OTHER DATA PERTAINING TO SUNDRY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES AND CORPORATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 247, submitted by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] on March 19, 1940, authorizing printing as a Senate document the report of the Secretary of the Treasury relative to the financial condition and operation of certain corporations and agencies of the Government; and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment was, on page 1, line 6, after the word "document", to strike out the comma and the words "and that — additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate Document Room."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the report of the Secretary of the Treasury relative to the financial condition and operations of certain corporations and agencies of the Government, transmitted to the Senate on February 15, 1940, in response to Senate Resolution 150, agreed to June 27, 1939, be printed as a Senate document.

PRINTING OF MONOGRAPHS ON ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 248, submitted by me on March 21, 1940, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

Mr. KING. I object to its present consideration.

Mr. HAYDEN. I can very briefly explain the resolution.

Mr. KING. I understand what it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator will yield to me—

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. This resolution does not cover all the work that is to be done. There will be another resolution, and we shall be very glad to include in it anything the Senator wishes to include. The reports on the group of activities studied by the Attorney General's office have been finished; but the work is still going on, and there will be another document.

Mr. KING. I am familiar with the situation; but I should like to have the resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The resolution will be passed over.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON SILVER

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Concurrent Resolution 41, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Con. Res. 41) submitted by Mr. PITTMAN on March 22, 1940, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2, of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Special Committee on the Investigation of Silver, United States Senate, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed in one volume for its

use, 1,500 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee pursuant to the resolution (S. Res. No. 187, 74th Cong., 1st sess.) authorizing a special committee of the Senate to investigate the administration, and the economic and commercial effect, of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934.

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 REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Joseph F. Deeb, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the western district of Michigan, vice Francis T. McDonald, deceased.

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported favorably the nominations of sundry officers for appointment to temporary rank in the Air Corps, Regular Army, under the provisions of law.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWELLENBACH in the chair). The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Miss Mary S. Anderson to be Administrator of the National Youth Administration for Illinois.

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

POSTMASTER—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dorothy B. Keeling to be postmaster at Camp Taylor, Ky., which nomination had previously been passed over.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nomination be again passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry further nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the remaining nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the remaining nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 26, 1940, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 25 (legislative day of March 4, 1940)

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

Miss Mary S. Anderson to be Administrator of the National Youth Administration for Illinois.

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Milton W. Struwing, Algonquin.
George C. Gaudino, Benld.
Rupert R. Barkley, Casey.
Dale A. Leifheit, De Kalb.
Mary Dillon-O'Brien, Flanagan.
Frank M. Bradley, Geneseo.
William V. Webb, Karnak.

Leo J. Willison, Olivet.

William Claude Rogers, Sr., Percy.

Alice May Pulley, Pittsburg.

Palmer Cecil Smith, Potomac.

Charles H. Roberts, Salem.

Harry G. Sleep, Warrenville.

Calvin L. Bradley, Willisville.

Lydia B. Morrissey, Winthrop Harbor.

OKLAHOMA

George L. Watkins, Tulsa.

PENNSYLVANIA

James D. Webster, Sewickley.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 25, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, we praise Thee that while treason revolted against truth and nailed it to a cross, we behold in our glorified Lord the triumph of love over hate, of right over wrong and of life over death. We earnestly pray that the Christ may be unto us a living crucible in which all our sins are burned away; keep us ever conscious that the worst thing for us to forget is that we are sinners. Lord God of the nations, we pray for peace to come when war, woe, and mockery shall be swept from the face of the earth and it shall rest like a heavenly benediction upon its troubled mind with its heavy heart. O let the new age come, the new life, the new progress, and the new joy. Grant that everything good may come to our President, our Speaker, and every Member, officer, and employee of the Congress; may all the hushed voices of the human heart bless our homes and Thine shall be the glory forever, through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 21, 1940, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title: H. R. 8202, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. McNARY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. COOPER for 1 week on account of the death of his father.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 438

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives, to wit:

Patents: JOE B. BATES, Kentucky; CLARA G. McMILLAN, South Carolina.

War Claims: WILL ROGERS, Oklahoma; A. F. MACIEJEWSKI, Illinois.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON MEMORIALS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I have sent to the Clerk's desk the usual resolution providing for memorial services for deceased Members of Congress to be held on Wednesday, April 24, and I ask its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 437

Resolved, That on Wednesday, the 24th day of April 1940, immediately after the approval of the Journal, the House shall stand at recess for the purpose of holding the memorial services as arranged by the Committee on Memorials, under the provisions of clause 40-A of rule XI. The order of exercises and proceedings of the service shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and all Members shall have leave to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD until the last issue of the Record of the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, on the life, character and public service of the deceased Members. At the conclusion of the proceedings the Speaker shall call the House to order, and then, as a further mark of respect to the memories of the deceased, he shall declare the House adjourned; and be it further

Resolved, That the necessary expenses connected with the memorial services herein authorized shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Committee on Memorials and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include certain excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement made by Albert S. Goss, former Federal Land Bank Commissioner, Farm Credit Administration, before the House Committee on Agriculture.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by myself before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in the city of Washington.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial from a Kansas newspaper.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech by Colonel Harrington, of the W. P. A.; also some reports of the activities of the W. P. A.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial which appeared in this morning's issue of the Washington Post, concerning the visit of His Excellency, Dr. Rafael A. Calderon Guardia, President-elect of Costa Rica.

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

There was no objection.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GREEN. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, I urge your cooperation and support of H. R. 9065, which I have introduced for amendments to the existing W. P. A. law. This is a timely bill, and your immediate consideration and favorable action is urged. Not only my dis-

trict and State but every State in the Union will derive great benefits from provisions of this bill.

The bill would repeal the 25-percent contribution by sponsors of W. P. A. projects. In many places in my district local sponsors, including county and city, are unable to obtain funds to put up the 25 percent for worthy projects. This inability of local sponsors to meet the requirements is curtailing the operation of the W. P. A. program and throwing needy persons out of employment. The sewing-room projects in my district have probably been hit harder than any others.

The various counties are absolutely unable to meet the local sponsorship requirements. Some counties, for the reason that the required funds were not set up in the Budget, and, of course, in some counties they are not financially able to bear additional tax for these funds. The result is that the sewing-room employees are the sufferers. There are also large numbers of other worthy and timely projects which have had to be stopped or, in fact, not embarked upon on account of this drastic requirement. Our local city and county officials are doing all that they can to meet these requirements, but there is a limit to money-raising abilities of these financial units, and the result is that our needy persons are being furloughed from W. P. A. and at the same time the city or county is needing the improvements which could be had.

REPEAL 18 MONTHS' LAY-OFF

Another provision of the bill which I have introduced is for the repeal of the required furlough after 18 months' continuous W. P. A. employment. This 18 months' provision has worked a severe hardship upon thousands of W. P. A. employees in my State. It should be repealed and I hope you will help me to do it. The W. P. A. administration itself is in a position to judge the relative needs of W. P. A. employees, and these officials furlough those who are able to find employment with industry. Time is lost and needless funds expended for reexamining and reemploying those who are furloughed. Frequently operations of projects are crippled on account of wholesale 18-month-provision furloughs. Also a provision of the bill which I would have you support is one to have the Federal Government give 50-50 in the expense in certifying W. P. A. workers. Some of the States are not financially able to pay employees to do investigating and certifying work. In my own State for many months we were without any certification office; during this period thousands of needy persons who were eligible to get certified were kept off W. P. A. projects, even when we had W. P. A. funds to employ them with. In fact, when we have certifying agencies, needy persons have to run through red tape from 2 weeks to 3 or 4 months trying to get certified. This is a needless situation and a preventable injury to the needy in my State. In some cases, if it were not for the help of charity and relatives, people would go hungry and die of starvation while they are waiting for certification. If the Government will put 50 percent to pay certifying officials and then cut off some of the red tape and foolishness in certification, W. P. A. will be able to take care of the relief which it was intended to.

Another requirement which is altogether unnecessary and impossible is the past-work-history requirement. This should be abolished. In my State, of course, there is very little industrial employment. It is, as in the past, impossible for many of the most needy persons to have had a work history. How can people be expected to have a work history when there has been no gainful employment for them to be engaged in? This requirement has been a serious handicap, especially to the women who have always kept their own homes and occupied the role of housewife and also to the young women who have not been able to find any employment this requirement is unfair and should be abolished.

EQUAL WAGES FOR ALL PARTS OF COUNTRY

This bill also provides for payment of equal wages for similar work in all parts of the United States. There is no justice in paying \$35.10 for labor in my congressional district and paying for the same kind of labor in a district, say in New York, the amount of \$55 per month. People get just as hungry in Florida or Georgia as they do in Massachusetts,

New York, or Michigan. The Federal Government pays to regular Federal employees the same amount of money in all parts of the United States. For instance, postmasters or rural carriers in Alabama draw the same amount of money for their services per mile as a rural carrier in New Jersey or Wisconsin. This difference in wages paid under W. P. A. law in different parts of the country is an abomination, is un-American and should be instantly changed. I have worked for every wage raise Florida W. P. A. workers have had, and shall keep up the fight until equality is obtained.

Thousands of the very best people in my State are now working with W. P. A.—financial reverses, sickness, and destitution are respecters of no persons. Men who have been wealthy and financially secure have in many instances been forced to work on W. P. A. in order to make an honest living for themselves and families. W. P. A. employees of my district are honorable and upright citizens and appreciate and support our Government as strongly as any group in the country. They are entitled to adequate pay and security.

There are other provisions of the bill which I shall not go into.

LARGER APPROPRIATION NEEDED NEXT YEAR

I take this opportunity to also urge my colleagues to vote for an adequate W. P. A. appropriation for next year. In fact, the funds provided for this year were not at all adequate.

The W. P. A. is now faced with a drastic cut of W. P. A. employees on account of scarcity of funds. I believe that \$1,477,000,000 was appropriated for this year, and in spite of this it is estimated that 800,000 W. P. A. workers will have to be dropped from the pay rolls by June 30. This will hit my State by a lay-off of 6,500. The fact is, in my State we still have a large number of needy people who are anxious to get on W. P. A. in order to support themselves and families. There is some talk in higher circles of reducing W. P. A. appropriation to \$1,125,000,000 for next year. If this is done, W. P. A. will have to furlough an additional 600,000 after July 1. This number added to the 800,000 now being furloughed would give 1,400,000 less jobs on W. P. A. next year than we have this year.

VOTED AGAINST 18-MONTH PROVISION

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is going to become of these needy people if the Government drastically cuts the appropriation for next year? Instead of cutting the appropriation, I urge that the appropriation be increased over the amount spent this year. At the last session of Congress I voted against the reduction in the appropriation, and I voted against the 18-month lay-off provision. I shall support amendments to increase the appropriation next year if the amount recommended is equal to or less than the amount used this year.

The W. P. A. is one of the most helpful departments of our Government. It has given employment to millions of needy people. It has, in fact, made possible to a large degree the general increases in business activities which our country has experienced in the last 4 or 5 years. In my own district, before we embarked upon the relief program hundreds of business houses, including stores, closed their doors. Today there are very few vacant store buildings. In many towns in my district the W. P. A. pay roll has probably done more to keep businesses going and thriving than any other funds. The W. P. A. employee likewise has through his earnings been able to pay his grocery bill, his doctor bill, his drug-store bill, and to buy clothing and other supplies so desperately needed by his family.

In addition to the work relief, help, and support which W. P. A. has carried to millions of our people, the American people have received in return not only increases in business and general wealth but substantial improvements which will last for generations.

PERMANENT AND NEEDED BUILDINGS

In my own State about 725 new public buildings have been erected, 532 improved, and 75 have had additions made to them; 180 of these new buildings are school buildings; 277 schools have been improved; 42 have had new additions; in other words, 500 school buildings have either been remodeled or rebuilt from the ground up. Some of these magnifi-

cent new structures are in some small school rural areas where heretofore nothing but rambling shacks existed. The small barefoot boy in the most remote district is entitled to the same comforts and educational conveniences as his city-dwelling brother. The Government has recognized this and is using the W. P. A. as the medium to take to these areas modern and magnificent buildings; 266 recreational buildings have been erected, 36 offices and administrative structures, and improvements made to 33 additional structures; 10 or 12 new hospitals. One of the greatest benefits to carry to the people of our Nation would be a hospital to each county where needed. A number of counties in my congressional district are without any hospital and hardly any county in the district realizes adequate hospital facilities. I desire to see each county in my district have at least one hospital. At present the only hope for this is through W. P. A. W. P. A. has constructed in Florida 10 or 12 armories for the Florida National Guard. My home town has one of these modern and substantial armory buildings. In architecture, construction, material, and adaptability to service, it is a glowing example of real Federal achievement. I doubt if it could be replaced for twice the money from any other source except W. P. A.

Courthouses, city halls, streets, sidewalks, sewers, water mains, deep-water wells, storage tanks, and countless other lasting improvements have been accomplished. W. P. A. has in its Florida health program drained 387,285 acres of land. With these and other sanitary projects, it is doing a great deal toward eradicating malaria and other diseases. The sewing-room projects have produced probably 3,000,000 garments, while the lunchroom projects have provided probably 1,000,000 hot lunches for hungry and needy little school children.

FIFTY PERCENT OF W. P. A. FUNDS SPENT ON ROADS

W. P. A. has expended in Florida almost 50 percent of all W. P. A. funds in the construction of highways, streets, and roads. These roads are a medium of transportation in bringing farm produce to the market and taking school children to consolidated schools, and, in fact, improving in every way the social and economic life in our State; 4,156 miles of such roads have been built in Florida. About 73 percent of all roads constructed by W. P. A. in Florida has been on lateral roads connecting up major highway systems; 864 new bridges and viaducts have been built in Florida by W. P. A.; 19 of these structures are steel and 34 of masonry types and the remainder are wooden structures.

W. P. A. SHOULD BUILD R. E. A. LINES

W. P. A. has assisted in building and rebuilding city-owned power plants. It is through W. P. A. projects that rural electrification could be carried to practically every farm in the United States.

I hope that arrangements will be made whereby W. P. A. laborers can be used for R. E. A. projects. No more important or lasting benefits could be given through any W. P. A. work than this.

I receive letters daily from individuals and towns and cities expressing their approval and appreciation, such as the following:

Hon. LEX GREEN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREEN: It is a genuine pleasure, as president of the town council of the town of Madison, Fla., for me to write you on behalf of the entire council and express our appreciation of your efforts directed toward retaining the W. P. A. office in Madison, in response to our recent urgent request.

The W. P. A. office means a great deal to this community, and your prompt, willing action in championing our cause, together with the favorable result accomplished, is indeed gratifying to all of us.

Respectfully yours,

C. S. BLALOCK,
President, Town Council.

Time will not permit me to enumerate all the lasting and permanent improvements brought about through W. P. A. in my State. I have voted for all of these W. P. A. funds, and frankly feel proud for the business-like achievements of the W. P. A. program in my State. It is true that some funds

possibly have been wasted. It is true that some persons on W. P. A. should not be there, and others who are not on W. P. A. are in dire need. These matters, however, are problems of the administration and it is confidently hoped that W. P. A. will grow more and more efficient and more and more for the relief of those in actual need.

I shall continue my support for W. P. A. appropriations, and shall defend its splendid accomplishments. During the past 4½ years about \$110,000,000 has been expended in my State by W. P. A. This included, of course, Federal funds and sponsors' contributions. From eighty to ninety million dollars of Federal funds have been expended—these funds representing the economic life blood of my State and without these funds bankruptcy and also hunger and need would have been the lot of thousands in my State.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by Mr. Frederick Moore appearing in the Textile Bulletin.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing March 21 in the Chicago Tribune.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star on Thursday evening, March 21.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

GOLD AND ITS POWER. PART 3

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this opportunity to call the attention of the House to a resolution which I presume will soon be introduced, and in which Congress will be requested to set up an inter-American bank by a special act of Congress. It is also my desire to remind the Members of the House that the people of this great Nation have not delegated power to Congress in the Constitution for the enactment of this or similar types of legislation.

I sincerely hope that every Member of the House and Senate will read the third preliminary draft of convention relating to the inter-American bank, which may be found on pages 2066-2069 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 27, 1940. I particularly call your attention to the third draft of charter of the inter-American bank, which you will find on page 2067, for it is that resolution which will be presented here in the House and which you will be expected to pass to please that invisible power which has been guiding this administration and this great Nation to destruction for the past 27 years.

It is important that you study these three documents very, very carefully, for you will, if you vote for the charter of this bank, not only violate your oath of obligation but you will, by such act, betray your own people. The Members of this House

and the Senate are not elected to follow political leaders, House leaders, or the President of the United States. The Members are elected to follow the Constitution of the United States and to represent the people of this Nation in Congress assembled.

The membership of both Houses are now the direct representatives of the people, and surely are sufficiently intelligent to read and understand the Constitution of the United States as it is written, and not as it may be interpreted by some absent-minded Justice of the Supreme Court. The Members who do not understand it should resign and go home, for enactment of unconstitutional legislation can only terminate in disintegration and in the destruction of our Government.

The resolution to create an inter-American bank which the internationalists want Congress to pass is clearly unconstitutional, and should, when the people of this Nation understand it, defeat every Member who votes for the charter of an inter-American bank. I now quote the charter:

FEBRUARY 6, 1940.

Third draft of charter of the Inter-American Bank. (Such charter would be granted by an act of the Congress of the United States of America)

SECTION 1. There is hereby created a body corporate with the name "Inter-American Bank," hereinafter referred to as "the bank."

SEC. 2. The structure, operations, and activities of the bank shall be as defined by the bylaws, which are annexed to the convention relating to the establishment of the bank. The bank shall have all incidental powers necessary and proper to carry out the powers now or hereafter expressly authorized herein or in the bylaws of the bank.

SEC. 3. The bank may begin operations when at least a total of 110 shares of stock of the bank are subscribed for by at least five governments which have also deposited their ratifications of the aforementioned convention with the Pan American Union.

SEC. 4. The bank shall have succession for a period of 20 years from the date of enactment hereof or until such earlier time as it shall be lawfully dissolved. The United States agrees not to repeal or amend this charter except upon the request of the bank pursuant to a four-fifths majority vote of the board of directors of the bank. The United States may extend the charter for additional 20-year periods upon the request of the bank pursuant to a four-fifths majority vote of the board of directors of the bank.

SEC. 5. Amendments to the bylaws of the bank, consistent with the aforementioned convention, this charter, and the purposes of the bank as now set out in article 5-A of the bylaws of the bank, may be adopted by the bank pursuant to a four-fifths majority vote of the board of directors: *Provided, however*, That article 5-A of the bylaws may not be amended: *And provided further*, That the provisions in such bylaws relating to the effect and manner of the making of a timely objection by a participating government may not be amended except by a unanimous vote of the representatives of all the participating governments.

SEC. 6. The bank shall have power to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, and to make such contracts and to acquire, own, hold, or dispose of such real and personal property as may be necessary for the transaction of its business.

SEC. 7. The bank may sue and be sued, complain and defend, in any court of competent jurisdiction. Any civil suit at law or at equity, brought within the United States, its Territories, and possessions to which the bank shall be a party shall be deemed to arise under the laws of the United States, and the district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction of all such suits; and the bank, in any such suit, may, at any time before trial thereof, remove such suit into the district court of the United States for the proper district by following the procedure for the removal of causes otherwise provided by law.

I do not believe there are enough clowns in the South American governments to perform in the ring of this international circus, or dupes to fall into this financial trap. It should be clear to all governments that the inter-American bank is an offspring of the League of Nations Bank of International Settlement.

We, the people of the Western Hemisphere, should be cognizant of the fact that the inter-American bank is another attempt at world domination through the power of gold. To be sure, it is very subtle. The creation of a bank appears to be harmless; yet the creation of the inter-American bank by the Congress of the United States is tantamount to bestowing the title to gold in the invisible government, who in the end will be final owners of this bank.

Mr. Speaker, I shall now highlight each section of the charter of the inter-American bank.

In section 1 of the charter Congress will create, if the resolution is passed, an inter-American bank, which will prove to be destructive to our own industries, agriculture, and labor.

In section 2 Congress will, if the charter is granted, bestow greater power on this bank than that now delegated to Congress, for this bank will, by wielding the power of gold, control the export and import trade of the Western Hemisphere and nations beyond the two oceans.

In section 3 Congress grants permission to the bank to begin operation with 110 shares of the 1,000 of the first issue. This, if nothing else, shows how anxious this crowd of international highbinders is to obtain congressional authorization for the bank. They are extremely impatient for this charter, for, if it is granted, these international shylocks will have the legal right to fleece the people of the United States, South America and Central America, and Mexico.

In section 4 Congress obligates the United States to extend life to the bank for a period of 20 years, and in addition to that agrees not to repeal or amend the charter of the bank except by permission of four-fifths majority vote of the bank's board of directors. The directors of this bank are indeed magnanimous, for they grant permission to the United States to extend the charter another 20 years or more, provided four-fifths of the board desire such extension. In other words, Congress will, in enacting this legislation, create and crown a monetary king for the Western Hemisphere.

It is further provided that article 5-A of the bylaws may not be amended, and the part which relates to timely objections only by unanimous consent. This provision of the bylaws is interesting, as it clarifies the power of our own Constitution, which provides:

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government * * * and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

It should be clear that this provision of the Constitution cannot be amended by three-fourths majority vote, but must, like article 5A of the bylaws of the bank, remain indestructible until amended by unanimous vote, a principle which we ignored in 1913 when we adopted the seventeenth amendment, which destroyed the fundamental principles of this Republic.

In section 6 Congress grants to the bank the power to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, and to make such contracts as it wishes, including the power "to trade, buy, and sell all kinds of property," including silver and other precious metals. This tribe, while making this provision for themselves, namely, ownership of gold and gold money and other precious metals, expects us, the real owners of gold money, to be satisfied with an inflated hocus-pocus dollar.

In section 7 Congress will, if it enacts this legislation, satisfy a dream long held by the internationalist, for legal power will be given him to operate a bank free from restriction, without taxation, and on capital or money appropriated from the United States Treasury, which is the property of our own people.

If Congress should be stupid enough to enact this legislation, it will, in fact, amend that part of article 3, section 2, which gives the Supreme Court original jurisdiction in all "cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a state—foreign state—shall be party," for this section in the bylaws of the bank gives original jurisdiction of all suits to district courts. I therefore advise Members of Congress to give this legislation serious consideration and note particularly the manner in which it will disadvantageously affect the people at home who sent you to Congress to protect their rights.

It is also well to bear in mind that should any of us in an apathetic moment grant this charter we will in such legislation create an international corporation of such far-reaching magnitude that it may even destroy our national banks, industries, and business. When anyone is authorized by Congress to sign the articles of convention, he actually signs a treaty which obligates the United States without further consideration for \$5,000,000 in gold and, in addition to that, com-

pliance with all the provisions which are set forth in the three documents to which I have referred.

In the first article of the convention, which I advise you all to read, Congress will, if it grants the charter, establish a bank with all the powers proposed in the charter and the bylaws, to engage in all types of activities, and the additional power to enact its own legislation. In other words, you grant this bank the power of an imperial despot, and it will in time wield greater power over the contracting parties than the governments of such nations wield within their own borders.

I have introduced a resolution to stop this international rape on the Western Hemisphere, which I hope the committee will report out so that it may be considered by the House. I also hope that all contracting nations, including ourselves, will think twice before signing the articles of convention, for the signing of it is like signing a treaty and will, if rejected by Congress after having been signed, prove embarrassing to the parents of this illegitimate offspring. I cannot refrain from quoting part of paragraph C, article 2, of the convention, for it is so typical and descriptive of those who are the promoters of this bank:

C. The bank, its assets, and real and personal property of whatsoever nature, including, without limitation of the foregoing, its charter, capital, reserves, surplus, income, and profits; its activities, transactions and operations, and shares of stock and all notes, debentures, bonds, and other such obligations issued by the bank, including dividends and interest thereon, by whomsoever held, and any remunerations or salaries paid by the bank, and also any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other entity in its dealings and relations with the bank in any of the foregoing matters, and in its acquisitions, holdings, transfers, or dispositions of any such shares and obligations of the bank, shall be exempt and immune from all taxation by a contracting party or a political subdivision thereof, now or hereafter imposed, and by whatever name described including, without limitation of the foregoing, excises and imposts: *Provided, however,* That the foregoing shall not be construed as preventing the imposition by a contracting party or any political subdivision thereof of nondiscriminatory taxes upon nationals of such contracting party with respect to any of the foregoing. As used in this paragraph "nationals of such contracting party" shall include any person who is domiciled in, or a citizen or resident of, such contracting party, and shall also include any individual, partnership, association, corporation, or other entity organized under the laws of such contracting party or political subdivision thereof, or having a permanent establishment, such as a branch, office, agency, or other fixed place of business, in the territory of such contracting party, but shall not include the bank. Notwithstanding any of the foregoing, neither a contracting party nor any political subdivision thereof shall impose any tax on or measured by salaries or remunerations paid by the bank to its officers or employees who are citizens of any other contracting party.

I cannot emphasize too strongly careful consideration and study of the articles of convention, the bylaws, and the charter of the inter-American bank, for it is, without doubt, an attempt by the international bankers to gain complete domination and control of gold money. The bank is legally exempt from taxation, and will serve no good to anyone except to the international financiers. They will benefit to the fullest extent, as the western republics furnish a hundred million dollars in gold for working capital, free from taxes, and with little or no responsibility to those who furnish the money. The return on this capital is also provided for, for the bank is, according to its own bylaws, permitted to pay only such dividends as it will, but at no time more than 3 percent.

E. The board of directors, by a four-fifths majority vote, may declare dividends out of the dividend reserve in surplus of the bank: *Provided, however,* That total dividends in any one year, including dividends paid pursuant to paragraph D-2 above, shall not be more than 3 percent of the paid-up amount of the stock.

F. The bank may not be liquidated except by a four-fifths majority vote of the board of directors. Upon liquidation of the bank, and after discharge of all the liabilities of the bank, the assets remaining shall be divided among the shareholders.

A question which should be of interest to Members of Congress, as well as to the people of this Nation, is the source from which South American republics are to obtain the gold to invest in this bank. Is it not possible that the United States will furnish gold for all of them in return for worthless notes? I believe you will agree with me that that is most likely, and particularly in view of the fact that their accounts with

the United States are now in default. I quote the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2095, February 28, 1940:

Countries	Total	
	Outstanding	In default
Argentina.....	\$233,000,000	\$20,000,000
Bolivia.....	60,000,000	60,000,000
Brazil.....	356,000,000	356,000,000
Chile.....	182,000,000	182,000,000
Colombia.....	146,000,000	143,000,000
Costa Rica.....	8,000,000	8,000,000
Dominican Republic.....	15,000,000	15,000,000
Ecuador.....	12,000,000	12,000,000
El Salvador.....	12,000,000	12,000,000
Guatemala.....	5,000,000	3,000,000
Haiti.....	8,000,000	8,000,000
Mexico.....	273,000,000	273,000,000
Panama.....	17,000,000	17,000,000
Peru.....	85,000,000	85,000,000
Uruguay.....	56,000,000	56,000,000

This table speaks for itself and should be of particular interest to us, the people of the United States, who are paying interest on these defaulted obligations. It strikes me that the purpose of the inter-American bank is to repay bad loans made by the international bankers to the above republics in somewhat the same manner as defaulted World War obligations were charged up to the taxpayers of the United States.

Take notice that paragraph F provides that, upon liquidation of the bank, the remaining assets shall be divided among the shareholders. The question may be asked, Why not among the contracting parties who furnished the capital or gold dollars for operation of the bank? This appears to be a deliberate fraud, for it is evidently the intention of the directors of the bank to divide the profits, if any, among themselves, and charge the losses to the contracting parties, or maybe to the Treasury of the United States.

I now respectfully call your attention to article 5-A of the bylaws, paragraph B-1, which I quote:

B. In order to carry out the foregoing purposes the bank shall have specific power to:

(1) Make short-term, intermediate, and long-term loans in any currency and in gold or silver to participating governments and to fiscal agencies, central banks, political subdivisions, and nationals thereof, provided that any such loan to such fiscal agency, central bank, political subdivision, and national shall be guaranteed by the government thereof.

You can well imagine how secure these loans will be, guaranteed among the number of republics in Latin America, governments already in default, in which the United States has invested nearly \$8,000,000,000 in gold, or the equivalent thereof.

In conclusion, I shall quote article 2 of the bylaws, paragraph H:

The voting power of each government on the board of directors shall be distributed as follows: 20 votes for each government for its minimum shares, and 1 vote for each additional share. However, regardless of the amount of stock owned by it, no government shall have a voting power in excess of 50 percent of the total voting power of all the other participating governments on the basis of stock which such other governments own at the time.

This paragraph is self-explanatory, as it states the voting power of each government, irrespective of money invested in the bank, shall be 20 votes, and 1 vote for each additional \$100,000 in gold invested in the capital structure of the bank. Do you suppose any citizen of the United States could borrow gold from the United States Treasury on the same terms, as stated in the bylaws of the inter-American bank? Of course not. A citizen of the United States is a criminal if he has gold in his possession, and, gentlemen, it is because of that act you passed in 1934, as you tagged behind your leaders. You are now requested to write the final chapter, and whether you will do it or not remains to be seen, but, if you do, always remember that you have violated your obligation and betrayed the people of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include quotations from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

NEELY BLOCK-BOOKING BILL

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. 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. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an excerpt from the Los Angeles Times with reference to the Neely bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct the attention of all the Members of the House to the insertion I am making in the RECORD this morning in connection with the Neely block-booking bill, which shows that 30,000 positions or jobs will be killed in Los Angeles County if this bill passes. May I also call your attention to the fact that already 120,000 indigents are on relief in Los Angeles County; that last year the charity relief bill for Los Angeles County was \$43,000,000 and that this year it is \$46,000,000; and that this bill has grown from \$8,000,000. Fifty-two percent of tax levy now goes for charity relief. The Legislature of California was called into special session about the matter of relief in Los Angeles County. I hope Los Angeles County will not have 30,000 positions killed by the enactment of any such bill as the Neely bill.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the following reasons, given by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, why this bill should not be enacted:

[Excerpt from Los Angeles Times of March 1, 1940]

FILM CURB BILL ASSAILED—CHAMBER ASSERTS NEELY MEASURE WOULD PERIL JOBS OF 30,000

Because, among other evils, it would imperil the jobs of 30,000 Los Angeles County motion-picture workers who receive \$133,000,000 in wages annually, the Neely block-booking bill yesterday was unqualifiedly condemned on seven counts by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce board of directors.

A community of 125,000 persons here is supported by the industry, which effects a distribution of \$172,000,000 annually through the county's business channels in wages, salaries, and payment of materials. Perhaps 15,000 other persons have jobs in subsidiary industries.

SEVEN CONTENTIONS

Seven points on which the bill was condemned include:

1. If any monopolistic abuses exist today in the motion-picture industry, they can be corrected under existing antimonopoly statutes.
2. By specifying the manner in which the business of distributing motion pictures must be conducted, the bill would bring the motion-picture industry under an unworkable form of Government regulation.
3. Established practices in distribution of films which have been developed over a long period of years, as particularly suited to the least expensive distribution of films to the public, would be disrupted by this bill.
4. The bill constitutes a form of Government price regulation costly to the public.

VAGUE AND UNCERTAIN

5. The bill makes the doing of certain acts a crime, and yet those acts are defined in such vague and uncertain terms that no motion-picture producer could safely conduct his business unless he discontinued entirely the age-long practice of giving quantity discounts by quoting a better price to a distributor who contracted to take all of his films than he could quote to a distributor who took only a single film.

6. The bill seeks to establish a form of Government censorship over an industry which has earned a well-deserved reputation for self-imposed regulation.

7. Requirement that a synopsis of each film play and a statement as to treatment of certain types of scenes be made in advance is impracticable and unworkable in the motion-picture business, because many pictures develop and change as their production progresses.

CHAMBER'S STAND

"Many proponents of this bill have been made to think it will improve the moral character of films. Let me say we are unalterably opposed to indecent pictures," President J. L. Van Norman, of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, said in announcing the chamber's stand yesterday. "Welfare of the youth of our country comes

first. But we feel certain that this bill can make no contribution to moral uplift in pictures. As a matter of fact, little, if anything, has ever been accomplished by attempting to legislate morality.

"Under the present method of motion-picture distribution with block booking the exhibitor is able to buy all pictures at a price permitting him to market pictures which Americans of every income level can afford to attend.

"Exhibitors are permitted contracts giving them cancellation privileges ranging up to 20 percent," he continued. "Showing the leeway this allows exhibitors in choosing pictures, one picture had more than 12,000 bookings while another in the same block had under 4,000.

"The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce believes that when the Government attempts to regulate matters by law in the field of censorship it enters a field where legislation has no place."

INJUSTICE OF THE C. I. O.

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?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to call your attention to an advertisement appearing in the Washington Post this morning:

PRESS CAFETERIA—WHY WE ARE BEING PICKETED

Our contract with the C. I. O. expired March 18. Under that contract we earned 3.3 cents net on each dollar of sales. Despite this small return we agreed to renew under same terms. This the C. I. O. rejected, demanding a closed shop and that we discharge 34 employees, or require that they join the union. We refused.

The union further demanded that no employee could be dismissed for any reason whatever without first securing consent of the union. This we refused in light of past experience under our old C. I. O. contract, viz, we had discharged a colored employee upon separate complaints of two white waitresses charging improper advances and misconduct in one case and attempted assault in the other.

The union filed a suit in its own name and in name of the discharged employee demanding \$500 damages for the dismissal. During trial of the suit the C. I. O. attorney admitted that "there was a good deal of merit in the reason for the employee's discharge." At conclusion of the trial the union sought to dismiss its own suit, which was refused by the court, and then sought to reduce its claim for damages from \$500 to 1 cent. This the court also refused, rendering judgment for the cafeteria. Verification may be had by reference to M. C. Case 383496.

Because of our refusal to agree to a closed shop and our insistence that management be retained by us we are being picketed.

We apologize to our patrons and to the tenants in the National Press Building for any inconvenience they may suffer as a result of the pickets.

PRESS CAFETERIA, INC.,
HARVEY L. COBB, Attorney,
Fourteenth and F Streets.

In the name of justice to our courts, in the name of justice to business, will this Congress permit injustices of this kind to continue? Where is American liberty and American freedom and American justice? Where is the Department of Labor, that they do not act in educating the C. I. O. that court orders must be the law of this land?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein an article by the Farm Bureau, showing how one group of farmers solve the farm problem.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. 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. EDWIN A. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw your attention to some remarks made by the distinguished Congresswoman from Massachusetts in a recent issue of the RECORD, and further to draw your attention to the fact that there is a great deal of truth in what she had to say about the Bata Shoe Corporation.

Coming as I do from the triple cities of Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott, in Broome County, up-State New York, it is my privilege and honor to represent some 20,000 Endicott-

Johnson shoe workers, and to attempt to reflect their desires in this Chamber, and I may say that in the Endicott-Johnson locality the workers own their homes, have felt very little the causes of depression, and have maintained a standard of living throughout that is comparable with any section of America.

A glance at Representative ROGERS' speech reveals that the Bata Co., since coming into the United States and opening plants at Belknap, Md., has taken steps to pretty thoroughly control even the private lives of its employees. I, for one, do not like regimentation and mass dictation. Yet here is a case which seems to smack of these odious relationships. It would seem as though the Bata Co. has plans not only to inject its economical and political thought into the present generation of its workers, but also into the workers of tomorrow. Such methods I denounce as un-American and not conducive to the best interests of our Nation.

I mentioned the fact that I was the representative of that typically American working body, the Endicott-Johnson workers. In the valley of fair play, as we call the place where the Susquehanna and Chenango Rivers meet, the buzz and the din of a hundred shoe factories can be heard as the daily testimonial of the satisfaction which 20,000 industrious men and women voice. For the past five decades they have represented the most perfect relationship between employee and employer which America has ever known. They call their community the Home of the Square Deal. They have never had need for protection against the scions of industry, because their scions worked side by side with them, and have given them every opportunity to participate in the progress and the profits of the institution for which they worked. They have been and are considered partners, and are taught that to work for the corporation's interests is to work for their own. Words of mine do not need to prove that the Endicott-Johnson workers are satisfied with their lot. I need only to point out that just a few weeks ago they upheld by an overwhelming vote of 6 to 1 in an election held by the National Labor Relations Board their time-honored principle of an open shop.

In these troublous times, when it is so easy on the part of agitators to stir up trouble between employer and employees, and when every section of the country has yielded to this influence, it is certainly proof that this vast industrial democracy, as it is called, is contented. It is my suggestion that the officials of the Bata Co. take heed of the splendid results of the fair and decent treatment which have been accorded to the people in Endicott-Johnson. It is further my suggestion that as long as they are in this country the Bata plants will try to follow these principles of worker relationships. It is my hope that they will go into the valley of fair play and note the loyalty, the respect, and the genuine enthusiasm which Endicott-Johnson employees have for their system. And last, it is my earnest advice and counsel that Bata Shoe Co. make drastic changes in their present relationship with their personnel so that they may emulate and perpetuate a great and truly American institution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement made by Mr. Earl McClintock, of New York.

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

There was no objection.

THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR IS ONE OF OUR NATION'S GREATEST INSTITUTIONS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein one or two short letters, and to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker. It is a democracy and in action it has no power of compulsion. Organized labor is the keystone of democracy around which freedom and liberty revolve. It is a rope of human hands, linked together by the

will for cooperation. It is a federation of unions, just as the United States is a federation of States. It is closely patterned after the United States Government. The American Federation of Labor itself stands for the Federal Government. The national unions represent the States. The central labor unions represent the local governments. Each is independent in its own field. Its laws become effective solely through the consent of the governed, whose representatives make the laws. It is a representative organization and through these representatives the weakest member in the smallest union can make himself heard and present his views. This voluntarism and democratic set-up is the reason why this great federation has existed throughout the years and has constantly gained in strength, power, and influence. Its effective aims are justice, liberty, and security for all.

LABOR ORGANIZES

Beginning with Peter Maguire, of the Carpenters and Joiners Union of New York City, and coming on down through the years it has developed great and courageous leaders who have carried the banner of labor for the welfare of the masses to the pinnacle of success. Late in the summer of 1881 at Terre Haute, Ind., a group of union leaders developed the national-union idea. They drafted organization plans and called a trades-union conference at Pittsburgh on November 10, 1881. The Pittsburgh conference was attended by union chiefs from all over the country. Outstanding among these leaders was Samuel Gompers, of the Cigar Makers Union of New York.

The Pittsburgh conference created a Federation of Trades and Labor Unions of the United States and Canada, adopted a program of 13 points, elected a legislative committee, but failed to provide revenues for headquarters, salaries, and so forth.

GOMPERS MADE PRESIDENT

During the next 5 years a great threat came to the organization in the form of the Knights of Labor; however, the trade-unions rallied and overcame this opposition, and in December 1886, at Columbus, Ohio, elected Samuel Gompers president, with a salary of \$1,000 per year. Mr. Gompers' first office was a single room donated by the cigarmakers' local in New York City. In it he had a second-hand kitchen table for his desk and a wooden box for his chair.

Filled with zeal for service and determination to liberate the laborers of our Nation, he continued his services as head of the organization, with the exception of 1 year—1894—until 1924. Then, on account of declining health, he was forced to retire. His final message in 1924 was read to the national convention by the Honorable William Green, secretary, United Mine Workers. An excerpt from this message is as follows:

Guided by voluntary principles, our federation had grown from a weakling into the strongest, best-organized labor movement of all the world.

Mr. Gompers was not only a brilliant and able labor executive but was of tremendous help to the Federal Government—particularly during the World War period. During this time he frequently conferred with President Wilson on war measures and probably contributed as much to the success of the American forces during this war as any individual in this country.

He was succeeded as president of the American Federation of Labor by the incumbent, Hon. William Green. President Green has proven to be the man of the hour during the great trials facing the American Federation of Labor in the past few years. Under his administration labor has gained prestige, power, and influence in national and international affairs. Not only have the rights of the workers been protected by Federal laws, but labor is regarded as a great stabilizing influence for Americanism and democracy. The right for labor to bargain collectively by representatives of their own choosing, better working conditions for laborers, shorter hours, and many other goals have been obtained.

BILL GREEN ENDORSES LEX GREEN

I have voted for these measures beneficial to labor—the right to bargain collectively, the train-length-limit bill, the

Railroad (Pension) Retirement Acts, wage and hour law, unemployment insurance, employers' liability law, and many others. I consider it an honor to be endorsed by President Green, as follows:

JANUARY 24, 1940.

Mr. CHARLES E. SILVA,

President, Florida State Federation of Labor,

Tampa, Fla.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: Congressman R. A. (LEX) GREEN has represented the Florida Second Congressional District continuously for the last 15 years. During that period of time he has constantly kept in touch with the officers and representatives of the American Federation of Labor at our headquarters and has invariably supported legislation which we were advocating.

He has proven himself by his conduct and votes to be a true friend of the American Federation of Labor.

I wish you would bring this letter to the attention of our members in Mr. GREEN's district, with the request that they and their friends vote for him.

Fraternally yours,

WILLIAM GREEN,

President, American Federation of Labor.

The American Federation of Labor is making today great contributions to the stability of the American Government in such timely things as combating un-American and subversive activities of un-American groups by holding up the American bar against the entrance of undesirable aliens, law enforcement, and other things conducive to better American citizenship.

WAGES RISE, HOURS SHORTER

In 1881 the average American worker was paid a wage of \$10.71 for a workweek of 63 hours. Today the average is about \$24 for a 37½-hour week. This includes the unorganized workers. The average for the organized workers today is more than \$40 per week for a 37½-hour week.

It was my fortune a few weeks ago to ride side by side with a locomotive engineer on his run between Jacksonville, Fla., and Savannah, Ga. He was operating one of the new large Diesel-powered motors pulling the Silver Meteor for the Seaboard Railway Co. He was a personal friend of mine, and we could not help but contrast this powerful, efficient, and comfortable device with the locomotive of about 40 years ago. He told me of his long hours per day when he entered the service, the firing of the old-style locomotive engine, the fabulous number of cords of wood he handled every 24 hours, and the small pay received. If I recall correctly, he averaged from 12 to 18 hours in a day's work and received from 90 cents to \$1 per day—not per hour—for his salary. His present employment on this modern locomotive is comfortable; his hours of employment are short; there is less danger of accidental death; he receives reasonable wages per hour and per month and is protected by the railroad retirement pension benefits in his old age.

This wholesome change of conditions has been brought about largely through the influence and strength of organized labor, and it has given me pleasure during the 15 years I have represented the Second Congressional District to vote for measures for the assistance, protection, and benefit of labor.

RAILROAD BROTHERHOODS ENDORSE GREEN

Labor has repeatedly endorsed me for reelection as a Member of Congress, and I have just been advised that the national labor legislative representatives of the railway brotherhoods have again endorsed me for reelection and commended my record to the voters of my district. I have abiding faith in my friends of labor and know that they will vote for me now as they have in the past. I have kept the faith. I have done practically all kinds of hard labor, even to firing boilers with coal and wood and using a sledge hammer in a blacksmith's shop. I know the needs of the laboring man and appreciate the golden virtues of labor.

This is an inspiration to me because I believe firmly in the dignity of labor and the majesty of toil. I honor the man who earns his living by the sweat of his brow. The laboring man is the Gibraltar and strength of American civilization and institutions. I shall continue to vote the vote of labor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include

therein a brief resolution adopted by the Idaho Grand Lodge of Odd Fellows, on the life of the late Senator William E. Borah.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a timely article from one of my constituents.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1941

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8202) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri, if this conference is agreed to, whether we are going to get an opportunity to vote with respect to the difference between what the bill was when it left the House and what it is now, after coming back to us from the Senate, so that the House may express itself on the legislation. House reductions against Senate increases. Why the Senate resolution for economy? Where is the economy movement they wanted to initiate? With income taxes increased March 15 about 30 percent above last year, and with a deficit for this year, March 20 from July 1, 1939, of \$2,676,787,238.30, would it look to anyone that has any sense of obligation of our Government that we can keep this up? I think it is a terrible way to run our Government—a lack of business sense and ability. Will the Congress be able to run the Government, or will they leave the debt for their children? It is dishonest and unjust the way this Congress is running the affairs of our Government.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The committee of conference expects to bring back to the House all amendments on which the rules require the House to vote.

Mr. RICH. Are we going to have an opportunity to vote on these large increases, to see whether the House is for economy, because we know now that the Senate, from what they are doing with the bills they send back here, are increasing all of them, and they are not for economy, as their actions would indicate? We want to find out whether the Senate meant what they said in the beginning of this session when they said they were for economy. It does not look to me as if they were. We want to find out whether the House is in favor of economy in the operation of Government. Will we have an opportunity to vote on these large increases?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The House has already shown very conclusively its attitude on these various economies by voting for them, and by sending them over to the Senate, and the conferees expect to sustain the position of the House. Just what will be brought back we are unable to say until we have consulted with the Senate managers.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. TARVER, and Mr. LAMBERTSON.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

JOINT COMMITTEE ON FORESTRY

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

House Concurrent Resolution 51

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the time for making the report of the Joint Committee on Forestry (established pursuant to S. Con. Res. 31, 75th Cong.) is hereby extended to April 1, 1941, and any amounts available for the expenses of such committee shall be available for expenditure until such date.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, also reported the following resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

House Resolution 436

Resolved, That notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI, it shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of any point of order, in connection with the consideration of the bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, the appropriation and language providing for the National Youth Administration for such fiscal year.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District day, and the Chair recognizes the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REGULATING DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN REFUSE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 8262) to regulate, in the District of Columbia, the disposal of certain refuse, and for other purposes, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the acts of Congress entitled "An act to regulate, in the District of Columbia, the disposal of certain refuse, and for other purposes," approved January 25, 1898, and "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate, in the District of Columbia, the disposal of certain refuse, and for other purposes,' approved January 25, 1898," approved March 20, 1902, are hereby repealed.

Sec. 2. That it shall be unlawful for any person or persons to maintain, upon any original lot or any subdivisional lot, situated on any street in the District of Columbia, where there is a public sewer and water main available for the use of such lot, any system of disposal of human excreta except by means of water closets connected with such sewer and water main.

Sec. 3. That no person shall, in the District of Columbia, erect or maintain a privy, or other means or system for the disposal of human excreta, except by means of water closets connected with a sewer and water main, without having secured from the health officer a permit so to do.

Sec. 4. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and empowered to make and enforce any such regulations as they deem necessary to regulate the design, construction, and maintenance of any system of disposal of human excreta, and the handling, storage, treatment, and disposal of human body wastes.

Sec. 5. That any person who shall violate or aid or abet in violating any of the provisions of this act or of the regulations promulgated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia under this act shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$50 or by imprisonment for not exceeding 15 days.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to repeal those measures which are now obsolete relative to the disposal of certain refuse. Changes in the mode of living in the District of Columbia, the increase in the population, and scientific knowledge have caused radical improvement in the design and maintenance of sanitary privies. This proposal gives the Commissioners authority to make health regulations and to bring these health regulations in line with modern practices. The bill comes to the House with the unanimous report of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the approval of the District Commissioners. I move the previous question on the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

CONSTRUCTION OF WAITING ROOM AT COMMODORE BARNEY CIRCLE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 8917) to authorize the construction of a waiting room and

comfort station in Commodore Barney Circle, United States Reservation 55-56, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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 Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, for the convenience of the public, to permit the Capital Transit Co., of Washington, D. C., to construct, maintain, and operate, at its own expense, a waiting room and comfort station in Commodore Barney Circle, United States Reservation 55-56: *Provided*, That the plans and specifications for this structure shall first be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and the Commission of Fine Arts: *Provided further*, That the Capital Transit Co. is hereby authorized to operate within such structure, either directly or by contract, such concession as in the determination of the Secretary of the Interior or his duly authorized representative may be desirable for the convenience of the public, and apply the revenues derived therefrom toward the cost of maintenance and operation of the structure. In the event the Capital Transit Co. shall at any time discontinue the operation of the waiting room and comfort station as herein provided, the same shall become the property of the United States.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the construction of a streetcar and bus terminal facility at the westerly end of the new John Philip Sousa Bridge across the Anacostia River.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. My understanding is that the streetcar company is quite willing to construct this shelter at its own expense, and that it will involve no expenditure by the District of Columbia or the Federal Government, but that permission is necessary in order to have this construction made. Is that correct?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I may say to the gentleman that his observation is correct. We know there has been rapid development in this area along Pennsylvania Avenue east of the Anacostia River, and it seems necessary that such facilities be provided, as it will be a great convenience to the thousands of people who have built homes there recently and who have established businesses in that locality.

I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

The previous question was ordered.

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

MEMORIAL FOUNTAIN TO MEMBERS OF METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 8792) to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to accept and maintain a memorial fountain to the members of the Metropolitan Police Department, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to accept and maintain for the District of Columbia the gift of a memorial fountain to the members of the Metropolitan Police Department: *Provided*, That the design and model of the memorial fountain are approved by the Commission of Fine Arts, and thereafter erected at a location to be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission on land now owned by the District of Columbia, for the municipal center.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide for the acceptance and maintenance of a memorial fountain to the members of the Metropolitan Police Department. A movement was started several years ago about the time of the World War for the erection of such a fountain and the funds are now available. It is to be dedicated to the memory of policemen who died or who may die in the future in line of duty. No appropriation is necessary as the funds have been gathered and I am advised that the cost of maintenance will be negligible.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. In a general way, what will that expense be? A slight expense sometimes runs into large figures, and we ought to know definitely about what this is going to be.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Answering the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I think I am safe in saying from the discussion in the committee, that it would not run over \$150 a year. That would be the top amount.

Mr. RICH. Then the gentleman feels, if we permit this to be erected, \$150 a year will be the amount necessary for the maintenance of that fountain?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That will be the top figure. I do want to reiterate there will be no cost in the construction—simply a small cost for the maintenance.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, standing committees of this body are charged with very definite responsibilities, and in that list is the District of Columbia Committee. I am sure that I need not express the feeling that the Members of the House on the District of Columbia Committee naturally have about service on this group. It is not an easy task. Neither is the task of membership on any committee. But there are very peculiar circumstances connected with service on the Committee on the District of Columbia which at times seem to aggravate Members a bit in connection with the discharge of their duties.

There may be an attempt this afternoon, and perhaps a proper attempt, to halt the consideration of a bill which will be brought here in a few minutes, to provide revenue for the District of Columbia. Certainly no Member of this House would say that a tax bill could be brought to this floor which would have the favorable attitude of every Member present.

I simply take the floor at this time to express the hope that the Members of the House of Representatives will give the Committee on the District of Columbia the opportunity to have considered this afternoon a measure to provide revenue for the District of Columbia.

I want it clearly understood that this is District of Columbia day and that in bringing this measure here this afternoon the Committee on the District of Columbia has acted in no manner contrary to the proper and expeditious consideration of bills before it. The present measure was reported out of the full Committee on the District of Columbia. There was a difference of opinion. The fight, shall I say, was very keen within the committee as to the provisions of the bill.

We are bringing in a combination income and sales tax measure for your consideration. I do want to refute most energetically, however, the implication which seems to be drawn by certain individuals that the consideration of this bill today violates some agreement which some individual may have made in connection with its consideration.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. From the press it is indicated that some of our friends on the minority seem to think that there should be some delay on this because of the absence of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], two able members of this committee. I ask the chairman of the committee if it is not a fact that both of these gentlemen were consulted? Both gen-

lemen knew the legislation was coming up, and neither one of them made any vigorous protest to its coming up at this time.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In reply to the gentleman from Oklahoma, I will say that I was attempting to bring my remarks to that question and to say that at no time did the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee or the committee itself agree with any individual that consideration of the tax bill would not come on District day, which falls on this Monday. I want to make this very clear. The distinguished majority leader of the House telephoned to me and in my absence talked with the clerk of the committee. This was prior to Wednesday's meeting, when the bill was considered in executive session. He stated at that time that there was a possibility an appropriation bill might be called for Monday consideration and asked, if so, whether the District Committee would postpone consideration of legislation, not tax legislation but simply any legislation that might be coming up Monday. I attempted to contact the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] but he had left the city. I did not talk to Speaker BANKHEAD on this subject nor to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. District day was set by those in charge not by any strenuous request upon the part of the chairman or other members of the committee but just in the natural order of business. This is the reason that District day, which falls on this Monday, has on its calendar for consideration this bill, among others, which have been brought before this body.

In the Committee on the District of Columbia since I have been its chairman—and I presume such procedure has been followed in the past—there has never been an attempt by the majority to impress itself upon the minority from a political standpoint. I have leaned over backward to take all members of the committee into my confidence and to discuss procedure connected with the consideration of legislation, believing then, as I believe now, that the Members of this House in considering District legislation look upon it perhaps in a little different manner than they do certain other legislative proposals which come before them.

I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The statement has been made that the minority members, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], have been consulted concerning the bringing up of this bill. May I ask the gentleman when this bill was acted upon by the full committee?

Mr. RANDOLPH. On last Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] has been investigating the locks at Panama Canal on an official visitation for over a week. When could the gentleman from Massachusetts have been consulted on it? When was he consulted on it?

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee to answer the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLS. I may say to my friend from Massachusetts that on Monday preceding last Wednesday this bill was considered in the committee and by reason of the fact that the bill had not yet been printed—and the gentleman, of course, will understand that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] was a member of the subcommittee—by reason of the fact that the bill had not yet been printed we could not take it up for consideration on Monday. But by agreement in the committee on Monday it was agreed without a dissenting vote that the bill should be considered at the special meeting on Wednesday at which time the bill would be reported and ready for hearing on the floor today.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was present at that meeting.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But he did not have the slightest idea when he left Washington that the bill was coming up today.

Mr. NICHOLS. He knew positively, I may say to my friend from Massachusetts, that the bill was coming up today.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is something wrong about it here, because when I talked with the majority leader about a week ago he himself did not know this bill was coming up today.

Mr. NICHOLS. The majority leader might not have, but the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] are able members of this subcommittee who have worked hard on this legislation. They know what is going on in their committee. They knew that the bill would be reported out on Wednesday and in the regular course of affairs go to the calendar for consideration today; and there was even discussion by these gentlemen as to whether they would file a minority report. I do not know whether they filed one or not.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Did the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] ask to have the bill postponed because he would be unable to be present in the House today?

Mr. NICHOLS. No, he did not. He indicated to me that he would be out of the city and, of course, was in hopes that we would not take it up. I do not think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was very serious.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I resent the reflection upon the gentleman from Illinois, that he was not serious.

Mr. NICHOLS. I mean no reflection on the gentleman from Illinois at all.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the attention of the distinguished minority leader for a moment. I want no misunderstanding relative to my position in this matter. I have the highest regard for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]. They are two very able members of the committee. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] were here today I am sure he would say that I have cooperated fully with him in the consideration of District of Columbia measures. I talked with him on the House floor Thursday afternoon before he left the city to go to his congressional district and I suggested to him that, since he would be absent on today, it perhaps would be best if I asked the consent of the House to have until midnight Thursday to file a minority report in connection with this bill. He said he believed such a request need not be made. I spoke to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE] in the same vein. He also said he believed he would not desire to file a minority report.

What the Members do so far as this bill is concerned will certainly be the responsibility of the House. I would like to have the measure considered this afternoon strictly on its merits. I may say that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE], a member of the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs is in favor of this bill, yet he is out of the city in Mississippi. So we find there are Members on both sides of the question who are out of the city. But we sit here as a body today to consider the bill for raising revenue for the District of Columbia. I should like to see it given an opportunity to be explained and debated on this floor. I will abide by whatever the House does, and I am sure the committee will. We are simply attempting to bring here for proper consideration a measure which should be given right-of-way at this time. A revenue bill must be passed. I am not in favor of all of the provisions of the proposed revenue-raising measure. At the proper time, if the Members allow the bill to be debated, I shall offer an amendment which would exempt all purchases under 10 cents from application of the sales tax. There are, no doubt, other amendments which might be offered which I would support.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, we members of the District of Columbia Committee have the highest regard and respect for our chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia, the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, who, at the request of the majority members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, is bringing in here this afternoon, for consideration by this House, a bill that includes both a gross-income tax and a sales tax. This sales tax attempts to get down so low as to tax those who buy a 5-cent article. As for myself, I have always opposed a sales tax and shall continue to do so as long as there is any strength in my body to do so, because it attempts to tax those who can least afford to pay. Now, I know nothing about the situation of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], but I do know that when this bill was considered by the District of Columbia Committee, very few of us were under the impression that it was coming up on the floor today. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] did not know it was coming up today, and, in fact, he told me on the floor of the House that had he known of it early enough he would have canceled his reservation. He stated that he wanted to be here when this bill is being considered, because he is unalterably opposed, like myself, to a sales tax in any form because of the unfairness of such a tax. The question before us this afternoon is, Are we going to place a burden upon those on relief, or the widows, or the very poor people here, by making them pay a tax that should be paid by people who can well afford to pay a higher tax? Why not place a higher tax on whisky; why not on beer? The tax on alcohol is lower here than in any other State in the United States, and I believe we are all agreed that all who drink beer and whisky are doing it because it is a luxury and not a necessity, and certainly an increase in tax there is not going to hurt anyone. That is the reason I would like to see consideration of the bill withheld until the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] return to the city. As a member of the District of Columbia Committee, I did not know that this would be brought up today until I read of it in the newspaper.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In view of the fact this is a 73-page sales-tax bill, which was introduced on March 19 and reported on March 21, would it not be a good idea to lay this bill aside and use the balance of the day to consider the Schulte anti-milk-monopoly bill?

Mr. SCHULTE. Yes; I think that is a good suggestion, and I hope that in the very near future this House may have an opportunity to vote on the Schulte milk bill, and if this bill passes it will give to the poor people in the District of Columbia milk at a price they can afford to pay.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is the gentleman in favor of some kind of a tax bill so that the District Government may secure funds with which to operate?

Mr. SCHULTE. I am very much in sympathy with a tax bill, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I am not in sympathy with making a woman who must scrub floors for a living for herself and family, or a widow who has received a small life-insurance policy or receiving a small pension, or a man on the W. P. A., or a man on relief pay the tax bill that rightfully should be paid by those who are riding around in big cars chauffeur-driven and with thousands of dollars in the bank and large real-estate holdings. Certainly those are the men who should rightfully pay the tax and instead of that they are now trying to shift the burden on the working man who certainly cannot afford to pay a sales tax on the wage he is getting. This bill is opposed by every working man and women in the District of Columbia, including the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman spoke about the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia bringing in this bill. The chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia does bring in the bill, but it is a bill that comes from the committee. I explained that this bill was reported out by the committee. I do not want the implication left that I am attempting to bring in the bill. It is the Committee on the District of Columbia that brings in the bill.

Mr. SCHULTE. No one denies that, and I am sorry if the gentleman understood me that way, as the chairman is only doing what he is instructed to do by the majority of the committee. There was a sharp division of opinion in the committee. There are two schools of thought, one which advocates putting the tax where it rightfully belongs; that is, on real estate and intangible property. Then we have the other group, who want to place a sales tax on the working people to relieve the big fellow from his just due.

Mr. NICHOLS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. Does not my friend know that any time a bill is reported by the full committee of the Committee on the District of Columbia it goes to the calendar and it is up for consideration on the following District Day? This is District Day.

Mr. SCHULTE. The gentleman is absolutely right, but we were given to understand it was not to be brought up at this particular time, and I do hope the membership of this House will stand by me and help to kill this sales-tax bill that would place a burden on those who could least afford to pay.

[Here the gavel fell.]

REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8980) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-seven Members are present; not a quorum.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 54]

Allen, Pa.	Dirksen	Kennedy, Michael	Reed, Ill.
Anderson, Mo.	Douglas	Keogh	Risk
Angell	Drewry	Larrabee	Ryan
Barden	Durham	Lea	Sacks
Barry	Eberharter	Lemke	Scrugham
Barton	Edelstein	Lesinski	Seger
Bates, Mass.	Evans	Lynch	Shafer, Mich.
Beam	Fay	McArdle	Shannon
Bender	Fernandez	McGehee	Sheridan
Blackney	Flah	McGranery	Simpson
Boehne	Flannagan	McKeough	Smith, Conn.
Bradley, Pa.	Flannery	McLaughlin	Smith, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.	Folger	McLean	Smith, Maine
Burch	Gavagan	Maas	Smith, W. Va.
Burgin	Gehrmann	Maclejewski	Somers, N. Y.
Byron	Gilchrist	Mansfield	Sullivan
Cannon, Fla.	Gross	Marcantonio	Sweeney
Celler	Harrington	Marshall	Taylor
Chapman	Hart	Martin, Ill.	Tenerowicz
Clark	Harter, N. Y.	Mason	Tibbott
Cluett	Hess	Merritt	Vinson, Ga.
Cole, N. Y.	Hook	Mills, La.	Vreeland
Collins	Izac	Myers	Wallgren
Cooley	Jacobsen	Norton	West
Cooper	Jarman	O'Leary	Wheat
Corbett	Jarrett	Osmers	Whelchel
Crowther	Jeffries	O'Toole	White, Ohio
Darden	Johnson, Ill.	Parsons	Whittington
Darrow	Keller	Patton	Wolcott
Delaney	Kelly	Pfeifer	Woodrum, Va.
Dickstein	Kennedy, Martin	Rabaut	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seven Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8980) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and pending that motion, I should like to propound two unanimous-consent requests. First, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an expert who has aided this committee in the preparation of this bill be permitted to sit at the committee table.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid this would be establishing quite a precedent. It is contrary to the rules of the House.

Mr. NICHOLS. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that when similar bills were considered on two previous occasions on the floor of the House the same request was made and agreed to. Certainly there is precedent for such action in the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair observes that under the rules the Chair cannot entertain such a request.

Mr. NICHOLS. Similar requests have been submitted and granted when previous tax bills have been under consideration, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Rule XXXIII, which enumerates those persons entitled to the floor, provides, in part, as follows:

It shall not be in order for the Speaker to entertain a request for the suspension of this rule or to present from the Chair the request of any Member for unanimous consent.

This is the general rule relating to admission to the floor of the House.

Of course, personally, the Chair has no feeling in the matter. Although it may have been done heretofore, the attention of the Chair was not called to it.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to see if we can agree on time for debate. Is 30 minutes on a side agreeable to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I believe there should be at least an hour of debate on a side. It is a pretty important subject we are being asked to consider now.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to an hour and a half, 45 minutes to be controlled by myself and 45 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES].

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is a 73-page bill, and it was introduced on March 19 and reported on March 21. It deals with a sales tax on the great rank and file of the people. I object to a limitation such as is now proposed.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, 1 hour to be controlled by myself and 1 hour by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES].

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I believe we ought to have 4 or 5 hours of general debate on a subject like this, and I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8980.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHULTE) there were—ayes 70, noes 79.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has just counted the Members present in the House. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 107, nays 197, answered "present" 1, not voting 125, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]
YEAS—107

Anderson, Calif.	Bland	Brooks	Buck
Arnold	Bolles	Brown, Ga.	Bulwinkle
Bell	Boren	Bryson	Burdick

Cannon, Mo.	Griffith	McMillan, John L.	Reece, Tenn.
Cartwright	Hare	Massingale	Rees, Kans.
Cochran	Harter, Ohio	May	Rich
Coffee, Nebr.	Havener	Michener	Richards
Colmer	Hendricks	Mills, Ark.	Robertson
Costello	Hennings	Mills, La.	Robinson, Utah
Cravens	Hill	Monroney	Rogers, Okla.
Creal	Hobbs	Mouton	Romjue
Cummings	Houston	Nelson	Ryan
Dempsey	Johnson, Luther A.	Nichols	Satterfield
Dingell	Johnson, W. Va.	Norrell	Schwert
Disney	Jones, Tex.	Norton	Sheppard
Doughton	Kee	O'Connor	Smith, Maine
Doxey	Kefauver	O'Day	Smith, Va.
Duncan	Keller	O'Neal	South
Edmiston	Kennedy, Md.	Pace	Terry
Elliott	Kerr	Patrick	Tolan
Ferguson	Kilday	Peterson, Fla.	Wadsworth
Ford, Leland M.	Kitchens	Peterson, Ga.	Wallgren
Ford, Miss.	Kleberg	Polk	Ward
Gearhart	Kramer	Ramspeck	Warren
Gore	Leavy	Randolph	Weaver
Gossett	McCormack	Rankin	Williams, Mo.
Gregory	McMillan, Clara G.	Rayburn	

NAYS—197

Alexander	Eaton	Kean	Rutherford
Allen, Ill.	Ellis	Keefe	Sandager
Allen, La.	Elston	Kilburn	Sasser
Andersen, H. Carl	Engel	Kinzer	Schaefer, Ill.
Anderson, Mo.	Faddis	Kirwan	Schafer, Wis.
Andresen, A. H.	Fenton	Knutson	Schiffler
Andrews	Fish	Kocalkowski	Schuetz
Angell	Fitzpatrick	Kunkel	Schulte
Arends	Flaherty	Lambertson	Secombe
Bail	Flannagan	Landis	Secrest
Barnes	Ford, Thomas F.	Lanham	Shanley
Bates, Ky.	Fries	LeCompte	Short
Beckworth	Fulmer	Lemke	Smith, Ohio
Bolton	Gamble	Lewis, Colo.	Snyder
Bradley, Mich.	Garrett	Lewis, Ohio	Sparkman
Bradley, Pa.	Gartner	Luce	Spence
Brewster	Gathings	Ludlow	Springer
Brown, Ohio	Gerlach	McAndrews	Starnes, Ala.
Buckler, Minn.	Geyer, Calif.	McDowell	Steagall
Byrne, N. Y.	Gibbs	McGregor	Stefan
Byrns, Tenn.	Gifford	McLeod	Sumner, Ill.
Caldwell	Gilchrist	Magnuson	Summers, Tex.
Camp	Gillie	Mahon	Sutphin
Carlson	Graham	Maloney	Taber
Carter	Grant, Ala.	Marshall	Talle
Case, S. Dak.	Grant, Ind.	Martin, Iowa	Tarver
Chaperfield	Green	Martin, Mass.	Thill
Church	Guy, Kans.	Miller	Thomas, N. J.
Clason	Gwynne	Mitchell	Thomas, Tex.
Claypool	Hall, Edwin A.	Monkiewicz	Thomason
Cleaver	Hall, Leonard W.	Moser	Thorkelson
Coffee, Wash.	Halleck	Mott	Tinkham
Cole, Md.	Hancock	Mundt	Treadway
Connery	Harness	Murdoch, Ariz.	Van Zandt
Courtney	Hartley	Murdoch, Utah	Vincent, Ky.
Cox	Hawks	Murray	Voorhis, Calif.
Crawford	Hinshaw	O'Brien	Vorvys, Ohio
Crosser	Hoffman	Oliver	Walter
Crowe	Holmes	Patman	Welch
Crowther	Hook	Pearson	White, Idaho
Culkin	Hope	Pittenger	Wigglesworth
Curtis	Horton	Plumley	Williams, Del.
D'Alessandro	Hull	Poage	Winter
Davis	Jenkins, Ohio	Powers	Wolfenden, Pa.
DeRouen	Jenks, N. H.	Reed, Ill.	Wolverton, N. J.
Dies	Jensen, N. H.	Reed, N. Y.	Woodruff, Mich.
Ditter	Johns	Robison, Ky.	Youngdahl
Dondero	Johnson, Ind.	Rodgers, Pa.	
Dunn	Johnson, Lyndon	Rogers, Mass.	
Dworshak	Jonkman	Routzohn	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hunter

NOT VOTING—125

Allen, Pa.	Cole, N. Y.	Gehrmann	Lesinski
Austin	Collins	Goodwin	Lynch
Barden	Cooley	Gross	McArdle
Barry	Cooper	Harrington	McGehee
Barton	Corbett	Hart	McGranery
Bates, Mass.	Cullen	Harter, N. Y.	McKeough
Beam	Darden	Healey	McLaughlin
Bender	Darrow	Hess	McLean
Blackney	Delaney	Izac	Maas
Bloom	Dickstein	Jacobsen	Maciejewski
Boehne	Dirksen	Jarman	Mansfield
Boland	Douglas	Jarrett	Marcantonio
Boykin	Drewry	Jeffries	Martin, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.	Durham	Jennings	Mason
Burch	Eberharter	Johnson, Ill.	Merritt
Burgin	Edelstein	Johnson, Okla.	Myers
Byron	Englebright	Jones, Ohio	O'Leary
Cannon, Fla.	Evans	Kelly	Osmer
Casey, Mass.	Fay	Kennedy, Martin	O'Toole
Celler	Fernandez	Kennedy, Michael	Parsons
Chapman	Flannery	Keogh	Patton
Clark	Folger	Larrabee	Pfeiffer
Cluett	Gavagan	Lea	Pierce

Rabaut	Sheridan	Sweeney	White, Ohio
Risk	Simpson	Taylor	Whittington
Rockefeller	Smith, Conn.	Tenerowicz	Wolcott
Sabath	Smith, Ill.	Tibbott	Wood
Sacks	Smith, Wash.	Vinson, Ga.	Woodrum, Va.
Scrugham	Smith, W. Va.	Vreeland	Zimmerman
Seger	Somers, N. Y.	West	
Shafer, Mich.	Stearns, N. H.	Wheat	
Shannon	Sullivan	Whelchel	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Wolcott.
 Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. McLean.
 Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Hess.
 Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Jones of Ohio.
 Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Dirksen.
 Mr. Patman with Mr. Goodwin.
 Mr. McKeough with Mr. Tibbott.
 Mr. Whittington with Mr. Jarrett.
 Mr. Beam with Mr. Vreeland.
 Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Darrow.
 Mr. Darden with Mr. Simpson.
 Mr. Cooley with Mr. Harter of New York.
 Mr. West with Mr. Jeffries.
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Maas.
 Mr. Cooper with Mr. Risk.
 Mr. Barden with Mr. Wheat.
 Mr. Cullen with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
 Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Englebright.
 Mr. Collins with Mr. Johnson of Illinois.
 Mr. Drewry with Mr. Osmer.
 Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Shafer of Michigan.
 Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Gross.
 Mr. Boehne with Mr. Jennings.
 Mr. Durham with Mr. Rockefeller.
 Mr. Boykin with Mr. White of Ohio.
 Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Barton.
 Mr. Kelly with Mr. Corbett.
 Mr. Jarman with Mr. Seger.
 Mr. Keogh with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Harrington with Mr. Austin.
 Mr. Flannery with Mr. Gehrmann.
 Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Blackney.
 Mr. Hart with Mr. Cole of New York.
 Mr. McGehee with Mr. Mason.
 Mr. McLaughlin with Mr. Bender.
 Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Cluett.
 Mr. Whelchel with Mr. Marcantonio.
 Mr. Allen of Pennsylvania with Mr. Tenerowicz.
 Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Zimmerman.
 Mr. Taylor with Mr. Smith of West Virginia.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Myers.
 Mr. Burgin with Mr. O'Leary.
 Mr. Pierce with Mr. Sheridan.
 Mr. Bloom with Mr. Chapman.
 Mr. Merritt with Mr. Sabath.
 Mr. Boland with Mr. Healey.
 Mr. Parsons with Mr. O'Toole.
 Mr. Pfeiffer with Mr. Sacks.
 Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Celler.
 Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Byron.
 Mr. Wood with Mr. Barry.
 Mr. McArdle with Mr. Buckley of New York.
 Mr. Martin of Illinois with Mr. Scrugham.
 Mr. Smith of Connecticut with Mr. Casey of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Edelstein with Mr. Shannon.
 Mr. Folger with Mr. Lynch.
 Mr. Lea with Mr. Jacobsen.
 Mr. Fay with Mr. Izac.
 Mr. Smith of Illinois with Mr. Dickstein.
 Mr. McGranery with Mr. Evans.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the District of Columbia feels that now it has discharged its duty to the great number of Members of the House of Representatives who came to the committee and asked that the committee bring out legislation which would not compel people employed in the District of Columbia and working for the United States Government, who come from States that have an income tax, to pay three income taxes. Of course, the bill, as it is now on the books, which was written in conference, not considered by this body or the Senate, except in a conference report, was an ill-advised bill, is bad law, and everyone agrees to that. So you leave yourselves now with only an income tax, no exemptions in the low brackets, taxing the low-income groups, Government employees with very little exemption, and it compels them to pay, if they pay

an income tax in their State, also to pay one in the District of Columbia, as well as to the Federal Government; but I presume that is the sense of the House and I have no quarrel with you gentlemen.

I am convinced that had you permitted an explanation of this bill, that probably 50 percent of you who voted just now to refuse to let us even consider the bill would have, in the end, voted for the bill. It has been dubbed a sales-tax bill. Well, that is not exactly correct. This was a combination of sales and income tax which to have worked must have been applied both together, and let me point this out to the Members: When I went on this committee just a few years ago and when the present membership of the committee started considering this legislation for the District of Columbia, there was a bill on the books which provided that the Federal Government should pay 40 percent of the cost of the District government. At the moment there is a \$44,000,000 budget to run the District of Columbia. We took that provision of law off of the books and we on this committee think that the people who live in the District of Columbia not only should be permitted to pay the tax to support their own government and remove the burden from the backs of your constituents, but that it is their duty so to do. So we brought in this legislation, and let me point out a further thing: There is no jurisdiction in the United States which can give precedent for tax matters in the District of Columbia. There is no other taxing jurisdiction like it in the United States. Why, one of the great oppositions to this bill came from the suburban areas of Washington—people earning every cent of their income in the District of Columbia, living in Maryland or living in Virginia, who did not want any form of a sales tax, of course, because as it is they use the police force, the fire department, the streets, the parks, and even the schools of the District of Columbia, and live in other jurisdictions and pay not one cent to the support of the District government, and, of course—

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. NICHOLS. No; I do not yield.

And, of course, if they have to pay a little sales tax they would have to contribute something to the support of the Government which they use, and let me tell you something about that sales-tax provision. I know that many of you gentlemen voted against it because you are interested in the people in the low-income groups and do not want them to be imposed on or burdened unduly by the payment of taxes. We realized that and so, in this bill, we provided for exemptions on food, exemptions on medicines, and exemptions on rents. Sixty percent, approximately, of an income in brackets below \$6,000 goes for these three items. Under this bill with the exemptions, according to statistics from the Department of Labor, a person with an income of \$2,000 a year would have paid in sales taxes 0.55 of 1 percent of their income. Still, it would have raised a sufficient amount of money to run the government of the District. Now, here is the position in which you leave the District of Columbia and the position in which you leave your constituents. Last year we repealed two taxes, the business-privilege tax and the intangible personal-property tax. This took off of the books \$5,000,000 worth of income of the District of Columbia. Of course, I had nothing to do with that, because I was against it all the time. However, the present personal income-tax law was written in its place, which is going to yield, under the most generous estimate, only about \$850,000, while the corporate tax will yield only \$2,000,000. So you started immediately last year with a deficit of over \$2,000,000 in the District of Columbia. You have not now provided any further revenue, so you will have at least another \$2,000,000 deficit. The Federal Government gives the District of Columbia \$6,000,000 annually. Where will the District make up this deficit? Do you know? Why, certainly, from the Federal Government, and your constituents will pay the bill.

[Here the gavel fell].

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD some letters which I have re-

ceived in support of an increase in the appropriation of the National Youth Administration provision in the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked this permission to insert in the RECORD a telegram I received from Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, sent to me under date of March 23, from a city in Ohio, where he was on that date, strongly urging support of an increase in the appropriation for the National Youth Administration, increasing it from \$85,000,000 to at least the amount which was appropriated last year. I put this telegram in the RECORD for the information of the Members of the House, in view of the fact that this matter will come up for consideration probably tomorrow or the next day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COSHOCOTON, OHIO, March 23, 1940.

HON. JOHN R. McCORMACK,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The National Youth Administration is making a definite contribution to the problem of unemployment. Through this agency of Government many thousands of the youth of our land are accorded educational opportunities and other thousands are being accorded economic assistance. Any curtailment of the activities or services of the National Youth Administration will tend to aggravate our serious unemployment situation. For this special reason I respectfully urge that Congress appropriate the amount of money asked for by Commissioner Aubrey Williams for the work of the National Youth Administration during the coming year. I earnestly hope and trust you will respond favorably to this recommendation and render all assistance possible.

WILLIAM GREEN,

President, American Federation of Labor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a very splendid editorial from the Randolph Review of Elkins, W. Va., my home city.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on the 20th I made some remarks on the floor of the House and obtained permission to extend my remarks. I think I received at that time permission to insert certain tables which I had prepared, but in fear that I am mistaken, I ask unanimous consent to insert those tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LABOR-SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1941

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9007, making appropriations for the Department of Labor, Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to submit a request with reference to the control of the time?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, the control of the time is provided for in the unanimous-consent request granted last Thursday, which also controls the question of whether or not debate shall be confined to the bill. There is no request to be submitted at this time for the conclusion of the general debate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is advised by the RECORD that the request submitted by the gentleman from Georgia covers the control of the time only on the day on which the bill was called up.

Mr. TARVER. Then, Mr. Speaker, pending the motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate may be controlled equally by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. The Committee on Rules this morning granted a rule to make some matters now in the bill which are subject to a point of order immune from the point of order. Those are very controversial matters and the House probably is not familiar with what has been done. Therefore, I ask the gentleman whether it is the intention to close debate today or will the general debate be continued until the Members of the House have an opportunity to discuss the provisions covered by the rule granted today?

Mr. TARVER. There is not only no disposition to close debate upon the part of those who desire to be heard in regard to anything contained in the bill, but it is the desire of the subcommittee that general debate shall proceed until reasonable opportunity has been afforded to all such Members to discuss any provisions of the bill in which they may be interested. Of course, if we reach a point in the general debate today when no additional Members desire to be heard, we would, of course, expect to proceed to the reading of the bill.

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

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Just what is the status of the rule? Will the rule come up tomorrow morning at 12 o'clock?

Mr. TARVER. We hope to bring the rule up before the House for consideration tomorrow upon the convening of the House.

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

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman proceeding upon the assumption that the rule reported making in order the consideration of this provision appropriating for the National Youth Administration will be adopted, and, therefore, debate will be had upon that provision of the bill?

Mr. TARVER. Of course, I assume that the membership of the House, at least a number of them, would want to discuss the National Youth Administration provisions in the bill, and they have that right, as I understand it.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill, 1941, with Mr. Buck in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time stood at the close of the debate on Thursday?

The CHAIRMAN. At the end of the debate on Thursday the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] had consumed 1 hour and 58 minutes; the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], 2 hours and 21 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON].

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am going to confine my remarks to a discussion of the provisions of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor.

When this wage and hour bill was before the House I think a great many Members will recall that the advocates of that legislation supposed there would be no great administrative expense in connection with the wage and hour set-up; but in 1939 the appropriation for this division totaled \$1,250,000. The estimate was \$1,450,000. That was in 1939. In 1940 the regular appropriation, including miscellaneous expenses, travel expenses, printing and binding, contingent expenses, and so forth, totaled \$3,116,570. The estimate at that time was \$3,350,000.

Then, in 1940 also there was a supplementary appropriation—a deficiency appropriation—of \$1,200,000, making a total of \$4,316,000.

In 1941, for the regular fiscal year of 1941, the estimate is \$7,486,400, including salaries, miscellaneous expenses, travel expenses, contingent expenses, printing and binding, and so forth, and the committee has submitted an appropriation of \$6,140,000. I am just showing by these figures how this Bureau has grown by leaps and bounds from 1939 to 1941. I do not want it construed that I am against the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor. I signed the petition to bring the bill to the floor, and I voted for the bill, but I do think it should proceed in order and organize accordingly.

I want to take my time to give a discussion of what the Wage and Hour Division is doing, what their function is, and how they are doing it, and why they are curtailed somewhat in their proposed appropriation for 1941.

The Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, because of the scope of its work, heavy responsibilities, and some weaknesses in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, is confronted with a gigantic task, but the hearings before the subcommittee have clarified some points not heretofore known by most of us, and I am glad to have this opportunity to assure the Members of the House that under the able direction of Colonel Fleming, definite progress is being made toward a better understanding of the wage-hour problem between employers, employees, and the personnel of the Bureau.

Industry is anxious for the work of this governmental agency to become standardized so that guesswork as to the application of the law may be reduced to a minimum, with benefit to all concerned. Voluntary compliance with the act is estimated to be about 93 percent, and only 7 percent of the industries are being complained against, which would indicate businessmen in general are willing to comply with the act and interpretative regulations of the Division. A cautious, understanding approach to fair administration by Colonel Fleming and his staff is in evidence, for which they should be commended.

To appreciate the job which the Bureau faces we must consider the great number and varied types of industries in the United States, and I quote a statement as to the number of plants to be inspected:

It was estimated previously, on the basis of tabulations of employers made by the Old Age Insurance Bureau of the Social Security Board, that the Fair Labor Standards Act covered not less than 250,000 of the 350,000 plants in industries generally subject to the act. This estimate included an allowance of less than 30,000 wholesaling establishments covered by the act. The Bureau of Labor Statistics survey on coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act as of April 1939 indicates approximately 70 percent of all wholesaling employees covered by the act. If the number of establishments were proportional to the number of employees, an additional 40,000 plants would have to be covered. Allowing for the likelihood that plants covered by the act will be somewhat larger than plants not covered, the estimate of the number of plants to be inspected regularly must be raised by not less than 20,000. In addition, data compiled by Dun & Bradstreet indicate a net total of nearly 38,000 new establishments in manufacturing and wholesaling in the year 1938 and a net total of a little over 36,000 discontinuances, excluding successions and changes of management from both figures. Assuming the same ratio of coverage as for all other establishments, 28,000 of the outgoing establishments would be classed as covered. Since approximately one-half of the net changes took place in the last 6 months of the year, it may be estimated that routine inspection will include an additional 14,000 plants accounted for by turn-over of business enterprise. It was estimated previously that 25,000 plants would require only a very brief inspection because of high standards already obtaining in these plants with respect to wages and hours. The 80,000 plants remaining in the original grand total of 350,000 would have to be inspected at least once to determine whether or not they are covered by the act. Excluding the latter two categories for the time being leaves a net total of 259,000 establishments to be covered in regular inspections.

The average number of required inspections, as determined by analysis of complaints received, has been 1,182 per month for the period through August 1, 1939. A little over one-third of these were inspections required by an indicated violation of the hours provision, and nearly all of the rest involved the wage provision or both the wage and hour provisions. Estimates of the probable load of inspection work involving violation of the act for the year 1940-41, based on the relative numbers of employees directly affected by the changed wage and hour provisions and by wage orders already recommended prior to the present date, indicate an average of 2,300 inspections required per month for the first 4 months of 1940-41

and 2,500 per month for the remaining 8 months. The estimate for those affected by wage orders is a net figure, including only workers directly affected by the wage order less the number already affected by the general minima. It does not include any estimate of the net number to be directly affected by wage orders expected to take effect during the remainder of the year 1939-40. The estimated total number of inspections required on complaint of violation is therefore something over 30,000 for the year 1940-41.

The Wage and Hour Division plans to train its contemplated staff of inspectors and pay-roll examiners during the first half of the fiscal year 1941 and concentrate on field operations during the last half of the year, but anticipates that at best only about 50 to 60 percent of the work in prospect will be accomplished.

The Division has established 15 regions in the United States and has given the regional directors authority to settle a great many cases without reference to Washington. They may now settle cases up to \$50,000 of restitution due employees in any particular case, and they have authority to decide whether cases shall be settled by restitution, whether they shall go to the civil courts for a consent decree, or recommendations shall be made that criminal action be taken. In the case of criminal action, the Department of Justice handles the prosecution.

Statistics show the following relative amounts of restitution paid workers and amounts of restitution which employers have agreed to pay workers as a result of settlement without legal action, because of civil action, and because of criminal action, as of February 21, 1940:

Without legal action, \$549,768.40 have been paid and \$697,498.64 are to be paid.

Because of civil action, \$194,049.99 have been paid and \$387,457.13 are to be paid.

Because of criminal action, \$32,564.16 have been paid, and \$38,608.25 are to be paid.

The amounts I have given you do not include any which may be paid or agreed to as a result of pending negotiations or pending court actions.

The total fines assessed in criminal cases amount to \$254,850, but only \$122,500 have been paid or will be paid in cash. Payment of the remainder has been suspended by the courts.

I might add some of the courts in these cases have evolved a plan of assessing a fine in a given amount and then collecting approximately 50 percent of that, with the idea and understanding that the employer will then make full restitution to the employee, and the balance will be suspended. It has been thought that this works out better than to put the money into the Federal Treasury by giving it back to the employee.

A statement of litigated cases involving sections 6 and 7 of the act shows: Civil cases, 116 closed, 9 pending, and criminal cases, 35 closed and 28 pending. Those figures are as of February 1, 1940, and do not include 7 pending cases now being prosecuted in the field.

A special inquiry has found that charges that the wage-hour law would bring about widespread factory shut-downs, particularly in the South, have not proved to be true. Neither has the contention that wages would be reduced to the minimum rate by a majority of employers paying wages in excess of the lawful rate been substantiated.

It is evident that some clarifying amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act should be adopted during this session of Congress, and I am hopeful the Committee on Labor will report a bill without undue delay, but it is also apparent that the main objectives of the act should be maintained and that at least the reduced appropriation as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations should be approved so as to enable the Wage and Hour Division to carry out the program of enforcement with which the majority of us are in favor, and which is not intended to work any hardship on legitimate business.

The committee has given laborious consideration to the estimates of the Wage and Hour Division. Exclusive of the items of travel, contingent expenses, and printing and binding, the estimates for 1941 contemplate an expenditure of \$6,185,000. If the three items just named are added to the total, it is indicated that the estimates call for an appro-

priation of \$7,486,400, or an increase of \$3,169,000, over comparable appropriations for the current fiscal year.

The committee recognizes the necessity for some expansion in the work of the Wage and Hour Division as it develops its organization and proceeds with its program of properly policing the industries that fall within the terms of the act. They do feel, however, that until Congress shall adopt legislation amendatory of the Fair Labor Standards Act which will serve to clarify certain ambiguities in the existing law, and until those charged with the administration of the act have been able to bring about simplification of procedure and clarification in the interpretation of the rules and regulations promulgated pursuant to any such amendatory legislation, it would be imprudent on the part of Congress to approve a greatly enlarged administrative set-up that could only lend further difficulties to an already confused administrative problem.

The present Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division has been but recently confirmed in his office. I might add that he had nothing whatever to do with the preparation of the estimates for the fiscal year 1941 for the Wage and Hour Division. That was done by his predecessor. The committee are confident that he will satisfactorily work out means and methods of administering this act that will be in conformity with elements of reasonableness and good judgment. The committee know further it is the intention of the present Administrator to build up the enlarged organization in a slow and methodical manner in order that a real selective and efficient personnel may be acquired.

In the light of the facts mentioned, the committee has effected a reduction of \$1,035,000 in the proposed increase of \$2,611,000 for salaries, which reduction includes the \$29,000 adverted to herein under the heading "Office of the Secretary" and has reduced the estimate of \$320,000 for miscellaneous expenses to \$275,000, or a reduction of \$45,000. To summarize, appropriations totaling \$5,105,000 for salaries and expenses of the Wage and Hour Division other than "Contingent expenses," "Travel expenses," and "Printing and binding" are contained in the accompanying bill. This sum is \$1,643,800 in excess of the appropriations for the current year and is a reduction of \$1,080,000 under the 1941 Budget estimates. If the items of "Contingent expenses," "Travel expenses," and "Printing and binding," which are made available to this Division by allotment from general departmental funds, are taken into account, the Wage and Hour Division will have approximately \$6,140,000 available for expenditure during the next fiscal year, which does not start or become effective until July 1, 1940; and as both the Secretary of Labor and Colonel Fleming indicated that they proposed certain revision and correction in regulations which would simplify, in their opinion, the work and the Wage and Hour Division, we think they should be given that opportunity during the first 6 months of the fiscal year of 1941. If it is then evident that more funds are necessary to carry out the provisions of the act, Congress will convene in January and a deficiency appropriation and readily be obtained. [Applause.]

Year	Appropriation objects	Appropriation	Estimates
1939	Total, all salaries and expenses	\$400,000	\$500,000
1939	Do	850,000	950,000
1940 regular act	Salaries	(2,339,000)	
	Miscellaneous expenses	(207,000)	
	Travel expenses	(380,000)	
	Printing and binding	(118,750)	
	Contingent expenses	(71,820)	
	Total	3,116,570	3,350,000
1940 deficiency act	Salaries	(915,000)	
	Travel expenses	(270,000)	
	Contingent expenses	(15,000)	
	Total	1,200,000	2,000,000
1941 regular act	Salaries	(4,830,000)	(5,865,000)
	Miscellaneous expenses	(275,000)	(320,000)
	Travel expenses	(860,000)	(1,000,000)
	Printing and binding	(12,000)	(136,000)
	Contingent expenses	(163,000)	(155,400)
	Total	6,140,000	7,486,400

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, at the first session of this Congress I supported an amendment increasing the amount for the National Youth Administration. Today I want to see the amount raised to the same amount as last year.

There are as many youths unemployed in the United States today as there were 1 year ago. They need to be taken care of now just as badly as they did then.

We hear much about pensions for old people and security in old age. To me, old age is a great handicap and we must take care of those who are unfortunate enough to not be able to take care of themselves when they get old, but at the same time youth is just as important. We live under a republican form of government. We believe in democracy, and the only way either can be maintained is through education throughout our whole lives.

Germany is educating youth in nazi-ism, Russia is educating youth in communism, and if we expect to maintain a republic, we must educate our youth in democracy.

I find upon investigation we have 1,500 C. C. C. camps in the United States, of which 44 are in the State of Wisconsin. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, these camps in all the States had a monthly average of 268,441 people in them. The monthly average in all the Wisconsin camps was 5,722 people. The highest number in all the States was 293,441 in January and the lowest 198,004 in March 1939.

It may be of interest to the Members of this House to know of some of the activities of this Youth Administration in Wisconsin, and some of the things they did. I do not want to burden you with too many, so I shall only mention a few. These camps repaired or improved 149 public buildings; built and repaired 24,781 feet of highways, roads, and streets; 38,918 feet of sidewalks, bridge paths, and trails. They did 151,740 lineal feet of landscaping, built 23,826 feet of fence, erected 133,580 feet of snow fences, built 102 playgrounds, planted 251,516 trees in a reforestation program, and renovated and repaired 266,827 books. These are only a few of the 32 activities.

In January and February 1940, 20,654 youths were taken care of in Wisconsin. Of this number, out-of-school work programs accounted for 8,290 in February 1940, and 12,364 in student-work program in January 1940. The number of youths certified and awaiting assignment on January 5, 1940, in Wisconsin was 3,491. The estimated number of needy youth not certified was estimated to be 35,486.

Funds allotted for the fiscal year 1939-40 are \$2,348,240. Of this amount there has been allotted for out-of-school work program \$1,590,700, and student-work program \$757,540. There are 632 schools participating in the student-work program—out of this number there are 82 colleges and universities.

I have letters from students who say that they will have to quit school if they cannot get this help. Now, with so many unemployed, they cannot get a part-time job of any kind.

It may also be interesting to note that during January and February of this year 746,268 youths were taken care of by the N. Y. A.

There were certified and awaiting assignment on January 5, 1940, 340,000, and the estimated number of needy unemployed youth on the same date was 2,119,000.

The turn-over is also important. From July 1, 1939, through January 1940, 154,820 youths left N. Y. A. The average number leaving each month from those unemployed is about 9.1 percent. After adjustments for reassignments, the annual turn-over is over 90 percent.

Of the funds spent during the past fiscal year, 76.8 percent went to youth in the form of wages; 11.6 percent to supervisors; 6.6 percent for materials, supplies, and equipment; and 5 percent for administration.

Take my own district: On March 1, 1940, there were employed in the school-work program 1,016 students, with 68 schools participating, for which an allotment of \$36,360 has been made for the fiscal year. A high-school student who could not otherwise attend school may work for and be paid from \$3 to \$6 per month, the average payment being \$4.05.

In the college and graduate-work program, 164 students are employed, with 9 schools participating, for which an allotment of \$17,280 has been made for the fiscal year.

These figures do not include students attending colleges or universities located outside of the district. A college student who could not otherwise attend school may work for and be paid from \$10 to \$20 per month, the average payment being \$11.69. In the combined student-work program, including the school-work program and the college- and graduate-work programs, there are 1,180 youths employed in 77 schools and colleges, with a total earning of \$53,640.

On the out-of-school work program, there were 981 employed on January 5, 1940, the average monthly earnings being \$1,959. For these projects there has been allotted \$45,890. On January 5, 1940, there were certified and awaiting assignment 359 youths. Those needy and unemployed were estimated at 2,185, making a total of unassigned, 2,544—more than two and one-half times as many as were assigned. A total of 2,161 youths are employed by the N. Y. A. in my district. A total of \$99,530 has been allotted for this employment during the fiscal year. This would be a good investment in youth at any time, but it is especially, now, when 9,000,000 men are out of work and need it badly.

Since 1935, when the National Youth Administration was first organized in Wisconsin, 4,400 youths of my district, have received part-time wages amounting to \$220,195.90 for work performed on student-work projects. In addition, 2,329 out-of-town youths have earned a total of \$235,457 in wages on work-projects programs. In all, 6,729 young people in my district have benefited by the N. Y. A. wage disbursements, totaling \$455,552.90.

Of the counties in my district, the following shows the total number of youths aided and the amount paid out in each county: Number in Brown 1,189, amount paid \$89,878.65; number in Door 354, amount \$14,771; number in Florence 324, amount \$27,953.34; number in Forest 628, amount \$38,574.71; number in Kewaunee 183, amount \$5,358.59; number in Manitowoc 1,063, amount \$83,191.50; number in Marinette 1,082, amount \$70,006.28; number in Oconto 721, amount \$34,316.56; number in Outagamie 1,185, amount \$91,642.36.

Since the inception of the National Youth Administration's student-work and out-of-school work project programs in Wisconsin in September 1935, approximately 55,000 young people in this State have been benefited directly by the part-time work afforded them. Other thousands have benefited indirectly as a result of the accomplishments in community development and the improvements in recreation facilities made by N. Y. A. people.

Thirty-three thousand students who might have had to abandon their educational pursuits because of a shortage of funds have been enabled to continue their studies in Wisconsin colleges, high schools, and vocational schools by means of the wages they earned on part-time jobs. Since 1935 these earnings have amounted to \$3,222,467.

Twenty-two thousand other young people, the great majority of whom were members of families on relief, received employment on National Youth Administration out-of-school work projects. During the past 5 years a total of \$4,760,061 was disbursed for project work, providing an average monthly wage of approximately \$18 to each individual. Many of these young people had been out of work for years. Many of them had never been employed and had found themselves facing that feeling of moral deterioration and frustration that accompanies all unemployment. As a result of the work experience, training, and vocational guidance they received while employed on N. Y. A. projects, hundreds of these young people have now secured jobs in private industry.

In three of the counties in my district—Oconto, Forest, and Florence—the Government has purchased and taken over a large acreage of land from these counties for park and reforestation purposes. In doing this they have left those who did not sell their land to pay the expenses of running the Government in these counties, even, in some instances, to pay off obligations of the counties on bond issues for building good roads, which now benefit the Government, but the remaining

taxpayers must carry the burden. No provision has as yet been provided by the Government to lighten this burden on the local taxpayers.

These C. C. C. camps located in these counties, doing the work that local residents should do in reforestation, at least leave the money there, and should not be discontinued until such time as the Government makes some provision to reforest and build parks by local citizens, to be paid for by the Government, or some other provision to take care of local citizens whom the Government deprived of a home and an occupation to help the Government.

No generation of young people has faced a more stubborn barrier to its progress than the present-day problem of insecurity and joblessness. The National Youth Administration is helping to solve that problem by giving them their chance in school, an opportunity for jobs, and the right to work and earn for themselves, and should be continued with sufficient funds to do so. After the billions we have spent on experimentation, we ought to spend some money for something that has proven to be a good investment. [Applause.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the indulgence of Members for a few minutes for the purpose of saying a few kind words in support of the appropriation for the National Youth Administration and to express the hope that this Congress will place its stamp of approval on that organization and its program for youth.

As you know, the present bill reduces the appropriation for the N. Y. A. \$15,000,000 below the sum that is being expended for the N. Y. A. for the present year. If this appropriation is permitted to stand as it is there will be at least 123,000 youth of America who will lose their jobs, and I am quite sure that Members of this House, despite the fact that we may think we are economy-minded, are unwilling to take 123,000 young men and women off the jobs they now have.

N. Y. A. has done a marvelous job all over the country, in every State in the Union. You hear no real criticism of the N. Y. A. or its fine program for youth, but for reasons of economy the committee has felt it necessary to reduce this appropriation \$15,000,000 below what is actually being expended this year for the N. Y. A. program.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman does not mean to leave the impression that the committee reduced the estimate \$15,000,000, I take it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, no. I did not intend to leave that impression.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman did not mean to say that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No. If I so stated or left that impression, then I am sorry. You know, one should take an Irishman by what he means, not by what he says.

The point I was endeavoring to make is that the committee has allowed the amount of the Budget estimate of \$85,000,000, but that is \$15,000,000 below the amount expended by the National Youth Administration during the present year.

In referring to the fact that there has been a reduction under the amount expended in N. Y. A. for the present year I have no desire or intention to criticize the committee. It has done a good job. I appeared before the committee in behalf of the N. Y. A. appropriation and also in support of the appropriation for the C. C. C., which has also been drastically cut. I can fully appreciate what the committee was up against, having recently reported the Interior Department appropriation bill. In the first place, it was faced with a resolution from the full committee that it must bring in the bill below the Budget estimate, which was almost a herculean task. But this Congress cannot afford to take a backward step at this time so far as the National Youth Administration is concerned; and that also applies, of course, to the C. C. C. camps, about which I hope to make some remarks very soon.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the resolution from the Committee on Appropriations was that the subcommittee should bring in their bills under the Budget estimate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman; what I should have said is, that the subcommittees are obliged to bring their bills within the Budget estimate. If I used the word "below," I most humbly beg the gentleman's pardon.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. HOOK. Yet I understand this bill is \$11,000,000 below the Budget estimate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct, and I commend the committee for reporting the pending bill more than \$11,000,000 below the Budget estimate. I wish it had been possible to have cut it even further.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. I think the committee would be glad to have the gentleman use the round figure \$12,000,000 below the Budget, since the bill is nearer \$12,000,000 below than \$11,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman; but, after all, what is \$1,000,000 between friends who are economy-minded, especially if the American youth is involved?

The appropriation for the National Youth Administration should be increased this year rather than being drastically cut. Funds for this great worth-while program must not be reduced at the expense of human welfare. Granting the need for economy, I submit that it would be poor economy, poor business judgment, and a very definite backward step to reduce the N. Y. A. appropriation \$15,000,000 for the ensuing year.

Since the cry of economy has been raised, let me make it plain that I believe in strict economy in government. Not only do I believe in it but I have practiced it as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. In a previous bill I took the liberty of making a motion that was adopted in the committee to reduce one item \$50,000,000. That amendment referred to a straight-out Government subsidy to private shipbuilders. The appropriation for the American merchant marine for the present year was \$100,000,000. The Budget estimate for the next fiscal year, to our utter surprise, was \$200,000,000. Taking into consideration that this shipbuilding program by the private shipbuilders is more than a year ahead of time, and the fact that the Budget estimate proposed to give as a subsidy for the same shipbuilders \$200,000,000 for the present year, I proposed to cut that back to what we had last year, of \$100,000,000, which proposal failed of adoption.

With the assistance, however, of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Houston], we managed first to cut this appropriation \$25,000,000 in the subcommittee and in the full committee we reduced it another \$50,000,000, making a total cut of \$75,000,000 saved to the taxpayers in that one item. Of course a great wall went up from the poor shipbuilders and their lobbyists have swarmed the Capitol in an effort to restore the entire \$75,000,000. The conferees of the House and Senate have finally compromised and we were able to make a saving of \$56,000,000 in that one item. That is a sizable saving, but the poor shipbuilders still have their subsidy raised some \$44,000,000 above the amount of the appropriation last year. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that inasmuch as Congress is making a clear-cut saving of \$56,000,000 below the Budget estimate in one item that we could well afford to take the \$56,000,000 thus saved and apply it to the N. Y. A. and the C. C. C. to assist the needy and deserving youth of the land. [Applause.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Oklahoma is entitled to full credit for his activity and work in securing that particular cut having to do with the merchant marine, but may I say that it also took support from

the minority Members along with the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Oklahoma to get this cut in the subcommittee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman. I may say that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] was most helpful in bringing about the cut and I appreciate his suggestion; also his fine spirit of cooperation.

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HOUSTON. Bringing the figure down so that the man in the street may understand it, may I say that the \$56,000,000 saving that has been effected so far as the maritime item is concerned would pay the gentleman's salary as a Member of Congress for the next 600 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman, and I trust his statement may find its way to my constituents. Let me say to my good friend from Kansas that should I make a wish it would be that the able and active gentleman from Kansas, who believes in getting everything possible for Kansas, be permitted to remain in Congress the rest of his natural life. He is a good investment for Kansas. I mentioned the difficulty in cutting appropriations for the shipping interests only to show that we are economy-minded in reference to certain things but extremely liberal in regard to others. When it comes to the N. Y. A. or the C. C. C., which involves human lives, some of our self-admitted statesmen shrug their shoulders and immediately become economy-minded.

Young people are the most tragic victims of unemployment. The years between 18 and 25 are the time when their whole future is being shaped. This period when they are making the transition from childhood to adulthood is perhaps the most critical period in their lives. It is the time when they should be learning how to work, planning for their life occupation, planning for a home, for a family, and those things that make life meaningful to us.

Today in America there are 4,000,000 or more young people who are denied the chance to get their foot in the door of the adult world. They can make no plans for their careers, for homes and families because they are denied the chance to work. They want jobs, and they need jobs but there are no jobs available for them.

Of course, there are some who argue that young people do not want to work. Some self-admitted economy-minded statesmen contend that young people could get jobs if they wanted them; others have the audacity to say that the trouble with youth is that they are lazy and would not take a job if they could get it.

Those of us who contend that young people are just as ambitious as they ever were, and who say all youth needs is a chance, know that there are about 4,000,000 young men and young women actually looking for jobs. We contend that an increased appropriation for the National Youth Administration will give many of these young people the chance they need, a chance to which they are rightfully entitled.

Those who argue that youth are not willing to work ought to be able to show us 4,000,000 jobs standing vacant, waiting for someone to come along and fill them. It is easy to sit here in comfortable chairs and say youth do not want to work, but the tragedy of it all is there are mighty few jobs. If anyone wants to argue that young people do not want to work, let him show me where there is one vacant job, and I will bring a thousand deserving applicants.

In my office I have letters from hundreds of young people, fine, intelligent Americans—many of them with college education, many of them with considerable experience—all asking for jobs, any kind of jobs. Every Member of this Congress has similar letters from young people who need jobs. But I have yet to hear of the first case of any Congressman getting a letter from an employer saying that he had even one job that he could not fill.

We have all had young people come to our offices here in Washington and back in our districts looking for work, but

I have yet to hear of the first employer coming around asking for help in getting jobs filled.

All we have to do is draw on our own experience to know that this talk that youth do not want to work is plain bunk. Almost any week we can learn of how a hundred or even a thousand people waited in line all night for a chance at 10 jobs. Maybe those people were just staying up on those cold nights because they had insomnia, but it sounds to me like they wanted jobs and wanted them badly.

Right on that point I want to read from a report issued by the American Youth Commission, a non-Government and nonpartisan organization, headed by Owen D. Young, of General Electric—and I quote:

No good purpose can be served by blaming the young person who has not found a job for himself. The facts of arithmetic cannot be wished away. In the entire country a few thousand jobs probably are vacant because no competent applicant has appeared. Another few thousand chances probably exist for unusual young people to make their own jobs by starting new enterprises. But there are several million more young women who want to work than there are jobs available for them. The totals do not balance. The bright or the lucky get the jobs, but some will have to be left out until their elders who control the economic conditions of the country find some way to open the gates.

That report was signed, not by a radical or an impractical dreamer but by Owen D. Young, who heads one of our large business enterprises. That report was signed by Robert E. Wood, who heads Sears, Roebuck & Co. That report was signed by Henry I. Harriman, past president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. If there were jobs available in industry, if there were openings for young people which were going unfilled, you can bet your last dollar the heads of these big business enterprises would be the first to know about them. If private industry had enough jobs for youth, or if there were any place for our young people to turn, these business leaders would not have come out and recommended a Government youth program to cost over a billion and a half dollars a year; but that is precisely what they did.

At the present time there are about 300,000 out-of-school youth working on projects of the National Youth Administration—working and earning every dime they are paid. There are more than 300,000 additional young people certified as in need and eligible for N. Y. A. employment who are anxious to go to work but who cannot be employed because the National Youth Administration does not have the money. This is the time to expand this program. Any reduction below the present N. Y. A. appropriation of \$100,000,000 would be not only false economy but in my judgment would be taking blood money.

The young people employed on N. Y. A. work projects earn around \$16 a month, on the average. They come from our most desperately needy families and every dollar, every dime counts with them. If there were any jobs in private industry available they would go out and get them for the sake of the extra earnings. And whenever private jobs are available that is precisely what these N. Y. A. youth do. There is a turn-over of about 10 percent a month on N. Y. A. projects—or in other words a turn-over of around 100 percent a year. To put it another way the number of people who leave N. Y. A. projects in any year is roughly equal to the average number employed at any given time during that year.

This high turn-over rate is good evidence that young people are not making a career out of N. Y. A. jobs but that the National Youth Administration is helping to keep them afloat during that period of unemployment which occurs between the time they leave school and the time they are able to get jobs in industry or agriculture. Even better evidence that youth do want jobs, and do go out and get them when jobs are available, is the fact that between one-third and one-half of the young men and young women who leave N. Y. A. projects do so to take jobs in private industry.

Fitting young people for jobs in private industry by teaching them sound habits of work and giving them basic experience has been one of the outstanding achievements of

the National Youth Administration. Many thousands of the young men and young women of today are going to be better workers, better farmers, better parents, and better citizens because of the N. Y. A.

We are considering an appropriation bill and the matter of the cost of this program is of importance. This year the National Youth Administration is operating with an appropriation of \$100,000,000 and is maintaining an average monthly employment of 744,000 young people on its student and out-of-school programs. That figures out to a cost of \$135 per youth. The N. Y. A. is operating about 30,000 projects, employing on an average of 744,000 youth a month, and doing it with an administrative cost of \$5,000,000, or 5 percent, which is adequate testimony of the efficiency of this agency.

Some Members of Congress have raised the question of N. Y. A. extravagance and apparently think that this organization is spending too much money on our youth. The young men and young women employed on the student-work program come from families that have to live on \$667 a year. That is the amount for the entire family and it is less than \$1.85 a day. I do not know what the average annual family incomes of youth on the out-of-school program is but it is probably lower. If giving jobs to families who live on a budget of that kind, if putting a little purchasing power into their hands to keep body and soul together is waste, then Congress would do well to extend and encourage that brand of waste. Oh, no; that is not waste, but a mighty sound national investment. [Applause.]

The National Youth Administration, far from wasting money, is carrying on a program that is paying benefits far in excess of the dollars spent. N. Y. A. is building up the morale of our young people, preserving and developing their skills, it is cutting down juvenile delinquency, and enriching our communities and our Nation by new schools, new parks, new playgrounds, and thousands of other new facilities that benefit the general public.

In each State and in each community that the National Youth Administration operates a project the local people get the benefit. The young people benefit by having jobs and all that a job means. The local merchants benefit from the increased purchasing power as every dime these youths earn goes through the hands of the butcher or the grocer at some time or other. The whole community benefits from a new school, a new park, a new playground.

In my own State of Oklahoma the N. Y. A. has from the beginning done an outstanding job. Its program has been, and still is, constructive and popular. The recently appointed State director for Oklahoma, Mr. Bruce Carter, is doing an excellent job. He is a young man of vision and courage. He has the support of our people. But, of course, he cannot expand or even maintain the N. Y. A. program without funds.

During the past year in Oklahoma our young people employed on N. Y. A. projects constructed or improved over 3,000 playgrounds and 49 public buildings. These young people constructed or improved 21 swimming and wading pools, 64 athletic fields, and countless other new facilities. Each one of these projects, each one of these new facilities, is of great benefit to the community in which it was made available. At this point I would like to include in my remarks a statement of physical accomplishments by the National Youth Administration in Oklahoma during the last fiscal year.

This year the National Youth Administration is carrying on a program in Oklahoma that in January was providing jobs for 22,578 young people, 13,722 students, and 8,856 out-of-school youth.

A quick glance at the figures for Oklahoma shows the need for expanding the N. Y. A. program by increasing its appropriation rather than curtailing it. On January 5, there were 25,826 youth certified and awaiting assignment to N. Y. A. projects, as compared to 8,856 on N. Y. A. out-of-school projects, or three times as many youth needing such

employment as were employed. In addition, there were 35,000 other youth in need of N. Y. A. jobs, although not certified, or a total of 60,826 needy youth in Oklahoma, about three times as many as were employed on the N. Y. A. student and out-of-school programs together. At this point I would like to include in my remarks a statement showing current N. Y. A. operations in Oklahoma.

It is our responsibility to provide our youth with the chance to live and to become part of our living world. It is our duty to our Nation's welfare, the present and the future welfare of the United States, to give our young people the opportunity to earn a livelihood by their own work. The best way we can do that is by increasing the National Youth Administration appropriation.

Report of work completed on N. Y. A. projects, year ending June 30, 1939, State of Oklahoma

Activity	Unit of measurement	Amount constructed, repaired, or improved
Public buildings	Number	49
Sidewalks	Linear feet	9,475
Culverts	Number	53
Curbs, gutters, and guardrails	Linear feet	607
Landscaping of grounds	Acres	1,290
Fencing	Linear feet	17,180
Street signs and markers	Number	9,591
Airway markers	Number	300
Parks	Acres	2,937
Fair and rodeo grounds	Acres	50
Playgrounds	Number	3,022
Swimming and wading pools	Number	21
Baseball, football, and athletic fields	Number	64
Outdoor fireplaces, council rings, and permanent tent floors	Number	35
Refuse burners	Number	34
Storage and check dams	Number	43
River-bank and stream-bed improvements	Linear feet	1,027
Levees and retaining walls	Linear feet	2,428
Soil-erosion control	Acres treated	3,335
Trees planted	Number	3,488
Plant and tree nurseries	Number	14
Bird and game sanctuaries	Number	1
Fish hatcheries	Number	2
Clothing	Number of articles	16,737
Shoes repaired	Pairs	6,170
Bedding and household articles	Number of articles	7,960
School furniture	Number of articles	10,838
Other furniture	Number of articles	3,144
Recreational equipment and toys	Number of articles	1,795
Mechanical equipment and tools	Number of articles	163
Stone, sand, and gravel produced	Cubic yards	1,080
School lunches served	Number	107,804
Foodstuffs produced on resident projects	Pounds	112,906
Canning and preserving	Pounds	16,040
Books renovated or repaired	Number	8,390

Summary of current operations in Oklahoma
EMPLOYMENT

Program	Number of youth employed January 1940		
	Total	Male	Female
All programs	22,578	12,462	10,116
Out-of-school work program	8,856	5,744	3,112
Student work program	13,722	6,718	7,004
School work program	10,711	5,138	5,573
College and graduate work program	3,011	1,580	1,431
Number of youth certified and awaiting assignment, Jan. 5, 1940			25,826
Estimated number of needy youth not certified, Jan. 5, 1940			35,000
Total unassigned needy youth			60,826
EMPLOYMENT BY TYPE OF PROJECT, JANUARY 1940—NUMBER OF PERSONS			
Grand total			9,163
Total number of youth			8,856
Highway, road, and street			188
Improvement of grounds			116
Public buildings			2,006
Recreational facilities			31
Conservation and sanitation			157
Clerical and service projects			1,234
Professional assistance projects			78

Summary of current operations in Oklahoma—Continued

Number of youth—Continued.	
Workshops	1,851
Sewing	63
Miscellaneous production	19
Resident training centers	2,321
School lunches, nursery schools, and homemaking	699
Projects not elsewhere classified	93
Supervisors	307
FUNDS ALLOTTED, 1939-40	
Total	\$2,349,633
Out-of-school work program	1,639,601
Student work program	710,032
School work program	365,502
College and graduate work program	344,530
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDENT WORK PROGRAM	
Total	996
Schools	949
Colleges and universities	47

AVERAGE MONTHLY EARNINGS

Out-of-school work program:	
Youth employees	\$15.05
Supervisors	106.82
Student work program:	
School	3.65
College and graduate	12.04

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman very much. I have consumed more time than I had intended.

It had been my purpose to discuss in some detail a report of a committee called in Washington last December by Federal Security Administrator Paul V. McNutt, which conference I attended. It was one of the most interesting and thought-provoking conferences held in Washington in many years. It was attended by some of the leading businessmen and financiers of the country. Also, some of the outstanding educators were present. I was deeply impressed by their very earnest discussion. After days of discussions and the compiling of a vast amount of authentic information, that conference appointed a committee to make its report to Congress and the country. Those serious-minded businessmen did not ask for a hundred million dollars or \$125,000,000, a figure that some of our self-admitted economy-minded statesmen seem to think is so unreasonably high. But those conservative gentlemen have reported to us that this Congress should make available funds in the amount of at least \$200,000,000 for the N. Y. A. next year.

That important report of disinterested businessmen and educators adds that such a sum would not only permit the N. Y. A. student work program to continue at an increased level but would permit the employment of the 300,000 youths who are now certified as unemployed, out of school, and in need.

That report further states, and I quote now from it verbatim:

If the appropriation proposed for the National Youth Administration for the fiscal year 1940-41 is adopted it will be necessary to reduce by 30 percent the funds devoted to aid for students in high schools and colleges and to reduce by at least 10 percent the employment of youths on out-of-school work.

This important report adds finally that a reduction in the appropriation for the National Youth Administration will be nothing less than a disaster. We must prevent that disaster. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Houston].

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations which conducted hearings on Federal Security Agency Budget estimates, I wish to say a few words about the United States Office of Education and its work.

Congress, in 1867, established the Office of Education—

For the purpose of collecting such statistics and facts as shall show the condition and progress of education in the several States and Territories, and of diffusing such information respecting the organization and management of schools and school systems, and methods of teaching, as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems, and otherwise promote the cause of education throughout the country.

For more than 70 years teachers and school officials and the general public have looked to the United States Office of Education for Federal Government service in educational matters. Just as the American farmer looks to the Department of Agriculture for assistance, and as the medical man depends upon the assistance of the Public Health Service, so those interested in our schools and in improved educational programs for our children, young people, and our adult citizens have learned to regard the United States Office of Education as their educational service agency in the Federal Government.

I have been quite impressed with the many types of service this office is called upon to provide. Yet I suppose we cannot expect anything else since American education itself is probably our Nation's largest and most important business.

United States Office of Education statistics reveal that there are more than 33,000,000 men, women, and children who go to school in the United States. That means that 1 of every 4 Americans goes to some kind of school at some time each day.

Surely an activity in which so many of our fellows participate, an activity which reaches into every community in our Nation, would produce thousands of problems. Some of these problems can be solved locally. Others are and can be attacked on a State basis. Many educational problems are of national significance, however. These problems also frequently call for solution and can be solved most effectively only by the Nation's educational service agency which is the United States Office of Education.

In cooperation with national, State, and local organizations of various kinds, working with State departments of education, city and county school systems, superintendents of schools, colleges, and universities, and teachers, the United States Office of Education does its work.

Its specialists in the major fields of education, all selected from civil-service rolls, study educational problems. Results of their research, with recommendations or proposals are made available to teachers, school officials, librarians, and to the public through Office of Education publications and in other ways.

In addition the United States Office of Education makes special surveys upon request. In this connection may I point out that of more than 1,000 recommendations in surveys of higher education made by the Office of Education, 70 percent have been carried out in full or in part by the States or colleges and universities concerned.

Many Office of Education responsibilities have developed from conferences held locally, regionally, or nationally, to consider problems of educational and social significance. Conferences called by the Office of Education bring together leaders in education and in other fields for group thinking. Frequently these leaders suggest the types and extent of cooperation that this Federal agency may offer.

During the past 3 or 4 years United States Office of Education conferences have considered such important problems as the out-of-school, out-of-work youth, conservation education, vocational guidance of Negroes, crime prevention through education, C. C. C. camp education, adult civic education, school records and reports, trade and industrial education, elementary and secondary education. They have discussed the education of physically handicapped children, consumer education, and vocational education. Regional conferences on school-building problems, State school statistics, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation have been held.

John W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education, emphasized, in his presentation of Office of Education budget estimates to the House Subcommittee on Appropriations that the Office of Education has vigorously focused its program during the past few years on types of education designed to help our people meet some of the crucial social

and economic issues. It has also assisted emergency programs directly engaged in meeting emergency issues.

United States Office of Education specialists, for example, helped to launch the emergency-education program—a program that has provided funds to repair thousands of school buildings and has given assistance to schools and educational classes for millions of Americans.

It drafted the initial plans for the student-aid service of the National Youth Administration program.

It planned, and is now directing, the educational programs in our Nation's C. C. C. camps.

It has sponsored locally administered demonstrations of public forums for the discussion of social, political, and economic problems in about 600 communities in practically all of the States. This activity has led to a greater appreciation of our freedoms—freedom of speech and learning. It is the democratic process in action.

The United States Office of Education has successfully shown how radio can be used most effectively for education. In a strictly nonpartisan spirit, series of programs, such as Let Freedom Ring, Americans All—Immigrants All, and Democracy in Action, have emphasized the work and importance of our form of government, have promoted tolerance and international good will, and have stimulated a more meaningful appreciation for the freedoms which are ours under the Constitution.

A recently established occupational information and guidance service in the United States Office of Education helps youths and adults who seek or need counsel and employments.

Through committees representative of labor, employers, and vocational education the Office has improved programs of vocational education carried on with Federal funds.

An Office of Education Library Service Division helps public and school libraries to provide better educational service.

Here is an office that provides Federal service which is needed in every community of our country.

An experimental program designed to give emphasis to the development of community programs for education in home and family living has been initiated in Wichita, Kans. The purpose of these cooperative programs is to enrich the educational offerings in home and family living, to implement the democratic process through educational procedures, and to make available to other communities possible procedures in developing similar programs.

The objectives of the Wichita program are as follows:

First. To evaluate present contributions toward family life education from all organizations and agencies.

Second. To develop an awareness of family life as it now exists in the community and opportunities for further enrichment of family life.

Third. To correlate programs of family life education within and without the schools.

Fourth. To integrate education for family life for all age levels.

Fifth. To stimulate increased interest in family life education.

Sixth. To stimulate individuals to assume responsibility for bringing about improved conditions.

Seventh. To develop procedures for evaluating progress in the program.

A report on developments during the past 9 months in the Wichita community program shows that the garden clubs and the chamber of commerce cooperated with the elementary schools, making it possible for elementary-school children to purchase small red-bud trees so that they might participate in last spring's city-wide beautification project.

The recreation director of the city park board cooperated with the parent-education leaders in acquainting families with the free facilities available within the city for inexpensive family recreation; for example, new picnic areas in the parks, improved swimming-pool facilities, and summer concerts.

Four of the leaders for adult parent education classes were employed part time during the summer months, and secured the cooperation of 134 women who gave of their time and cars

in transporting a large group of physically under-par children to the sunshine camp maintain by the park board.

Three classes for household employees were cooperatively provided by the vocational-education division of the public schools, and the public gas and electric light company.

A self-help community center for marginal income or relief families has been developed in the southwest part of the city through the cooperative efforts of the Lend-a-Hand Club of Friends University, and the family life education council. The families recondition clothing and furniture which they can purchase through their work hours. A nursery is maintained for their small children, and child care and guidance is taught to the parents by the person in charge of the children. This undertaking has been so enthusiastically reported by the families who have earned membership in the community center that representatives from about 30 Negro organizations have formed an advisory council, and are organizing a similar community center for the use of Negro families.

Adult classes include work in parent education. There are classes organized in connection with practically all of the public schools in the city. In addition, classes are formed for parents of crippled children and for grandparents.

There are also adult classes in home improvement, food buying, clothing, and consumer education.

The homemaking teachers are making careful study of the courses in junior and senior high school in an attempt to make them more practical, and to better enable young people to assume their responsibilities in the family.

It is not only necessary in our democracy that we provide school facilities but that we do everything possible to make our schools and educational programs equal to the needs of modern times.

We require education to prepare the individual for self-support, for creative work, and to prepare him for intelligent citizenship. Without this preparation the individual will not long respect our democratic ideals and institutions.

The United States Office of Education in many ways is helping the States and local communities to make their educational programs more effective. Through a vigorous promotion of American education, this Office is making a great contribution to American democracy. [Applause.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

SUPPORT THE C. C. C. AND N. Y. A.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have consistently endeavored to support a program which would result in achieving some economies in the operation of our Federal Government. I believe most all of us in and out of the Congress have come to the conclusion that we must begin to make retrenchments and curtail costs of government in order not only to do away with the continuing of deficit spending but also to arrive at that point where we may live within our income. After 7 years we are no nearer that goal than we were in the beginning. However, I am not of the opinion that we should attempt to make these savings at the expense of the youth of our country.

There are 500,000 young men and women each year entering manhood and womanhood and going out into the world, many of them with diplomas, seeking a foothold in the industrial and professional life of our country. They seek in vain. There are no openings for them. Many of them are becoming discouraged. Some of them, as we have had reason to learn recently here in Washington, are critical of our democratic processes, and are beginning to question whether our American way will work after all. There are 2 outstanding agencies which we have been carrying forward in an endeavor to help the youth of our Nation—namely, the Civilian Conservation Corps camps, and the National Youth Administration program.

Mr. Chairman, there are 4,000,000 youth in America 18 to 24 years of age unemployed and not in school. It is reported the N. Y. A. costs on an average \$268 per year per student. This bill reduces the appropriation from \$100,000,000 last fiscal year to \$85,000,000 for the ensuing year. This will leave 123,000 youth out of the program. There are now 300,000 certified who cannot be enrolled under the \$100,000,000 appropriation.

Would it not be better statesmanship to leave out a battleship costing \$100,000,000 or a cruiser or two or a few bombers and save our youth from despair and a career of crime?

The plan seems to be now to postpone our defense program and let England and France have our aircraft now being built. If so, why appropriate the money now? They will be outmoded by the time we construct them. Better forego a few such craft and save our boys.

There is an excessive overhead in the C. C. C. administration. High-salaried political employees are securing the money appropriated and the boys are left out of the program. This should be stopped at once and the money spent on the boys themselves. An examination of the record shows the large number of these political employees receiving high salaries. It is significant to note the States from which they come.

In my own western area of the United States, as you well know, we have vast forest areas. The United States is the owner in fee of much of these forest lands. The C. C. C. camps, in the main, are located in these areas in the West, and have been doing a most excellent work in trail and road building, clearing away fire hazards, working in fire patrol, and generally carrying on a constructive program resulting in adding values to our forest areas, and, at the same time, building up and conserving our natural resources.

I have received numerous protests from districts all over the State of Oregon urging that none of the C. C. C. camps be discontinued. I feel that it would be a grievous mistake to discontinue them, not only by reason of the values we are receiving from the moneys expended in the prosecution of this program, but also, in the moral and educational values we are implanting in the youth of our country. Many of them we are taking from the streets where they have had no opportunity for educational or cultural advancement, and with no opportunity to make their own way. They are brought into a wholesome atmosphere out in the broad expanses of our timbered areas in our western country, and are imbued with new energy and new opportunity and a new outlook on life. They are not only broadened in the mental and moral horizon, but they are restored in vigor and health and put on the road to becoming useful citizens.

The same is true with respect to the N. Y. A. program, except that they are not placed in the out of doors, but are given wholesome work to do in a practical way and are educating themselves in schools at a small expense which will return the investment manyfold to our Nation in after years when these young people become a part of the citizenry of the Nation upon whom we must depend to defend our democratic processes.

Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks and to include a report I received last year from Dean Onthank of the University of Oregon giving in some detail the results of the N. Y. A. work in the university.

The report is as follows:

Dean Onthank's letter referred to is as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
Eugene, June 9, 1939.

Mr. HOMER ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR HOMER: I don't often bother our delegation at Washington. It occurs to me, however, that you might be interested in knowing directly what happens with the National Youth Administration money which is allotted at the University of Oregon, since Congress appropriates for the National Youth Administration and will, I infer, be asked to do so again before long.

We received this last academic year a total of \$33,075. Grants were made to students in varying amounts, but rarely exceeding \$15 a month, and averaging approximately \$11 during the 9-month period. Appointments of students to receive the work grants are made term by term. Between 300 and 325 students were aided thereby each term. About half the students on the list received aid all three terms, many only one term. Students to receive the aid are selected primarily on a basis of necessity for aid in order to stay in college. By that I mean at minimum standards of living, such as are maintained in the student cooperative living groups. National Youth Administration money emphatically does not pay fraternity dues or extravagances of any kind. Students are selected to receive aid secondarily on a basis of quality of university work. The competition for the available places is so keen that we are compelled to select among those whose need is unmistakable.

Naturally the selection is made on a basis of performance in the university or, in the case of new students, of previous school record. No student is selected who is not average with respect to the whole student body, and students above freshman level rarely get on unless they are in the upper quarter of the student body. That means the National Youth Administration is helping a superior group of students to stay in college and do successful work.

The fact that National Youth Administration students are doing not only successful work but outstanding work is evident from the enclosed documents. Enclosure No. 1, which presents the grades of undergraduate students, as compared with the total undergraduate enrollment at the university, shows, as you will see, in the last two columns, that National Youth Administration students get from 8 to 10 times their share of places on the honor roll, as compared with the student body as a whole. Of the students making straight A grades, from one-third to one-half are National Youth Administration students, notwithstanding the fact that they are handicapped by the outside work that they have to do. The second document, a list of scholarships and other distinctions won by National Youth Administration students, shows that they are outstanding not only in scholarship but in a variety of other competitions. Last spring the Koyl cup, going to the most outstanding student at the end of the junior year and the equivalent Gerlinger cup going to women, although not listed here because the girl at the time was not on the National Youth Administration, went to a girl who had been on the National Youth Administration but had been so outstanding that she had been awarded a special scholarship, so had been spared the necessity for doing National Youth Administration work during her junior year. The fact that the two outstanding juniors in the whole university were, in effect, able to stay in college and win the honor by means of National Youth Administration is not without some significance.

I am stressing this point somewhat, because I have heard it said that National Youth Administration aid is given indiscriminately or even as a means of subsidizing athletes. I have no objections to helping athletes, but what help they get from National Youth Administration is gotten on their own merits in competition with others. Relatively few do get help from this source, however much they may get from other sources.

Though the primary purpose of N. Y. A. is to help deserving and able students, the fact that the university is benefited greatly from the help given by N. Y. A. students. The university is spending as much as it ever did from its own funds for student help; but with the increasing pressure on faculty members for off-campus services, the assistance in reading papers and in laboratory and studio has released them very helpfully from some of their routine work for higher-level services. Incidentally, the experience has been a very wholesome and profitable one for the students themselves, apart from the money they have earned. The majority of them are doing jobs in the field in which they are definitely interested and expect some day to practice. The testimony is nearly unanimous that they not only earn their money, but that they are getting a very valuable vocational experience besides.

We are in the process of getting out the annual report of the committee which administers college aid for the University of Oregon. This is a rather detailed report, but if you care to have a copy I will send you one. If you have any questions or comments on this somewhat general statement, I will be very glad to have them. I know you are not unfamiliar with what is going on now, but it occurs to me that you might like to have such items as I have enclosed since it is more specific information than is likely to come to you otherwise.

Sincerely,

KARL W. ONTHANK.

Report of honor grades of undergraduate National Youth Administration students as compared with total undergraduate enrollment at University of Oregon

Term and year	Total university enrollment	Number of students on National Youth Administration	Number of National Youth Administration students on honor roll	Number of total enrollment on honor roll	Percent of National Youth Administration students on honor roll	Percent of total enrollment on honor roll	Percent of total honor-roll students on National Youth Administration
Fall, 1937.....	3,120	280	31	117	11.0	3.75	26.5
Winter, 1938.....	2,037	280	50	143	17.7	4.7	34.9
Spring, 1938.....	2,870	263	27	153	17.8	4.9	30.7
Fall, 1938.....	3,334	311	42	129	13.5	3.9	32.6
Winter, 1939.....	3,194	319	42	136	13.1	4.2	30.9

Out of 7 students making straight A grades, spring term, 1938, 2 were National Youth Administration students.

Out of 14 students making straight A grades, fall term, 1938, 5 were National Youth Administration students.

Out of 13 students making straight A grades, winter term, 1939, 6 were National Youth Administration students.

LIST OF SOME OF THE SCHOLARSHIPS AND OTHER DISTINCTIONS WON BY N. Y. A. STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, 1938-39

State-board fee scholarships: Won by 44 students out of 69 awards.

Oregon mothers' scholarship: Won by Nisma Banta, Betty Gregg, out of three awards. (Aida Brun, Benson Matess, 1937-38. Tom Turner, 1935-36.)

Phi Beta scholarships: Won by Rebecca Anderson, Harriett Douglass.

Associated women students' scholarships: Won by eight girls out of eight awards.

Gertrude Watson Holman Memorial Fund: Won by Gladys Saunders, Ruth Tawney.

Pan-Hellenic scholarships: Won by four girls out of eight awards.

Spinsters' Club scholarship, awarded annually to a Eugene girl on basis of scholarship, ability, and worthiness: Won by Mary Catherine Soranson. (Joan Murphy, 1939-40.)

Sigma Delta Chi scholarship, awarded to outstanding man in Journalism: Won by James Brinton out of four awards.

W. F. Jewett prizes: \$10 award for forensic excellence won by Florence Sanders; second prize, \$10, intersectional speech contest, won by Jean Banning; second prize, \$10, poetry-reading contest, section 1, won by Peter Chiolero; second prize, \$10, poetry-reading contest, section 2, won by Shirlee McCarter; third prize, \$5, after-dinner speech contest, won by Harrington Harlow; first prize, \$25, oratorical contest, won by John Blankenship.

Koyl cup, 1938, awarded to most outstanding, all-around junior man: Won by Zane Kemler, 1938.

Second prize, best student-owned personal library: Won by Glenn Hasselroth.

Best poster designed to stimulate reading of books: Won by Alice Mueller.

Beta Gamma Sigma award to freshman major in business administration having highest scholastic average for the year: Won by Lois Irene Lee.

Botsford-Constantine-Gardner contest, second prize, for solution of an advertising problem, won by Betty Wagner.

German Government award of several volumes on German cultural history, for outstanding work in German, won by Mary E. Hughes.

French Government award (1938) to student ranking highest in undergraduate French study, won by Marion Fuller, 1938.

Twenty-five-dollar prize to undergraduate student submitting best essay on a philosophical topic, won by John Richard Benson Mates.

Pi Delta Phi award of book prize to graduating senior who has made greatest progress in advanced undergraduate courses in French, won by Maxine M. Winniford.

Scabbard and Blade freshman medal to outstanding freshman in each company, won by Harry T. Finnell out of seven awards.

Officer's saber awarded to outstanding junior in military science, won by William B. Rosson.

Marshall-Case-Haycox short-story contest: First prize, Margaret Dick; second prize, Jane Dachtelberg; first prize, 1938, George Stephenson.

Alpha Kappa Psi award, 1938, for highest scholastic standing among juniors in school of business administration, won by Luther Siebert, 1938.

Mortarboard scholarships, won by three girls out of three awards.

Phi Beta Kappa membership: Marion Fuller (1938), Ben J. Winer (senior 6), Betty Brown (senior 6) (1937), Thomas T. Turner, Fred Raser, Mary C. Soranson, and George W. Stephenson (5 out of 20 elected during 1938-39).

Theta Sigma Phi, selection of two most outstanding freshmen women in journalism, won by Nisma Banta.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, this report is a plain factual recital which evidences the fact that this work is worth while. It is interesting to note from the report of Dean Onthank that grants rarely exceeded \$15 a month per boy over the period covered, and averaged approximately \$11 during the 9-month school period. Between 300 and 325 students out of a total registration in excess of 3,000 were aided by this fund each term, and about half of this group of students received aid all three terms; many, however, were receiving aid only one term. This small monthly payment is not used for extravagances, but to cover the necessary living and other similar expenses of the student. They show themselves to be a superior group of students, as shown by the rewards they received. In the group of students referred to by Dean Onthank, the N. Y. A. students had 13.1 percent of their number on the honor roll, whereas the total enrollment there was only 4.2 percent on the honor roll. Although the number of the N. Y. A. students was 10 percent of the total registration, 30.9 percent of all honor-roll students were taken from their number.

I hope that this committee and the House will restore to the bill the appropriations that were allowed in the last fiscal year for these two activities.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK].

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, the present appropriations bill before the House recommends \$85,000,000 for the National Youth Administration which is \$15,000,000 below what they had last year. Under the appropriations for 1940 they were able to care for 780,000 youths in the United States. If the present recommendation of \$85,000,000 is not increased it will mean 125,000 youths will not receive any aid during the fiscal year of 1941.

The average cost per youth, including the administering of the act, is approximately \$11 per month, which seems to me to be a very reasonable amount.

I feel it would be false economy to save \$15,000,000 at the expense of the youth of this country. For that reason I am going to support an amendment to increase the appropriations for the N. Y. A. to \$100,000,000 which I hope will meet with the approval of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I esteem it a great privilege to support the program advocated by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]. I think that the appropriation for the National Youth Administration and for the support of the C. C. C. is one of the great measures of conservation. We are conserving one of the greatest resources we have in educating the youth of this country, and it has been very encouraging in this period of depression, when so many of the youth of the country are denied an opportunity for education, that the strong arm of the Government has reached out through the National Youth Administration to help these young people and has appropriated money to the very people it intends to assist. This appropriation goes direct to assist the youth of the country, the young men, the boys, and the young girls, who have failed to obtain an opportunity for education. They are now given an opportunity to work their way through school by the assistance of the National Youth Administration. Out in my State we are doing wonderful things with the money made available by the appropriations for the N. Y. A. We have schools out there that are taking up these young boys from the local groups and young women and educating them, and giving them qualifications so that they may go forth in the world and make their way and obtain better positions. We have reached a time in the conduct of the business of the Government, in the conduct of the business of private companies, when an education is absolutely a necessity. One of the most pathetic things a Congressman has to deal with is an attempt to assist young people who aspire to better positions, to make up for the deficiencies of an imperfect education.

The files of the congressional offices are full of letters seeking the assistance of Congressmen to help them overcome these deficiencies.

I desire to read certain telegrams and letters that have come to me in support of this legislation. I am in favor of and will support restoration of the full amount of the appropriation for the National Youth Administration and the C. C. C.

I will read a telegram from President Dale, of the University of Idaho, under date of March 16:

MOSCOW, IDAHO, March 16, 1940.

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Washington, D. C.:

Since college rules, regulations, and fees not ordinarily changed within single college generation, proposed drastic N. Y. A. cut most deplorable. Even partially shutting N. Y. A. door at this time simply means termination of ambition of many boys and girls already enrolled in our institution who possess promising intellectual qualification but would find themselves entirely without resources if N. Y. A. reduced. This program has profound social

implications, and bears directly on national welfare. Urge your support full restoration present N. Y. A. appropriation, where every dollar counts tremendously.

HARRIS DALE,
President, University of Idaho.

I have a letter from the head of the Boise Junior College, at Boise, Idaho:

BOISE JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Boise, Idaho, March 9, 1940.

Representative COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: It is my understanding that the college-aid program of the National Youth Administration is to be cut 16.6 percent for the coming year. This program has proved invaluable to the young people above high school, and has enabled them to go on to college when such would not be possible were they denied this opportunity to earn their way as they secure their education.

We have excellent young people at the Boise Junior College earning their way by jobs assigned to them in and around the college, who would not be able to go to school otherwise. These young people cannot find jobs in this region, and if the college-aid program of the National Youth Administration were discontinued, the only alternative open to them would be to lie around home, become dissatisfied, and eventually prove a social problem to their community and the Government.

I think that the few dollars spent on N. Y. A. will prove of exceptional worth to the American Nation. We are taking young people, helping them find a way out, keeping up their morale, and thus developing full-rounded personalities, able to battle their way through the complexities of life. It is my measured judgment that the money spent for N. Y. A. by the Federal Government will be repaid tenfold by the type of a citizen that Government has during the coming generation.

I hope that you can see fit to support this National Youth Administration program, and I shall be glad to furnish any data that may help you to understand how it works here in Idaho.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE B. CHAFFEE, President.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the committee has reported the full amount recommended by the President and his Budget?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. That is my understanding, but I understand that the Budget cut the amount \$15,000,000.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman understands also that the President, in recommending his Budget to the Congress, recommended that cut of \$15,000,000?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I understand that the Bureau of the Budget made such a recommendation. I want to say to the gentleman it is my idea that it lies with this House of Representatives to determine which is the most meritorious and the most important items in an appropriation bill, and lend full measure of support to those items.

Mr. KEEFE. I was just wondering, having heard the gentleman urge support of the President on many occasions, whether or not he is departing from his usual support of the President in this instance?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I think the President has been 100-percent right on many occasions, but when I disagree with the President, I am willing to stand by my own judgment.

Mr. KEEFE. And in this case the gentleman thinks the President is wrong?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. It is my judgment that we are here conserving one of the greatest assets which the Nation has, namely, the youth of this Nation.

Mr. KEEFE. I heartily agree with the gentleman's conclusion in that regard, but responsibility for the cut ought to be placed by the gentleman where it belongs, not on the Appropriations Committee or the subcommittee, but exactly where it belongs, on the Budget which the President submitted.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. It is the opinion of the gentleman from Idaho that responsibility for making appropriations rests primarily with the Appropriations Committee and the great House of Representatives, by advice of the President of the United States. I do not concede that any bureau, call it Budget or otherwise, supersedes the functions of the great Committee on Appropriations. That is my position.

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

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Idaho will recollect that the N. Y. A. came into being under the present administration against the opposition of the Republican Party at that time, and the gentleman from Idaho, as I understand it, is not only with the President, but the gentleman from Idaho feels that the appropriation should go further, having in mind particularly the fact that this is one of the most meritorious activities engaged in in this emergency, and that it has been tremendously successful.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. It has; and the gentleman has stated the position correctly.

I want to read a letter from the superintendent of public instruction of the State of Idaho:

SALMON, IDAHO, March 16, 1940.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress:

Urge you oppose any reduction in appropriation for National Youth Administration. This has been very beneficial to Idaho underprivileged children.

ALLEN C. MERRITT,
State Committeeman.
(Former Idaho State Commissioner of Public Works.)

PETITION FOR INCREASED N. Y. A. APPROPRIATIONS

Whereas 106,000 American youth will be denied the opportunity for education fitting them to take their places as useful citizens in our society by the Budget at present up for consideration before the Congress of the United States, which will cut \$15,000,000 off the appropriation for the National Youth Administration, we, as young people of the State of Idaho and citizens of the United States, protest this cut as a measure of unwise economy. According to a recent survey, 59 percent of American youth desire more vocational guidance and training. The only place where this guidance and training can be had at present is the N. Y. A. program. We regard the continuance of this program of preparing American youth for effective, constructive citizenship as useful members of our society a vital program to the future of this Nation. Therefore, as the only proven practical method of providing this training, we ask that increased N. Y. A. appropriations be made as the best national defense and for the prevention of poverty and crime.

IDAHO YOUTH CLUB.

I have read the above resolution of the Idaho Youth Club and understand its significance and great importance to me; I therefore concur in this resolution and petition Congress to grant the additional funds asked for N. Y. A.

Signed by 420 members of the Idaho Youth Club.

WEISER, IDAHO, March 15, 1940.

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Congressional Office Building:

We urge strongly you use your influence to keep N. Y. A. school at Weiser operating at same high level. This is one Government activity that meets with the approval of a big majority of the people.

JOHN FAGERSTED.

REXBURG, IDAHO, March 16, 1940.

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Representative:

Sentiment here overwhelmingly favors continuance of N. Y. A. program without curtailments.

D. W. NELSON,
Chairman, Madison County Democrats.

OROFINO, IDAHO, March 19, 1940.

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge N. Y. A. appropriation not be reduced for next year as we believe this program does a great deal for youth.

J. L. HOUX.

NAMPA, IDAHO, March 16, 1940.

Congressman COMPTON I. WHITE,
Washington, D. C.:

Referring to appropriation bill for N. Y. A. We, the people of Nampa, would like very much to see this program continued for 1940 and 1941 without any decrease in funds. This program is accomplishing a great deal for our youth. Thanking you for your trouble.

Mayor Ben H. WAIGAND.

BOISE, IDAHO, March 16, 1940.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The members of the Idaho State Library Commission are wholeheartedly in favor of N. Y. A. program. Value has been felt not only

in State library but in practically every library in Idaho. Would be pleased to see appropriation for this national program maintained at present figures or increased.

J. W. TAYLOR.
J. W. CONDIE.
GEO. H. CURTIS.

EMMETT, IDAHO, March 16, 1940.

COMPTON I. WHITE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Reduction of funds for N. Y. A. and student aid here would work great hardship on 50 high-school pupils and 25 other homes from which N. Y. A. help comes. This Federal aid has been very valuable to this entire valley. Your help before committee appreciated.

M. M. VAN PATTEN,
Superintendent of Schools.

LEWISTON, IDAHO, March 16, 1940.

Congressman COMPTON I. WHITE,
Washington, D. C.:

Lewiston State Normal School strongly urges your support to continue N. Y. A. appropriation on the present basis. Many youths in this section would be unable to continue their education without this help.

J. E. TURNER, President.

BONNERS FERRY, IDAHO, March 17, 1940.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
United States Representative,

Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned citizens and voters of Boundary County, Bonners Ferry, Idaho, hereby petition you to do all you can in getting the N. Y. A. appropriation for the coming year. We would like at least the same amount of money. H. B. Kinnear, Inez L. Cave, Daisy Kelly, Alice E. Leslie, E. B. Schelette, M. D. Pace, R. L. Soderling, Harry Walden, W. J. Nixon, H. M. MacNamara.

Thanking you sincerely,

ALICE E. LESLIE,
County Superintendent of Schools.

GEM COUNTY DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
Emmett, Idaho, February 12, 1940.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
United States Representative,

Washington, D. C.:

DEAR MR. WHITE: I wish to call to your particular attention the National Youth Administration. We, the people of Emmett and of Idaho, feel that a great deal of good is being accomplished for our young folks by this program. Our boys and girls are being given opportunities by the National Youth Administration which is undoubtedly worth more than the actual dollars and cents which it is costing. Our youth of today are going to be our leaders of tomorrow. If we can teach them to be good leaders and install in them a feeling of confidence, good citizenship, honesty, etc., and at the same time teach them to be self-supporting, I believe we have really done something.

We hope that you will be able to support this measure. I would also like to mention the fact that I believe the general public, Republicans as well as Democrats, look upon the National Youth Administration as a nonpartisan measure and feel that it is very worth while.

With best personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD V. EATON,
State Committeeman.

RICHARDS & HAGA,
Boise, Idaho, March 15, 1940.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Re: Appropriation for National Youth Administration.

DEAR MR. WHITE: I understand that it is proposed to reduce the appropriation for the National Youth Administration.

I think that organization is doing fine work in assisting the sons and daughters of poor people to acquire a sufficient education to meet the needs of the times and to make them self-sustaining. I happen to know the work that is being done in this part of the State. Several of these boys and girls are attending the Boise Junior College, and except for the assistance they get from the National Youth Administration they would not be able to do so.

I hope cuts in appropriations may be made in connection with matters that are not so important and vital as the education of our young people.

Regards.

Sincerely yours,

OLIVER O. HAGA.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND BOARD OF REGENTS,
UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO,
Boise, March 16, 1940.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITE: Inasmuch as the N. Y. A. Federal appropriation bill is now up before Congress for consideration, I wish to lend my endorsement to this very fine program that has been carried on in Idaho during the past few years.

I feel sure that hundreds of young people have had an opportunity to attend school and find desirable employment through the

agency of the N. Y. A. who never have otherwise received these privileges.

We are hopeful that Congress will not see fit to reduce the appropriation below what it was the last year.

Anything that you can do to secure this appropriation will be greatly appreciated by the educators of Idaho.

Yours very truly,

J. W. CONDIE,

State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Under permission to revise and extend these remarks in the RECORD at this point, I insert a telegram from former Idaho State Commissioner of Public Works Allen C. Merritt, and a copy of a petition which I have received from the Idaho Youth Club, signed by some 420 members, and referred to the House Committee on Appropriations, together with the following telegrams and letters from prominent businessmen and educational leaders of Idaho.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein certain telegrams, letters, and communications received in support of this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho will have to obtain permission in the House to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. This goes to the matters considered by this Committee and is entirely relevant to the issue before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Permission to include telegrams and letters may not be obtained in Committee of the Whole. The gentleman will have to prefer his request in the House after the Committee rises.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to correct an impression left in the RECORD by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], who indicated in his statement that the N. Y. A. was created despite the objections of the Republican Party. I do not think the gentleman, who is usually very sincere and very honest, intends to leave that impression as a fact. The fact is that the N. Y. A. was created by the President of the United States by Executive order, through the allocation of funds in 1936 out of the relief appropriations made by Congress. It seems to me that to leave the impression that the original creation of the N. Y. A. was fought by the Republican Party is leaving an impression that does not accord with the facts in the case.

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

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. What the gentleman says, from a historical angle, is true, but there are other facts involved.

The Republican Party in the main has always opposed W. P. A. appropriations. Last year 98 percent of the Republican membership, with a combination of 30 or 40 Democrats, massacred the W. P. A. appropriation bill, and you are going to try and do it again this year.

Mr. KEEFE. I presume the gentleman is the authority for the statement I heard over the radio from a news commentator the other night that the Republican Party is fighting the N. Y. A. I want to say for the benefit of the gentleman from Massachusetts that here stand the two Republican members of the subcommittee that has this appropriation in charge, and these Republican members intend to vote for the N. Y. A. appropriation. I think the gentleman's innuendo and insinuation is absolutely wrong. If any cut is to be made in the N. Y. A., or if a cut is finally accomplished, it will not be by the work of the Republican members of this subcommittee but the work of the President of the United States who submitted a budget to the Congress and asked the Congress to adopt it—\$15,000,000 less than the Budget last year.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman intend to vote for the amendment that will increase the item to \$100,000,000?

Mr. KEEFE. I intend first to vote to support the report of the committee. I want the gentleman to know that I favor the N. Y. A.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman favor the \$100,000,000 appropriation?

Mr. KEEFE. Just one moment. I shall take the floor at the proper time and make a statement of my views on the subject. Then I will answer the gentleman so there will be no question of exactly where I stand.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the appropriate time is only 24 hours off. The gentleman certainly must have made up his mind about this question now.

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, yes; I have made up my mind. It has been made up for weeks, and it has been in the press for at least 3 weeks. I suppose the gentleman has not read that.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts, of course, finds it difficult to follow the gentleman from Wisconsin; he moves with such rapidity that he is interesting and refreshing. But my question was a very simple one, whether the gentleman would support the amendment increasing the fund to \$100,000,000 when it is offered. It is a simple question and calls for a simple and direct answer.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not know that I am called upon to answer the gentleman at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman does not have to answer, of course, if he does not want to.

Mr. KEEFE. I have indicated to the gentleman that I shall make a statement at the proper time in which the gentleman's question will be answered directly.

Mr. McCORMACK. I respect my friend, even though we may disagree, because I have a wholesome regard for his views.

Mr. KEEFE. We do not disagree.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think on this occasion, however, my friend, having already made up his mind, could answer whether he intends to vote for the amendment increasing the N. Y. A. appropriation to \$100,000,000 when it is offered on the floor.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the gentleman is a little unfair.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman really mean to use the word "unfair"?

Mr. KEEFE. He knows that I am a member of this subcommittee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Would not the gentleman prefer to say "premature"?

Mr. KEEFE. It is a little premature because the gentleman knows I am a member of this committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am aware of that fact.

Mr. KEEFE. When the time comes I will state my views on the floor definitely.

Mr. McCORMACK. Prior to that I shall assume that the gentleman intends to support his own committee.

Mr. KEEFE. I intend to support the committee at the start.

Mr. McCORMACK. That means the gentleman will vote for \$85,000,000?

Mr. KEEFE. Let me ask the gentleman in this time—

Mr. McCORMACK. In the gentleman's own time.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. Was I not correct in my statement, generally?

Mr. McCORMACK. Historically, but from the angle of actual facts, the basic facts, the appropriations, the opposition—

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman can see that if his great party wanted to give \$100,000,000 to N. Y. A. all that would have been necessary was for the President of the United States to recommend \$100,000,000 to his Budget. Am I not correct in this?

Mr. McCORMACK. If we follow the gentleman's reasoning that he relies upon the recommendation of the President, the gentleman would vote to sustain the President's recommendations en bloc. In practice, however, the gentleman votes to reduce the recommendations of the President. When the President sends a recommendation to Congress, it is within the power of Congress to do whatever it wants—increase or decrease. The gentleman from Wisconsin knows that just as well, if not better, than I do.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand, but the gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. McCORMACK. But I have answered the gentleman's question directly and flatly.

Mr. KEEFE. It would have been perfectly simple for the President had he wanted \$100,000,000 for N. Y. A. to have recommended \$100,000,000 in his Budget. Is not that true?

Mr. McCORMACK. Would the gentleman have voted for it?

Mr. KEEFE. I would vote for the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman would?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then, if the gentleman would vote for it had the President recommended it why will he not vote for the increased \$15,000,000 though the President did not recommend it?

Mr. KEEFE. Perhaps I will when the vote comes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to hear that because the gentleman a moment ago said he was going to support the committee.

Mr. KEEFE. I believe in N. Y. A. just as much as the gentleman does; but I am not making a campaign speech here on the floor this afternoon on N. Y. A.

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope the gentleman does make a campaign speech. I have no objection to it. I make them here occasionally. It is very refreshing to know that there is one Member of the House who does not make a campaign speech when he is on the floor.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield any further at this time.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. Chairman, in fairness to the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Wisconsin, I feel it is appropriate I should say, in view of the colloquy which has taken place, that in the subcommittee which considered this appropriation and brought it to the floor there was no suggestion of partisanship. The matter of which members of the committee were Republicans and which members were Democrats did not arise, and there were no two members of the subcommittee who were apparently more sympathetically interested in the provision of reasonable appropriations for the National Youth Administration than the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Wisconsin. I regret very much that any suggestion has been made that there is involved in the consideration of this appropriation bill any sort of partisan issue.

I have no objection to answering the gentleman from Massachusetts insofar as I am concerned as to whether I will vote to increase the Budget estimate by \$15,000,000 for this purpose, and I answer it as one of the Members of the House who is perhaps as sympathetically interested in the objectives of the National Youth Administration as anyone could possibly be and as a Member of the House who is thoroughly convinced that the work of that organization is extremely worthy and ought to be continued in an orderly way. But in view of the present financial condition of the Government and in view of the recommendation made by the President himself in the transmission of his Budget to the Congress, I as the chairman of this subcommittee shall not vote to increase the N. Y. A. appropriation above the Budget estimate, \$85,000,000, and I am convinced that no member of the subcommittee will vote to do it. I believe that those who are urging that the appropriation be increased to \$100,000,000 are really not acting in the interest of the organization which they profess to be endeavoring to help, but that a more reasonable appropriation at this time would be conducive to the eventual welfare of the N. Y. A.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Georgia is certainly laboring under a very serious misapprehension in his interpretation of the colloquy between the gentleman from Wisconsin and myself.

Mr. TARVER. I certainly hope I am.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think the gentleman from Wisconsin for a moment thought I was accusing him of playing partisan politics on this occasion. We were dis-

cussing the history in connection with the development of the N. Y. A. Back in those days when we were fighting to make appropriations for the W. P. A.—and last year, as a matter of fact, when these appropriations came before the House, N. Y. A. was connected with the W. P. A. appropriation—the Republicans were very careful to see that the minimum amount was appropriated. The gentleman says that I injected politics into this discussion. The gentleman is laboring under a misapprehension.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the colloquy between the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Wisconsin speaks for itself, and I do not care to make any further reference to it. I stated, and I repeat, that it is the first suggestion of partisanship which has come into the consideration of this bill so far, either in the subcommittee or in the full committee, and I certainly hope the matter of making reasonable provision for the N. Y. A. may be decided by the House without the consideration of partisan differences, and that there may be no crimination and recrimination as to responsibility for what may have occurred heretofore.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to observe that it is true that the Republicans along with a number of Democrats voted for certain W. P. A. appropriations. I have no knowledge of the Director of the W. P. A. coming in here and asking for additional funds for the current year. Apparently the appropriation made for W. P. A. has proven to be sufficient. Neither the President nor the Director, Colonel Harrington, has asked for additional appropriations for the current year.

Under these conditions I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the Republicans and the Democrats who voted for those appropriations have proved correct in their votes. In regard to N. Y. A., I may say that certainly it is by far the most desirable and the best of all the agencies recommended; however, we lose sight of the fact that from the time the New Deal came into power in 1932, it has been promising a solution to the problems facing the American people. The New Deal said the depression would end, but the depression has not ended. I have here a quotation from the C. I. O. pointing out that there are 12,000,000 unemployed people today in the United States. There were 10,000,000 unemployed people when President Roosevelt became President of the United States. In these discussions we lose sight of the point that no solution of our domestic problems has been found.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, even though we have spent over \$20,000,000,000 in an effort to solve these problems, we have been throwing good money after bad trying the same old stunt over and over again. But nothing in the way of a permanent solution has been found. That is the point. After N. Y. A. what? After W. P. A. what? We should get our people back into private industry, back into regular jobs at regular pay. That is the American way, that is the American program, and any other method, whether it be W. P. A. or anything else, certainly is not of permanent value, and is not of permanent benefit to the American people. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, once upon a time, before a monster called depression knocked us in the solar plexus, this country had an income of over \$80,000,000,000. As we look back upon those days, it seems, in view of our struggles today, that we must have been riding high on the swell of prosperity in the 1920's. The facts are—and Government figures will bear me out on this point—that even in 1928 and 1929 we were nowhere near using our full plant capacity. The great mass of incomes, even in those years, were not sufficiently high to enable most Americans to buy

and use all the goods and services which should have been available to them, in view of the American standard of living.

Today we are painfully aware that something is vitally wrong, because the unemployment problem has been steadily growing worse. Yet nothing basic, nothing real has been done to solve that problem. Our national income continues to stagger along slowly in the lower brackets. Our increased population has been largely an increase of men and women of working age.

I am drawing upon personal experiences of 16 years as a high-school teacher to tell you that the principal cause of unemployment and low national income today is that the young people of our Nation are leaving school without being fully prepared for definite jobs. I have known this for many years and have constantly urged such revision of our public-school system as will provide a real system of vocational guidance and training.

Recently there came into my hands a report published by the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association. This report is entitled, "Education and Economic Well-Being in American Democracy." It may be obtained in this city at the headquarters of the National Education Association on Sixteenth Street. I urge every Member of Congress to get this report and read it thoughtfully. It is sound, logical, and convincing. It offers a program for a basic educational attack on unemployment. The American people, I believe, will back this program to the limit. It is, and I speak to you frankly, the first plan I have seen which offers hope that the American Nation will rise triumphantly over its troubles and move steadily forward toward the greater achievements of a positive, dynamic economy.

High productivity and adequate education go together. All economists agree that this is true. But we must not simply blindly increase the amount of education which we will offer to the youth of our land. Each boy and girl presents a different and unique personality. Capabilities vary. There are some who should have all the advanced training obtainable in this country. There are a larger number who can use to advantage at least 2 years of training beyond high school. I agree heartily with the Educational Policies Commission that the boy or girl of average ability in this country today should have the advantages of junior college, with particular emphasis placed on vocational training during the last 2 or 3 years of schooling. The rule that boys and girls should be trained for definite jobs and be ready to fill these before they leave school is a rule which we should adopt without delay.

Today there is a shortage of skilled labor in many industries. There is likewise a shortage of many types of goods and services which can be produced only by skilled labor. The more highly skilled workers we have in this country, the more money we shall have. This is true both because the average personal income will rise with an increase in skilled labor and because our productivity snowballs as a result of training and knowledge. This does not mean that unskilled labor is unnecessary to us. Probably our whole system would collapse without some workers who offer unskilled manpower of the strictly brawn type. But we have too many laborers who are untrained and unskilled.

Among what class of workers is there greatest unemployment today? You know the answer. By far the greatest proportion of them are unskilled. Yet there is little chance, as things stand, to increase our numbers of skilled workers unless we increase education and plan it very carefully. A high output per worker is associated with a high level of education, vocational intelligence, and skill—never the reverse.

Vocational guidance and training is a topic widely misunderstood today. It is not something totally distinct and separate from basic education, but is a training which should proceed side by side with the study of reading, writing, arithmetic, civics, and science. Even in the primary grades pre-vocational training should begin with the cultivation in the child of good work habits—concentration, punctuality, neatness, and care of tools. In later grades, when the pupils are learning something of employer-employee relations and facts

about the workaday world, as they should be in the ideal set-up, they should be likewise becoming proficient in certain mechanical skills. We cannot neglect science or mechanical skills in the schools of today, because this world in which we live is increasingly dependent on science and machinery, and so are all of us who live in it.

Eventually, in the ideal school set-up of today, there should come a time when the pupil should consult with his vocational adviser to decide "in just what job will I be happiest and most productive?" Together pupil and teacher must then determine the definite preparation which the boy or girl must receive.

Here we come to a vital point. We do not want to train children for jobs that are today overcrowded or poorly paid. How may we know what are the opportunities today, and what the opportunities will be tomorrow?

I am told that the Bureau of Labor has recently initiated an occupational survey, which perhaps may eventually answer this question. Certainly the problem must be met adequately, if we are to proceed with vocational training with some assurance that our efforts will be rewarded. Everybody today wants to know where the good jobs are; where there are promising openings for a great number of workers. Two young men named Lyle Spencer and Robert Burns have set up an organization in Chicago and in a small way are attempting to analyze occupational trends. This is good as far as it goes, but we need something which is country-wide in scope—accurate, dependable, scientific.

Once the schools have this information they will know better how to proceed in the matter of providing more semi-skilled and highly skilled workers.

Our problem is one of raising incomes so that we may have widespread distribution and consumption of goods and services, which we now have the plant capacity to produce. There is but one way to raise incomes, and that is to increase the numbers of our highly skilled and semiskilled workers. How can we increase our numbers of highly skilled and semiskilled workers? Industry and labor may help on this program by developing adequate apprentice systems. Industrial schools, night schools, C. C. C. camps, and other governmental agencies may do their share. But on the public schools and colleges inevitably falls the largest share of responsibility for turning out graduates who have mechanical skills and training for work which pays good financial returns, because it is training which has increased productivity.

Employers are always interested in prospective employees who furnish lists of skills in which those seeking work are efficient. I believe that there will always be a demand for good welders, mechanics, printers, carpenters, painters, bricklayers, plumbers, cooks, bakers, tailors, operators of business machines, statisticians, office managers, business administrators, laboratory assistants, and so on. But we must have more knowledge of industry's needs, demands, and requirements as of today and as of tomorrow if we are to proceed with intelligence. We Americans are a strangely stubborn people at times. Faced with this colossal illness called unemployment, we have tried to cure it with sugar-coated pills instead of seeking out the basic cause of sickness and finding a cure which is a cure. The educational cure is not a quick cure. We may only just begin to see results 5 years after we have taken steps to revise and improve our school system. Yet we must take the long view. We must think ahead to 1945, 1950, 1960. No nation was ever so poor that it could not afford good public education. Our public schools are far from being adequate today. We have even cut school budgets severely. In 1936 public education received only 14 percent of the Nation's expense budget, as compared to 22 percent in 1930. This reduction was made in the face of a greatly increased school enrollment, due in large part to the unemployment of our youth. In other words, many hundreds of thousands of additional children have been clamoring for instruction, and there has been less money than before with which to do the job.

Education is not the sole answer to a renewed prosperity. It is, however, a vitally important basic step in the right direction. There are figures and studies available showing

conclusively that those States which spend the most for education now will have the greatest per capita wealth in years to come.

You may tell me, Mr. Chairman, that there are many States today which simply cannot load more taxes upon their people in order to give the children the adequate schools we must provide to meet the needs of 1940.

If this is true, then the Federal Government must step in to give such grants-in-aid as will enable us to educate all our children well, giving to each child that amount of training and that kind of training which will fit him to compete in the business world of today to the extent of his ability.

The time has come to reinvest in education, because it is such an important tool for establishing economic security. The time has come to cease drifting and to face realities. The time has come to put out money where it will do most good in banishing forever the scourge of 1940—unemployment. [Applause.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, all over this country hundreds of thousands of young men and women are looking to the Congress of the United States to give them an opportunity to earn a living. All these young people ask is the same chance that our fathers and our grandfathers had, the same chance that you and I had; that is, the chance to work.

Let us not be fooled into thinking that by asking this they are asking anything unusual or departing from what we call the American tradition of self-reliance. In the days when we and our fathers were growing up young men and women looked to this same Congress to give them a chance, and it was given to them. They looked to Washington for land, and this land was meted out to them. Congress gave each of them 160 acres of fertile land, and this was the start the young people of that day needed.

You may not remember it, but it is a historical fact that from 1865 down to 1890 Congress gave away land amounting to more in area than the total of New England, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Ohio, and half of Kentucky combined.

Today we are considering the same proposition, that of giving young people the start they need, and since we have no land to give away we are going about it a little differently and appropriating money to provide jobs on public works. There is nothing new about that.

Our fathers got a chance to go out and earn a quarter of a section of land by working it, and today we are giving some of our youth a chance to earn wages by going out and working. In the past the work that our fathers did on their homesteads was for their own benefit, and they and their families reaped the fruits of their labor.

Today when we give youth a chance to work on public projects by the National Youth Administration the entire country, villages, cities, and rural communities are getting the benefit of their labor. The parks and the playgrounds, the schools and the hospitals, and the many other things these young people have built benefit every one of us.

We can, if we want to ignore completely all the benefits that these N. Y. A. jobs bring to our young people, and on a strictly selfish basis, regard the money we are spending through the National Youth Administration as the investment that is going to pay us the highest rate of interest.

About a third of the total of our young men and women are unable to find jobs. This is an indictment against somebody, and I contend it is an indictment against the American Congress for not finding a solution to the problem. Their number is probably between four and five million—I am talking about the unemployed—and there are perhaps a million more who have only part-time jobs.

These are the young people who are going to have to carry on our industry, agriculture, and our Government when old age pushes us out of the picture. These are the young men who are going to have to guide the destinies of this Nation in peace and in war, and it is up to us to fit them for the task we are going to expect them to do. We cannot shirk our

responsibility by trying to smut up some official of the Government, as I understand will be tried later on.

The National Youth Administration is one of the agencies that is helping to fit our young people for this task. It is the agency that is helping them to stay in school, helping them to learn a trade, teaching them how to work and to do a good job, and otherwise making useful citizens out of young men and young women who otherwise would be forced to grow up in idleness and neglect.

To carry on with this work the National Youth Administration needs an appropriation proportionate to the needs it has to meet. We are giving the National Youth Administration the responsibility of doing this job, and it is up to us to give them the money with which to do it. This year the National Youth Administration has an appropriation of \$100,000,000. May I add that this \$100,000,000 came from the Congress, and not from the Appropriations Committee. It established a legislative policy and fixed a minimum amount with which to do the job. It is infinitely more binding upon us than the whims of some single assistant Budget director, even admitting that he is a good man. Members have referred to this as the President's Budget, but all of us that have sense enough to get out of the rain know full well that the President does not carry in his head all the items carried in all appropriation bills. Furthermore, we as members of the Appropriations Committee cannot shirk our responsibilities because we know full well that every time we write an appropriation bill we reduce items of appropriations and likewise we raise some of them.

We have had plenty of experience right in our own offices to show that these young people want a chance to work and need jobs—any kind of jobs. All kinds of young people come to us—fine, intelligent young Americans—and there is little we can do for them because there are no jobs in Governmental circles.

Most important to young people is the opportunity for jobs and education. This is something that the National Youth Administration is doing for them, and doing well. The immediate responsibility of the Congress to the youth of America is to appropriate to the National Youth Administration \$100,000,000, which is the same amount the Congress appropriated last year.

In order to present facts regarding the National Youth Administration operations in each State, the District of Columbia, and New York City, I am submitting the following tables which give State allotments and employment in the student work program, and the out-of-school youth project program; the types of work being performed and the employment in each work category; and a listing of the amount of work accomplished by N. Y. A. project youths during the last fiscal year.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

Allotments and youths employed on N. Y. A. programs, and number of schools, colleges, and universities participating in the student work program, by States

ALABAMA	
Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$2,101,646
Total youths employed.....	18,170
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	7,318
Student work program, January 1940.....	10,852
School work program.....	8,942
College and graduate work program.....	1,910
Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	1,326
Schools.....	1,299
Colleges and universities.....	27
ARIZONA	
Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$382,038
Total youths employed.....	3,350
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	1,420
Student work program, January 1940.....	1,930
School work program.....	1,343
College and graduate work program.....	587

Allotments and youths employed on N. Y. A. programs, etc.—Con.

ARIZONA—continued

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total	86
Schools	81
Colleges and universities	5

ARKANSAS

Funds allotted, 1939-40	\$1,801,661
Total youths employed	13,278
Out-of-school work program, February 1940	6,598
Student work program, January 1940	6,680
School work program	5,487
College and graduate work program	1,193

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total	668
Schools	644
Colleges and universities	24

CALIFORNIA

Funds allotted, 1939-40	\$4,206,860
Total youths employed	33,335
Out-of-school work program, February 1940	14,242
Student work program, January 1940	19,093
School work program	10,984
College and graduate work program	8,109

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total	576
Schools	487
Colleges and universities	89

COLORADO

Funds allotted, 1939-40	\$917,417
Total youths employed	8,220
Out-of-school work program, February 1940	2,915
Student work program, January 1940	5,305
School work program	4,004
College and graduate work program	1,301

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total	371
Schools	354
Colleges and universities	17

CONNECTICUT

Funds allotted, 1939-40	\$982,776
Total youths employed	6,514
Out-of-school work program, February 1940	3,653
Student work program, January 1940	2,861
School work program	2,070
College and graduate work program	791

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total	143
Schools	119
Colleges and universities	24

DELAWARE

Funds allotted, 1939-40	\$115,488
Total youths employed	1,086
Out-of-school work program, February 1940	611
Student work program, January 1940	475
School work program	352
College and graduate work program	123

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total	50
Schools	48
Colleges and universities	2

Allotments and youths employed on N. Y. A. programs, etc.—Con.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Funds allotted, 1939-40	\$451,215
Total youths employed	2,834

Out-of-school work program, February 1940	1,196
Student work program, January 1940	1,638

School work program	665
College and graduate work program	973

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total	46
---	----

Schools	34
Colleges and universities	12

FLORIDA

Funds allotted, 1939-40	\$1,222,943
Total youths employed	9,337

Out-of-school work program, February 1940	4,181
Student work program, January 1940	5,156

School work program	4,004
College and graduate work program	1,152

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total	676
---	-----

Schools	661
Colleges and universities	15

GEORGIA

Funds allotted, 1939-40	\$2,348,103
Total youths employed	19,294

Out-of-school work program, February 1940	7,020
Student work program, January 1940	12,274

School work program	9,290
College and graduate work program	2,984

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total	875
---	-----

Schools	825
Colleges and universities	50

IDAHO

Funds allotted, 1939-40	\$597,191
Total youths employed	4,484

Out-of-school work program, February 1940	1,860
Student work program, January 1940	2,624

School work program	1,844
College and graduate work program	780

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total	191
---	-----

Schools	182
Colleges and universities	9

ILLINOIS

Funds allotted, 1939-40	\$5,086,245
Total youths employed	42,020

Out-of-school work program, February 1940	18,594
Student work program, January 1940	23,426

School work program	17,189
College and graduate work program	6,237

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total	1,091
---	-------

Schools	1,013
Colleges and universities	78

INDIANA

Funds allotted, 1939-40	\$2,210,178
Total youths employed	18,988

Out-of-school work program, February 1940	7,176
Student work program, January 1940	11,812

School work program	8,456
College and graduate work program	3,356

Allotments and youths employed on N. Y. A. programs, etc.—Con.

INDIANA—continued

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	781
Schools.....	741
Colleges and universities.....	40

IOWA

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$1,671,655
Total youths employed.....	15,616
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	8,150
Student work program, January 1940.....	7,466
School work program.....	4,669
College and graduate work program.....	2,797

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	963
Schools.....	899
Colleges and universities.....	64

KANSAS

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$1,628,896
Total youths employed.....	15,265
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	5,625
Student work program, January 1940.....	9,640
School work program.....	7,030
College and graduate work program.....	2,610

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	758
Schools.....	712
Colleges and universities.....	46

KENTUCKY

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$2,045,613
Total youths employed.....	15,754
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	6,447
Student work program, January 1940.....	9,307
School work program.....	7,500
College and graduate work program.....	1,807

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	791
Schools.....	759
Colleges and universities.....	32

LOUISIANA

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$2,104,784
Total youths employed.....	12,787
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	5,491
Student work program, January 1940.....	7,296
School work program.....	4,932
College and graduate work program.....	2,364

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	810
Schools.....	787
Colleges and universities.....	23

MAINE

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$911,070
Total youths employed.....	4,393
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	2,400
Student work program, January 1940.....	1,993
School work program.....	1,395
College and graduate work program.....	598

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	234
Schools.....	218
Colleges and universities.....	16

Allotments and youths employed on N. Y. A. programs, etc.—Con.

MARYLAND

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$1,088,826
Total youths employed.....	8,425
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	4,759
Student work program, January 1940.....	3,666

School work program.....	2,399
College and graduate work program.....	1,267
Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	210

Schools.....	182
Colleges and universities.....	28

MASSACHUSETTS

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$2,753,679
Total youths employed.....	23,057
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	11,395
Student work program, January 1940.....	11,662
School work program.....	8,437
College and graduate work program.....	3,225

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	422
Schools.....	370
Colleges and universities.....	52

MICHIGAN

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$3,532,806
Total youths employed.....	28,459
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	13,021
Student work program, January 1940.....	15,438
School work program.....	10,806
College and graduate work program.....	4,632

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	850
Schools.....	807
Colleges and universities.....	43

MINNESOTA

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$2,150,010
Total youths employed.....	16,310
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	6,400
Student work program, January 1940.....	9,910
School work program.....	7,077
College and graduate work program.....	2,833

Number of institutions participating in the student work program—total.....	561
Schools.....	524
Colleges and universities.....	37

MISSISSIPPI

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$1,628,037
Total youths employed.....	13,784
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	5,606
Student work program, January 1940.....	8,178
School work program.....	6,194
College and graduate work program.....	1,984

Number of institutions participating in the student work program—total.....	768
Schools.....	730
Colleges and universities.....	38

MISSOURI

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$2,653,061
Total youths employed.....	21,010
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	8,549
Student work program, January 1940.....	12,461
School work program.....	9,213
College and graduate work program.....	3,248

Allotments and youths employed on N. Y. A. programs, etc.—Con.

MISSOURI—continued

Number of institutions participating in the student work program—total..... 935

Schools..... 875
Colleges and universities..... 60

MONTANA

Funds allotted, 1939-40..... \$573,968
Total youths employed..... 5,049

Out-of-school work program, February 1940..... 1,903
Student work program, January 1940..... 3,146

School work program..... 2,422
College and graduate work program..... 724

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total..... 207

Schools..... 196
Colleges and universities..... 11

NEBRASKA

Funds allotted, 1939-40..... \$1,029,442
Total youths employed..... 9,791

Out-of-school work program, February 1940..... 3,905
Student work program, January 1940..... 5,886

School work program..... 4,288
College and graduate work program..... 1,598

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total..... 594

Schools..... 571
Colleges and universities..... 23

NEVADA

Funds allotted, 1939-40..... \$65,647
Total youths employed..... 551

Out-of-school work program, February 1940..... 269
Student work program, January 1940..... 282

School work program..... 220
College and graduate work program..... 62

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total..... 38

Schools..... 37
Colleges and universities..... 1

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Funds allotted, 1939-40..... \$428,423
Total youths employed..... 2,257

Out-of-school work program, February 1940..... 1,128
Student work program, January 1940..... 1,129

School work program..... 605
College and graduate work program..... 524

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total..... 107

Schools..... 99
Colleges and universities..... 8

NEW JERSEY

Funds allotted, 1939-40..... \$2,682,883
Total youths employed..... 19,370

Out-of-school work program, February 1940..... 9,548
Student work program, January 1940..... 9,822

School work program..... 8,008
College and graduate work program..... 1,814

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total..... 305

Schools..... 272
Colleges and universities..... 33

Allotments and youths employed on N. Y. A. programs, etc.—Con.

NEW MEXICO

Funds allotted, 1939-40..... \$633,634
Total youths employed..... 4,054

Out-of-school work program, February 1940..... 2,156
Student work program, January 1940..... 1,898

School work program..... 1,449
College and graduate work program..... 449

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total..... 241

Schools..... 234
Colleges and universities..... 7

NEW YORK CITY

Funds allotted, 1939-40..... \$5,040,394
Total youths employed..... 33,898

Out-of-school work program, February 1940..... 10,900
Student work program, January 1940..... 22,998

School work program..... 15,779
College and graduate work program..... 7,219

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total..... 254

Schools..... 200
Colleges and universities..... 54

NEW YORK (EXCLUDING NEW YORK CITY)

Funds allotted, 1939-40..... \$4,049,741
Total youths employed..... 28,563

Out-of-school work program, February 1940..... 11,266
Student work program, January 1940..... 17,297

School work program..... 12,946
College and graduate work program..... 4,351

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total..... 905

Schools..... 850
Colleges and universities..... 55

NORTH CAROLINA

Funds allotted, 1939-40..... \$2,473,917
Total youths employed..... 21,995

Out-of-school work program, February 1940..... 12,003
Student work program, January 1940..... 9,992

School work program..... 6,755
College and graduate work program..... 3,237

Number of institutions participating in the student work program; total..... 1,393

Schools..... 1,338
Colleges and universities..... 55

NORTH DAKOTA

Funds allotted, 1939-40..... \$883,006
Total youths employed..... 7,620

Out-of-school work program, February 1940..... 2,996
Student work program, January 1940..... 4,624

School work program..... 3,694
College and graduate work program..... 930

Number of institutions participating in the student work program; total..... 473

Schools..... 460
Colleges and universities..... 13

OHIO

Funds allotted, 1939-40..... \$4,315,357
Total youths employed..... 34,868

Out-of-school work program, February 1940..... 13,672
Student work program, January 1940..... 21,196

School work program..... 15,522
College and graduate work program..... 5,674

Allotments and youths employed on N. Y. A. programs, etc.—Con.

OHIO—continued

Number of institutions participating in the student work program; total.....	1,277
Schools.....	1,209
Colleges and universities.....	68

OKLAHOMA

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$2,349,633
Total youths employed.....	22,578
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	8,856
Student work program, January 1940.....	13,722
School work program.....	10,711
College and graduate work program.....	3,011

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	966
Schools.....	949
Colleges and universities.....	47

OREGON

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$696,354
Total youths employed.....	6,614
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	2,846
Student work program, January 1940.....	3,768
School work program.....	2,342
College and graduate work program.....	1,426
Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	290
Schools.....	266
Colleges and universities.....	24

PENNSYLVANIA

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$6,320,437
Total youths employed.....	53,198
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	20,918
Student work program, January 1940.....	32,280
School work program.....	25,252
College and graduate work program.....	7,028

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	1,309
Schools.....	1,221
Colleges and universities.....	88

RHODE ISLAND

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$546,165
Total youths employed.....	3,661
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	1,810
Student work program, January 1940.....	1,851
School work program.....	1,265
College and graduate work program.....	586

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	69
Schools.....	63
Colleges and universities.....	6

SOUTH CAROLINA

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$1,455,239
Total youths employed.....	10,989
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	4,052
Student work program, January 1940.....	6,937
School work program.....	5,305
College and graduate work program.....	1,632

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	918
Schools.....	884
Colleges and universities.....	34

Allotments and youths employed on N. Y. A. programs, etc.—Con.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$913,061
Total youths employed.....	10,113
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	3,973
Student work program, January 1940.....	6,140

School work program.....	5,464
College and graduate work program.....	676

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	393
Schools.....	377
Colleges and universities.....	16

TENNESSEE

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$2,058,767
Total youths employed.....	18,840
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	8,448
Student work program, January 1940.....	10,392
School work program.....	8,476
College and graduate work program.....	1,916

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	646
Schools.....	603
Colleges and universities.....	43

TEXAS

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$5,158,130
Total youths employed.....	39,501
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	18,133
Student work program, January 1940.....	21,368
School work program.....	15,128
College and graduate work program.....	6,240

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	2,663
Schools.....	2,579
Colleges and universities.....	84

UTAH

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$685,076
Total youths employed.....	5,803
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	2,066
Student work program, January 1940.....	3,737
School work program.....	2,144
College and graduate work program.....	1,593

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	115
Schools.....	104
Colleges and universities.....	11

VERMONT

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$211,409
Total youths employed.....	1,977
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	809
Student work program, January 1940.....	1,168
School work program.....	713
College and graduate work program.....	455

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	108
Schools.....	95
Colleges and universities.....	13

VIRGINIA

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$1,835,835
Total youths employed.....	15,475
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	7,327
Student work program, January 1940.....	8,148
School work program.....	5,560
College and graduate work program.....	2,588

Allotments and youths employed on N. Y. A. programs, etc.—Con.

VIRGINIA—continued

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	942
Schools.....	901
Colleges and universities.....	41

WASHINGTON

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$1,391,619
Total youths employed.....	12,024
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	5,572
Student work program, January 1940.....	6,452
School work program.....	4,393
College and graduate work program.....	2,059

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	347
Schools.....	323
Colleges and universities.....	24

WEST VIRGINIA

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$1,950,127
Total youths employed.....	13,765
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	6,453
Student work program, January 1940.....	7,312
School work program.....	5,951
College and graduate work program.....	1,361

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	404
Schools.....	383
Colleges and universities.....	21

WISCONSIN

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$2,348,240
Total youths employed.....	20,654
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	8,290
Student work program, January 1940.....	12,364
School work program.....	8,662
College and graduate work program.....	3,702

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	652
Schools.....	570
Colleges and universities.....	82

WYOMING

Funds allotted, 1939-40.....	\$178,305
Total youths employed.....	1,500
Out-of-school work program, February 1940.....	734
Student work program, January 1940.....	766
School work program.....	557
College and graduate work program.....	209

Number of institutions participating in the student work program, total.....	92
Schools.....	91
Colleges and universities.....	1

Number of youths employed under the out-of-school work program by types of work, by States, February 1940

Type of work	Ala- bama	Arizona	Arkan- sas	Calif- ornia
Total number of youths employed.....	7,318	1,420	6,598	14,242
Highway, road, and street.....	46	96	169	148
Improvement of grounds.....	38	168		1,129
Public buildings.....	1,534	215	2,402	1,020
Recreational facilities.....	75	26	200	561
Conservation and sanitation.....	101	96	27	88
Clerical and service projects.....	840	323	1,089	4,354
Recreational leadership.....	168	26		471
Professional assistance projects.....	215	104	41	1,163
Workshops.....	436	80	603	2,202
Sewing.....	653		89	481
Miscellaneous production.....	43	80	54	927
Resident training centers.....	2,173	76	1,756	249
School lunches, nursery schools, and home-making.....	708	130	163	1,102
Projects not elsewhere classified.....	288		5	347

Number of youths employed under the out-of-school work program by types of work, by States, February 1940—Continued

Type of work	Colo- rado	Connec- ticut	Dela- ware	District of Co- lumbia
Total number of youths employed.....	2,915	3,653	611	1,196
Highway, road, and street.....	6	106	10	
Improvement of grounds.....		72		
Public buildings.....	149	66	51	86
Recreational facilities.....	259	366	92	
Conservation and sanitation.....	46	52		
Clerical and service projects.....	476	1,005	150	190
Recreational leadership.....	131	120	25	119
Professional assistance projects.....	437	149	100	355
Workshops.....	472	1,371	54	
Sewing.....	694	167		59
Miscellaneous production.....		47		
Resident training centers.....	186	101		
School lunches, nursery schools, and home-making.....	59	26	129	236
Projects not elsewhere classified.....		5		151

Type of work	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Illinois
Total number of youths employed.....	4,181	7,020	1,860	18,594
Highway, road, and street.....	52		38	1,671
Improvement of grounds.....	122		162	1,422
Public buildings.....	482	1,196	124	396
Recreational facilities.....	95	78	36	1,239
Conservation and sanitation.....	48	286	41	509
Clerical and service projects.....	1,549	1,429	345	3,911
Recreational leadership.....	140		84	1,338
Professional assistance projects.....	161	3	168	1,518
Workshops.....	357	776	82	1,820
Sewing.....	443		104	2,384
Miscellaneous production.....	37			39
Resident training centers.....	297	1,710	539	467
School lunches, nursery schools, and home-making.....	398	1,542	99	799
Projects not elsewhere classified.....			38	1,081

Type of work	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Ken- tucky
Total number of youths employed.....	7,176	8,150	5,625	6,447
Highway, road, and street.....	237	544	570	19
Improvement of grounds.....	180	105	284	257
Public buildings.....	1,401	965	1,295	1,120
Recreational facilities.....	1,004	1,576	1,125	115
Conservation and sanitation.....	135	601	110	84
Clerical and service projects.....	1,075	1,802	487	585
Recreational leadership.....	162	85	4	29
Professional assistance projects.....	258	330	32	222
Workshops.....	1,099	1,017	254	928
Sewing.....	1,178	587	35	120
Miscellaneous production.....	14	240		
Resident training centers.....	100	126	1,157	1,058
School lunches, nursery schools, and home-making.....	323	172	79	1,786
Projects not elsewhere classified.....	10		193	124

Type of work	Louis- iana	Maine	Mary- land	Massa- chusetts
Total number of youths employed.....	5,491	2,400	4,759	11,395
Highway, road, and street.....	36		384	113
Improvement of grounds.....	380		40	346
Public buildings.....	314	310	647	210
Recreational facilities.....		196	365	1,548
Conservation and sanitation.....		11	55	230
Clerical and service projects.....	680	474	942	3,201
Recreational leadership.....	5	82	100	889
Professional assistance projects.....	367	113	398	852
Workshops.....	228	303	908	1,876
Sewing.....	125	111	320	1,590
Miscellaneous production.....	92			105
Resident training centers.....	2,837	673	164	55
School lunches, nursery schools, and home-making.....	275	127	344	380
Projects not elsewhere classified.....	152		92	

Type of work	Michi- gan	Minne- sota	Missis- sippi	Mis- souri
Total number of youths employed.....	13,021	6,400	5,606	8,549
Highway, road, and street.....	174	205		1,722
Improvement of grounds.....	644	86		383
Public buildings.....	555	733	1,503	316
Recreational facilities.....	1,190	1,367		707
Conservation and sanitation.....	337	145		103
Clerical and service projects.....	3,749	1,076	1,864	2,691
Recreational leadership.....	821	311		71

Number of youths employed under the out-of-school work program by types of work, by States, February 1940—Continued

Type of work	Michi- gan	Minne- sota	Missis- sippi	Mis- souri
Professional assistance projects.....	1,371	418		728
Workshops.....	2,239	428	769	369
Sewing.....	667	874		810
Miscellaneous production.....	3	199		
Resident training centers.....	646	237	1,470	279
School lunches, nursery schools, and home- making.....	288	264		187
Projects not elsewhere classified.....	337	57		183

Type of work	Mon- tana	Ne- braska	Nevada	New Hamp- shire
Total number of youths employed.....	1,903	3,905	269	1,128
Highway, road, and street.....	13	247		
Improvement of grounds.....	6	87		
Public buildings.....	115	466		
Recreational facilities.....	131	623		132
Conservation and sanitation.....	48	198		
Clerical and service projects.....	661	530	128	268
Recreational leadership.....	27	133	11	
Professional assistance projects.....	17	206	80	44
Workshops.....	309	292	88	145
Sewing.....	209	400		281
Miscellaneous production.....		209		
Resident training centers.....	264	242		223
School lunches, nursery schools, and home- making.....	143	191	12	19
Projects not elsewhere classified.....		81		16

Type of work	New Jersey	New Mexico	New York City	New York (exclu- sive of New York City)
Total number of youths employed.....	9,548	2,156	10,900	11,266
Highway, road, and street.....	450			374
Improvement of grounds.....	550	51		159
Public buildings.....	625	158		493
Recreational facilities.....	970	147	1,776	514
Conservation and sanitation.....	554	20		474
Clerical and service projects.....	2,682	389	3,988	2,949
Recreational leadership.....	513	114	3,517	372
Professional assistance projects.....	163	111	503	1,647
Workshops.....	1,275	407	407	2,547
Sewing.....	1,101	92		342
Miscellaneous production.....	141	107		120
Resident training centers.....	263	472		607
School lunches, nursery schools, and home- making.....	148	78	709	595
Projects not elsewhere classified.....	113	10		73

Type of work	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Okla- homa ¹
Total number of youths employed.....	12,003	2,996	13,672	8,856
Highway, road, and street.....	121	270	1,215	188
Improvement of grounds.....	287	123	466	116
Public buildings.....	2,089	170	1,359	2,006
Recreational facilities.....	26	334	2,076	31
Conservation and sanitation.....		49	419	157
Clerical and service projects.....	2,110	577	2,869	1,234
Recreational leadership.....		45	791	
Professional assistance projects.....	781	73	1,303	78
Workshops.....	1,704	220	1,358	1,851
Sewing.....	417	262	558	63
Miscellaneous production.....	246	1	107	19
Resident training centers.....	783	450	367	2,321
School lunches, nursery schools, and home- making.....				
Projects not elsewhere classified.....	3,439	125	420	699
		297	364	93

Type of work	Oregon	Penn- syl- vania	Rhode Island	South Caro- lina
Total number of youths employed.....	2,846	20,918	1,810	4,052
Highway, road and street.....		925		
Improvement of grounds.....	223	996		
Public buildings.....	29	1,309	123	380
Recreational facilities.....	772	2,183		
Conservation and sanitation.....		1,322	41	
Clerical and service projects.....	614	4,815	225	794
Recreational leadership.....	24	953	111	

Number of youths employed under the out-of-school work program by types of work, by States, February 1940—Continued

Type of work	Oregon	Penn- syl- vania	Rhode Island	South Caro- lina
Professional assistance projects.....	244	3,161	74	
Workshops.....	318	2,421	698	600
Sewing.....	119	738	421	
Miscellaneous production.....		199		
Resident training centers.....	305	339	57	2,060
School lunches, nursery schools, and home- making.....	174	1,156	60	
Projects not elsewhere classified.....	24	401		218

Type of work	South Dakota	Tennes- see	Texas	Utah
Total number of youths employed.....	3,973	8,448	18,133	2,066
Highway, road, and street.....	186	455	1,491	59
Improvement of grounds.....	262	385	679	186
Public buildings.....	358	2,341	3,252	296
Recreational facilities.....	528	223	1,296	153
Conservation and sanitation.....			513	125
Clerical and service projects.....	734	1,322	2,982	231
Recreational leadership.....	68	95	118	153
Professional assistance projects.....	22	304	1,135	252
Workshops.....	173	927	1,896	97
Sewing.....	397	681	521	67
Miscellaneous production.....		104		
Resident training centers.....	506	1,085	2,652	288
School lunches, nursery schools, and home- making.....	367	512	1,450	36
Projects not elsewhere classified.....	372	14	148	123

Type of work	Vermont	Virginia	Wash- ington	West Virginia
Total number of youths employed.....	809	7,327	5,572	6,453
Highway, road and street.....		325	10	644
Improvement of grounds.....		917	747	1,957
Public buildings.....		490	265	1,150
Recreational facilities.....		134	269	192
Conservation and sanitation.....		111	45	67
Clerical and service projects.....	187	2,096	1,565	823
Recreational leadership.....	64	248	300	144
Professional assistance projects.....	8	475	329	164
Workshops.....	183	308	734	50
Sewing.....	195	116	216	378
Miscellaneous production.....		53		23
Resident training centers.....		498	275	716
School lunches, nursery schools, and home- making.....	172	1,510	208	123
Projects not elsewhere classified.....		46	609	22

Type of work	Wisconsin	Wyoming
Total number of youths employed.....	8,290	734
Highway, road, and street.....	39	10
Improvement of grounds.....	465	3
Public buildings.....	251	33
Recreational facilities.....	1,494	35
Conservation and sanitation.....	453	
Clerical and service projects.....	2,674	328
Recreational leadership.....	342	81
Professional assistance projects.....	130	81
Workshops.....	887	97
Sewing.....	883	4
Miscellaneous production.....	12	
Resident training centers.....	463	
School lunches, nursery schools, and homemaking.....	136	6
Projects not elsewhere classified.....	61	2

¹ January 1940.

Physical accomplishment on National Youth Administration work projects, year ending June 30, 1939

Activity	Unit of measurement	Work completed	
		New construction or additions	Repair or improvement
BUILDING CONSTRUCTION			
Total number of buildings		3,120	7,728
Administrative buildings	Number	59	237
Warehouses	Number	37	17
Garages	Number	108	38
Hospitals	Number	3	49

Physical accomplishment on National Youth Administration work projects, year ending June 30, 1939—Continued

Activity	Unit of measurement	Work completed	
		New construction or additions	Repair or improvement
BUILDING CONSTRUCTION			
Isolation buildings for tubercular, etc.	Number	14	81
Other charitable, medical, or mental buildings	Number	45	85
Educational buildings, total		708	4,538
Schools	Number	294	3,930
Dormitories	Number	105	150
Libraries	Number	9	87
Museum and art galleries	Number	13	24
Other educational buildings	Number	287	347
Agricultural buildings	Number	287	132
Social and recreational structures, total		1,650	2,455
Auditoriums	Number	9	59
Stadiums, grandstands, bleachers, etc.	Number	213	596
Gymnasiums	Number	33	135
Shower- and dressing-room structures	Number	174	403
Bandstands, bandshells, and outdoor theaters	Number	85	81
Youth center buildings	Number	118	184
Other community buildings	Number	183	411
Park and trailside shelters, etc.	Number	627	282
Other social and recreational buildings	Number	208	304
Staff residence buildings at schools, institutions, etc.	Number	67	81
Street markets and roadside stands	Number	140	4
Aircraft hangars and airport buildings	Number	2	11
Bridges	Number	483	412
Seaplane bases	Number	3	
Landing fields	Number	1	13
OTHER CONSTRUCTION AND CONSERVATION			
Highways, roads, and streets	Miles	187.4	2,225.3
Sidewalks	Miles	130.3	86.8
Bridle paths, bicycle paths, and hiking trails	Miles	81.6	137.4
Curbs, gutters, and guardrails	Miles	227.8	144.7
Culverts	Number	1,920	1,274
Parking areas and overlooks	Square yards	250,007	274,939
Roadside landscaping	Miles	373.3	652.6
Landscaping of grounds	Acres	52,063	
Fencing	Miles	236.5	75.0
Erection of snow fence	Miles	35.6	
Street signs	Number	157,045	64,031
Airway markers	Number	418	90
Other signs and markers	Number	170,201	32,118
Parks	Acres	28,883	41,672
Fair and rodeo grounds	Acres	557	509
Playgrounds, school	Number	715	4,671
Playgrounds, other	Number	421	716
Baseball and football fields	Number	649	715
Athletic fields for track and field events	Number	250	446
Swimming pools	Number	46	103
Wading pools	Number	83	87
Tennis courts	Number	761	1,165
Basketball courts	Number	45	31
Croquet courts	Number	63	
Golf courses	Number	35	95
Handball courts	Number	46	8
Horseshoe courts	Number	365	167
Shuffleboard courts	Number	52	
Volleyball courts	Number	35	7
Pistol and target ranges	Number	21	12
Outdoor fireplaces, council rings, permanent tent floors	Number	1,549	
Trash and garbage burners	Number	331	
Storm and sanitary sewers	Miles	43.9	16.6
Construction of sanitary privies	Number	1,364	
Cesspools, septic tanks, etc.	Number	214	171
Storage dams, including dams for artificial lakes and ponds	Number	168	45
Storage tanks, reservoirs, cisterns	Number	159	93
Riverbanks and stream bed improvements	Miles	89.9	
Levees and retaining walls	Miles	66.5	2.5
Check dams	Number	6,000	188
Soil-erosion control	Acres treated	136,554	
Reforestation	Trees planted	1,838,244	
Plant and tree nurseries	Nurseries	1,474	52
Firebreaks and fire trails	Miles	278.7	165.1
Fire-observation structures	Number	11	690
Bird and game sanctuaries	Number	3,385	254
Fish hatcheries	Number	44	59
Stocking—fish	Fingerling and fry	3,553,000,000	
Stocking—other game	Number	60,062	

Physical accomplishment on National Youth Administration work projects, year ending June 30, 1939—Continued

Activity	Unit of measurement	Amount
NONCONSTRUCTION		
Clothing produced or renovated	Number of articles	1,628,765
Shoes repaired	Number of pairs	18,055
Household articles, bedding, etc., produced	Number of articles	539,186
Hospital supplies produced	Number of articles	4,308,111
Toys made or renovated	Number	914,246
Home furniture constructed or repaired	Number of articles	68,267
School furniture constructed or repaired	Number of articles	552,296
Office furniture and equipment constructed or repaired	Number of articles	93,585
Recreational and playground equipment constructed or repaired	Number of articles	146,802
Tools and mechanical equipment constructed or repaired	Number of articles	88,187
Concrete articles, adobe brick, cinder block, etc., produced	Number	2,355,374
Stone, sand, and gravel produced	Cubic yards	237,305
Lumber produced	Board feet	1,976,194
Firewood cut	Cords	90,833
School lunches served	Number	18,907,633
Foodstuffs produced (resident projects only)	Pounds	1,002,463
Canning and preserving	Pounds	523,717
Construction and renovation of museum articles	Number of articles	95,397
Cataloging museum articles	Number of articles	208,092
Books renovated or repaired	Number of books	2,244,112
Ceramic articles produced	Number of articles	8,189

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the squandering for travel expense of Government officials is still going on. There are many individuals in the Federal service who keep well abreast of the "galloping hounds of waste." I refer to the 52 officers of the National Youth Administration who propose to travel at Uncle Sam's expense next year and have asked for an average of \$8,100 each in expense money. Besides the 52 officers, the balance of the 1,965 employees of the National Youth Administration have 592 automobiles at their disposal. No doubt this will be news to the taxpayers who pay the bills. Santa Claus and the New Deal are still synonymous to these roving ambassadors of the new order, wherein we all will spend and nobody earn.

See page 621, part 2, hearings, testimony of Aubrey Williams, and so forth. In the table at the bottom of the page the travel expenses for 52 officers on an annual basis is estimated at \$421,200. This amounts to \$8,100 per officer per year, or, on a basis of 313 working days in the year, not counting vacations, holidays, or other factors, a sum equal to \$28.43 per day. Now, this means that for every hour in the working day or night, the officer will have \$1.18 of travel allowance to use up. Each one of them could take a de luxe trip around the world on that allowance.

It would be pretty nice if Members of Congress could be allowed \$28.43 a day for traveling expenses. It would probably be worth it if some of them were gone for good.

Day and night the waste goes on while we in Congress are asleep. A day of reckoning will come, gentlemen—a day of reckoning will come.

Besides the huge sum spent for travel expense, the N. Y. A. also has 592 automobiles to service the activities of the balance of its 1,965 employees who do not enjoy these extensive travel privileges. See page 625 of the hearings.

The cuts in the N. Y. A. appropriation recommended in the bill are in the wrong places. The bureaucrats are well taken care of by getting their salaries and expenses increased from \$4,979,240 to \$5,290,000 for 1941. Let us put in an amendment to cut this administrative expense by \$300,000 or more.

I have gone through this measure, and it looks to me as if this is a pretty good bill on which to apply the paring knife. I cannot see any sense in reducing the appropriation for N. Y. A. so far as their activities go out in the field, but here you turn around and double the amount that shall become available for the officer personnel. To me this does not make good sense. I do not think it is fair to the youth of America

whom we are trying to benefit, and when the time comes I shall offer a suitable amendment to make the necessary cuts.

I think we ought to reduce the number of automobiles provided for. There is no sense in a little organization like this having nearly 600 automobiles to drive in; and that reminds me that the matter of furnishing official cars is rapidly assuming the proportions of a national scandal. About 2 years ago I had occasion to look into the matter of vehicular transportation costs of this Government, and you will be surprised, I know, when I tell you that there are considerably in excess of 100,000 automobiles owned by Uncle Sam that are used for official and unofficial purposes.

Last spring, in Brunswick, Ga., I saw a large limousine car pull up in front of the hotel, having a tax-exempt tag. In talking with the chauffeur, I found they had been in Florida spending several weeks. That car belonged to the Government. It was on its way back to Washington with the official and his family. I have often regretted I did not think to inquire whether the chauffeur was getting his salary from the Government.

When we come to analyze all this spending, we must agree that this New Deal outfit has been the most expensive, the most extravagant administration we have ever had. It is no wonder that the Roosevelt administration has spent more money since it got into power than did all the Presidents from George Washington to Woodrow Wilson, and that includes the prosecution of the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and a number of Indian uprisings. As a matter of fact, the Roosevelt administration has spent an amount equal to 58 percent of all the money that this Government has collected from the time it was organized. This is not a very good record on which to go before the people, and yet you blindly follow the New Deal. You blindly vote the appropriations that it asks for. You blindly condone the extravagances and the wastes that are worse than a scandal; but some day, and not very far hence, the taxpayers of this country are going to demand an accounting, and I am thinking that it will be on November 5.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. HOUSTON. I know the gentleman wants to be fair, and is it not a fact—

Mr. KNUTSON. Certainly, I want to be fair.

Mr. HOUSTON. The House has tried to effect some economies at this session, but the Senate put it all back in one bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. The trouble is not with the Senate alone. The blame must be placed on both Houses of the Congress. You have blindly voted the President unheard-of powers, you have set up needless bureaus and commissions, the cost of which is running into the millions and millions of dollars. No effort was made to ascertain whether they were necessary and the gentleman cannot escape his share of it. If the gentleman will go through his voting record, he will find he has been a pretty consistent follower of the New Deal and has voted for practically everything the New Deal has asked for.

Mr. HOUSTON. I am willing to admit that I voted for a great many of the appropriations of the New Deal and I voted against a good many of them, but I am pleased to hear the gentleman express himself, because I am sure he will sustain the committee in the action it has taken on the pending bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. The National Youth Administration has 592 automobiles for the officials to travel around in. I cannot see why the Government should furnish these officials with automobiles any more than they should furnish Members of Congress with automobiles. I do not know how many automobiles the Government owns, or pays for the operation of, but I do know that the number runs into astronomical figures.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON. I want to call the gentleman's attention to page 3 of the report on the present bill where we limit the use of automobiles to official business only.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. KNUTSON. You are not going to cut out this joy riding at the expense of the taxpayers until you put letters a foot high on every car, designating the bureau to which it belongs.

Mr. HOUSTON. And I may say that we have called the attention of the bureaus to that very thing on page 4, with respect to the lettering on official automobiles.

Mr. KNUTSON. What size letters?

Mr. HOUSTON. Conspicuous letters, so they can be seen.

Mr. KNUTSON. One thing would be conspicuous to you, while another sort of lettering would be conspicuous to Mr. Ickes, who does not want any lettering at all. I think these letters ought to be at least four inches high and an inch wide, so you can read them. We do not want any small lettering so a little dust will cover them up. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute. With reference to the lettering on automobiles of the name of the department, which the gentleman from Minnesota has just been discussing, I point out to the gentleman that that matter is controlled by a provision in the United States Code. If the gentleman feels that that provision is not sufficient to secure protection of Government property, I think his duty would be to introduce a bill to correct the section of the code so as to provide the statute law that he holds ought to be enacted. May I ask the gentleman why he has not introduced a bill of that kind?

Mr. KNUTSON. And I say to the gentleman from Georgia that is an abuse which has grown up under the New Deal. I defy the gentleman to point to a single bill introduced by a Republican that had for its object a reduction in the expenditures of the Government that was ever reported out by a committee.

Mr. TARVER. The abuse to which the gentleman refers has been going on for a number of years, long prior to this administration, and there has been no effort on the part of the gentleman's party when in power to enact additional legislation to correct this matter. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, this bill as presently written provides for the reduction in the number of C. C. C. camps in the United States from 1,500 to 1,282 camps. This means an elimination of 218 camps. The original proposal was to eliminate 273 camps but by making certain economies in personnel and economies of management, it is hoped that at least 55 camps, which otherwise would be closed, might be saved. Whether this can be accomplished remains yet to be seen. I have talked with those who know the C. C. C. program throughout the United States and these experts with whom I have spoken doubt very much that the economies suggested by the committee in its report can be adopted to such an extent as to save 55 C. C. C. camps throughout the United States.

It is my thought that if because of economies it is necessary to close any camps in the United States no new camp should be opened except in place of a camp whose work has been completed. In other words, Mr. McEntee has testified in the hearings that it costs the Civilian Conservation Corps from \$13,000 to \$24,000 to move a camp from one place to another. Until the work of a camp is completed, to move the camp adds to the cost of operation by this amount and since under these circumstances a camp might be removed before work is completed in order to carry on the program, the additional cost of change is sustained.

Mr. Chairman, I have drafted an amendment which I have proposed to be submitted to the paragraph of this bill covering the C. C. C. appropriation. This amendment:

Provided, That the funds herein appropriated shall be used insofar as possible to continue the work of existing camps and no new camps shall be established, and no camps shall be moved, until the work of the presently existing camps shall have been completed.

It is my thought that this amendment would have the effect of requiring the work in the camps now existing to

be fully completed before removal. I do not believe any new camps should be opened at a time when camps are being closed throughout the United States because of economy measures.

After writing this amendment and studying the parliamentary rules of the House of Representatives in reference to amendments on appropriation bills, I am convinced that it is subject to a point of order. Rather than present to the House, therefore, an amendment which I know at the outset would be stricken out by a point of order, I merely bring my thoughts before this body in the hope that at a later date the United States Senate, whose rules are different from ours, may consider the matter with a view toward preventing new camps being established while the work is pending in camps being closed for economy reasons.

Mr. Chairman, the Civilian Conservation Corps has been in existence since 1935. During that time it has made an enviable record. Over 13,000,000 persons have received direct benefits from the establishment of this program and over 2,615,000 young men have been trained during long periods of time by the C. C. C. It is estimated that more than 1,700,000,000 forest trees have been planted on nearly 3,500,000 acres of land and that millions of acres of farm land have been adapted by painstaking and well-planned work to the prevention of soil erosion.

In my part of the country, the soil conservation C. C. C. camps have done a magnificent job. Under the guidance of skillful and conscientious supervisors, the young men of the C. C. C. have gone out in the fields and in the valleys of northwest Louisiana and revitalized thousands upon thousands of acres of worn-out farm land. The building of the little dams to check the wash, the construction of terraces to prevent erosion and the adapting of land to its proper use has resulted in reconstructing many parts of northwest Louisiana.

For my part, I intend to vote and work for the return to this bill of the same amount of money voted for this work during the last session of Congress. I think the Congress makes a serious mistake in curtailing the work that keeps millions of our young men busy, out in the open, in a healthful, active life upon a most constructive work. In one sense, the Civilian Conservation Corps prevents more crime by giving these young men proper environment for their work than does the F. B. I. which investigates and places the fear of the law in the minds of those who otherwise would be violators. I intend, Mr. Speaker, to vote to increase the appropriation for this purpose to \$287,000,000, this being an increase of \$57,000,000.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield for a question.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. McEntee himself testified that \$3,800,000 could be saved through putting on civilian employees instead of Army officers. They would not ask for that amount.

Mr. BROOKS. Your committee also said that by effecting certain economies it is thought that \$6,000,000 more might be taken off, but it is still my opinion that a great many of the camps will be closed down. I think it is the gentleman's opinion that many of them will have to be closed down in order that this bill be workably used by the C. C. C.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. ENGEL. The records show that if this bill is passed without amendment, as originally submitted by the Budget, 28,000 employees will receive \$49,400,000 in pay. If you cut off 2 employees per camp in the higher brackets, you have five or six million dollars' saving there.

Mr. BROOKS. A cut of 218 camps, as proposed by this bill, will mean the earnings of 436,000 American families will be greatly reduced and in many instances completely cut off. I want to see the number of camps continued as at the present time. When we reach 13,000,000 persons throughout the United States, when we actually bring funds to that many needy people throughout the United States, it is my

opinion that the work is most worthy and should be continued.

Before I close, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I hold in my hand a great mass of telegrams from my congressional district in Louisiana. The ones that I think we are especially interested in are the ones that come from governmental bodies in the Fourth Congressional District, the mayors of towns, members of police juries and of conservation districts, and prominent leaders of northern Louisiana. At the proper time I expect to ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD following these remarks some of these telegrams and letters. I think they are worthy of consideration by this Congress as indicating the attitude of the public mind. [Applause.]

The letters and telegrams referred to follow:

MANSFIELD, LA., March 19, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
United States Congressman:

The citizens of De Soto Parish will appreciate you using your efforts to continue the C. C. C. camp at Mansfield. The work done by the Conservation Service has meant so much to the farmers of our parish. De Soto needs this soil-conservation work to continue, and we do think this is an ideal location.

MANSFIELD TOWN COUNCIL,
W. F. TOWN, Mayor.

MANSFIELD, LA., March 19, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
United States Congressman:

De Soto Parish citizens need your influence in retaining local C. C. C. camp. We will greatly appreciate your assistance.

DE SOTO PARISH POLICE JURY,
EMERSON BENSON, President.

MANSFIELD, LA., March 16, 1940.

OVERTON BROOKS,
United States Congressman:

We understand that there are plans to discontinue at once the Mansfield C. C. C. camp and greatly reduce the personnel of the local soil-conservation service. We think this is the best Federal work ever done in De Soto. Thoughts of losing it are very disturbing to Mansfield and the entire parish. Please do all possible to have both of these units remain in their present status.

MANSFIELD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

MANSFIELD, LA., March 19, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
United States Congressman:

All your efforts to retain C. C. C. Camp No. 4414, Mansfield, will be sincerely appreciated.

LIFFORD COOK,
Supervisor, Grand Cane, La.

MANSFIELD, LA., March 19, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building:

Urge you do everything possible to retain C. C. C. camp in De Soto Parish, La. We need this camp very much and to move same now would be a big loss to our community.

GOODWYN H. HARRIS, Jr.,
President, Herndon Chapter, N. A. A.

MANSFIELD, LA., March 19, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
United States Congressman,

Washington, D. C.:

Citizens very anxious to retain C. C. C. camp, so as to continue its fine service to farmers. Everything you can do will be highly appreciated.

S. M. SHOWS,
Superintendent, De Soto Parish Schools.

MANSFIELD, LA., March 16, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress:

The Soil Conservation Service, supplemented by C. C. C. here, is the most effective and far-reaching service the Government has ever done for this parish. They have contracts with farmers here for 2 years' work in advance. Please have this continued as is in De Soto.

CLAUDE ROBERTS.

MANSFIELD, LA., March 19, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS:

Please do everything possible to keep C. C. C. camp at Mansfield.

MANSFIELD DEPARTMENT CLUB,
RUBY ROACH, President,
MRS. JOE T. CAWTHORN, Secretary.

MANSFIELD, LA., March 19, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
United States Congressman:

We the Bonchasse Chapter, Daughters of American Revolution, request your valued influence in regard to retaining C. C. C. 4414 at its present location in Mansfield, La. This camp has been of immeasurable assistance in soil conservation, which work has really just begun.

Mrs. P. C. FAIR,
Regent, Bonchasse Chapter, D. A. R.

MANSFIELD, LA., March 19, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
United States Congressman:

We urge your assistance in retaining C. C. C. Camp No. 4414 with Soil Conservation Service in De Soto Parish.

Mrs. FLEET PENDLETON,
President, United Daughters of the Confederacy.

MANSFIELD, LA., March 19, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
Congressman,
House of Representatives:

Cooperating with the Soil Conservation Service, the C. C. C. camp here has rendered invaluable service, but has scarcely made a beginning on work to be done. The developed projects are a guide and benefit toward training the camp boys. Please exert your influence in retaining the camp.

DE SOTO PARISH CATTLEMEN'S
ASSOCIATION,
N. W. JENKINS, President.

MANSFIELD, LA., March 19, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
United States Congressman:

De Soto Post, No. 42, American Legion, respectfully solicits your influence in retention of local C. C. C. camp.

Dr. R. A. THARP, Adjutant.

MANSFIELD, LA., March 19, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
United States Congressman:

We sincerely appreciate all your efforts toward maintaining our local C. C. C. camp.

MANSFIELD ROTARY CLUB,
Dr. W. B. HEWITT, President.

MANSFIELD, LA., March 18, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
United States Congressman,
Washington, D. C.:

We sincerely appreciate your help in retaining soil conservation and C. C. C. camp here. Work of Mansfield camp is not complete. Mansfield camp is youngest in this area; in actual acceptance of agreements this camp has more unfinished contracts (137 agreements accepted unfinished and with implied obligations to farmers) and more potential contracts than Keithville and Pleasant Hill camps combined. If economy move necessitates removal of one camp from this area, then let them move one of the other camps.

MANSFIELD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

HOMER, LA., March 12, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS, M. C.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Homer C. C. C. camp ordered abandoned. Soil-conservation work just begun in parish. This program best of all Government agencies. Please work to retain Homer camp.

FRED JACKSON, Mayor of Homer.

HOMER, LA., March 9, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives:

There is evidence C. C. C. camp here in Homer may be moved soon. This unit well located and citizens of parish anxious that it be retained. We earnestly solicit your assistance and will appreciate advice as to what steps may be taken to hold this unit.

B. W. FORTSON,
President, Claiborne Parish Police Jury.

HOMER, LA., March 11, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS, M. C.,
House Office Building:

Recognizing vital necessity of soil-conservation program to Claiborne Parish, we urge you use every means possible to retain C. C. C. camp and conservation unit at Homer. Our information is that closing of this camp leaves Claiborne without conservation service and abandonment of valuable work already in progress.

HOMER LIONS CLUB,
GEO. F. WHITE, President.

HOMER, LA., March 12, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Our youth today get more from C. C. C. training than many other stations in life. Let us help our farmers and keep our C. C. C. camp.

EMERSON MOTOR CO.,
H. H. EMERSON.

HOMER, LA., March 12, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your holding C. C. C. camp in Homer. Farmers need the help badly in this area. Only five parishes have more cropland than Claiborne and none so badly eroded.

JOE ROBERTSON.

HOMER, LA., March 12, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Reported that C. C. C. camp at Homer to be closed. Farmers appreciate this camp and its work. Please do all in your power to hold camp here.

H. S. FORD,
Parish Administrative Assistant.

HOMER, LA., March 12, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Citizens of Claiborne Parish very anxious that C. C. C. camp at Homer be maintained. The soil-conservation work being done is much needed.

N. J. KENDRICK.

HOMER, LA., March 14, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Continuance of local unit conservation service and Homer C. C. C. camp highly necessary to farmers this parish. Other camps cannot reach this area. Applications and demands for this service make it urgent that you help Claiborne Parish by securing orders that this unit be maintained.

JOHN S. PATTON,
Public Service Commissioner.

HOMER, LA., March 13, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Use your influence to continue C. C. C. camp in Homer as hill land badly eroded in this parish. Need soil-conservation work.

ALBERT AUSTIN,
Manager, Peoples Compress.

HOMER, LA., March 13, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Farmers of Claiborne Parish badly in need of soil-conservation service of C. C. C. camp. Very urgently request Homer camp be retained.

WADE PRYOR.

HOMER, LA., March 13, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Farmers in this parish benefit from the help of soil-conservation work. Increases farm value and crop value. Please help keep C. C. C. camp in Homer.

ATKINS BAILEY,
Superintendent, Saline Conservation District.

HOMER, LA., March 13, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Farmers in this parish need soil-conservation work to help control erosion. Use your influence to keep C. C. C. camp in Homer.

HARRY MCKENZIE.

HOMER, LA., March 13, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Claiborne Parish mostly hill land and badly in need of erosion control. Please assist in retaining Homer C. C. C. camp.

R. F. ODOM.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Urge you to use influence to retain Homer C. C. camp and conservation unit. Farmers badly need this service as Claiborne Parish hill land badly eroded.

R. J. McADAMS,
Superintendent, Darbonne Conservation District.

HOMER, LA., March 13, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Soil-conservation service and C. C. C. camp work urgently needed by farmers of this parish account badly eroded hill lands. Urge you permit continuance Homer camp.

W. M. RAINACH,
Representative Elect.

HOMER, LA., March 13, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS, M. C.,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Urgent that you make every effort to maintain local C. C. C. camp and soil-conservation unit for Claiborne parish.

T. KINNEBREW,
District Attorney.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION,
Homer, La., March 14, 1940.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS, M. C.,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is rumored that the Homer C. C. C. camp, situated in Claiborne Parish, might be one of those abandoned in connection with the President's recommendation of a reduction in camps.

Having been born and reared in this parish, we are acquainted with existing conditions.

First, Claiborne Parish is one of the largest hill parishes in the State, and also one of the most thickly populated hill parishes in the State.

Erosion has been taking place ever since the land was first brought under cultivation. The rate of erosion has been greater than in most of the adjoining parishes on account of the heavy population.

Homer seems to be the most logical place for a camp, having roads leading in all directions making all points of the parish accessible at all times of the year.

Soil-conservation districts were formed only a few months past and have just begun to function. Applications are being made at a greater rate than can be taken care of at present. A careful survey of the parish will substantiate the above statements.

The parishes of Lincoln and Union would be too far distant for any material good to be done for Claiborne Parish by the existing camps located in those parishes.

The parish of Claiborne has never received its pro rata share of protection justly due a parish of its size and population. The people of this parish are deeply interested in erosion control, realizing that unless the land is protected from erosion a greater part of the population must soon resort to other means of making a living.

We are enclosing a map of Claiborne Parish which shows the location of the present C. C. C. camp with relation to the road system of the parish.

We are also enclosing a clipping of an editorial and article which appeared in a parish paper under date of Wednesday, March 13, 1940.

In closing, may I ask that you use all available means in your power to help us in maintaining the camp at Homer.

Yours very truly,

CLAIBORNE PARISH AGRICULTURAL
CONSERVATION COMMITTEE,
S. P. MEADOWS, Chairman.
L. M. GREEN, Member.
C. D. WORLEY, Member.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much interest to the debate this afternoon, particularly that which pertained to the National Youth Administration.

There has been some discussion and contention of political bias. I want to disclaim any political bias in this, but I will admit some personal bias. There is no need of my telling you people that I have been a school teacher, a college man. I have before coming to Congress been closely in contact with the N. Y. A., and I know whereof I speak. Ever since becoming a Member of this body I have consistently supported this program.

Right in the Well of this House in the spring of 1937, again in 1938 and in June 1939, I did what I could to get a suitable appropriation for the National Youth Administration. I recall last year that the Budget recommended \$123,000,000.

The committee came in with an estimate written in of \$81,000,000. You will remember that we succeeded in offering one amendment after another until the bill was passed at \$100,000,000. I recall distinctly that I was one of several who were to offer amendments in a certain order to increase the committee figure.

I deeply regret that the Budget, which a year ago recommended \$123,000,000 annually, this year recommended only \$85,000,000. I know how the President feels about this and many other matters. It must have been a feeling of great regret on the part of the Director of the Budget and the President himself that the recommendation was in that amount. Nothing but great pressure could have caused such a change.

I further regret that the committee has seen fit to write into the bill only the \$85,000,000 recommended by the Budget. I know how regretfully the members of the subcommittee must feel about the matter, but that does not help when we need more than that amount of money. I understand that the total amount of this bill is several millions under the total amount of the Budget estimate for all its items. Therefore, an effort must be made to amend the bill with regard to N. Y. A., and make it more nearly adequate. Perhaps we may raise it so as to keep the bill still within the Budget limit for the total amount.

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

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Very briefly.

Mr. HOUSTON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this bill was under the Budget estimate on the N. Y. A.?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. No; I did not say that. I understand that the total amount is under the Budget estimate, for all of the items.

Mr. HOUSTON. That is correct, approximately \$12,000,000.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I thank the gentleman for the information. Such being the case, we could increase N. Y. A. \$12,000,000 without exceeding the Budget estimate.

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

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Briefly.

Mr. HOOK. I want to call attention to the hearings on page 615, where Mr. Williams said, "In my discussion with the President I asked for \$125,000,000. This was revised by the Budget Bureau, and a budget of \$85,000,000 was submitted to Congress."

Then on page 613 it is stated there that the estimate submitted by the Bureau of the Budget, 1941, National Youth Administration, is \$100,000,000.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. That confirms my feeling that, if the President were not confronted with the national-debt limit set by Congress 25 years ago, the Budget estimate would at this time have been \$123,000,000 or \$125,000,000. What perplexing difficulties are involved in weighing the relative importance of so many necessary appropriations, knowing that to raise some means lowering others.

We all heard what was said here a moment ago about high salaries and the use of 400, 500, or 600 automobiles by the higher officials of N. Y. A. If you want to cut down on such, perhaps I am with you in that respect, for I want to put more money than \$85,000,000 out yonder in the high schools and colleges where it will do the work. I want overhead minimized and the greatest possible proportion spent effectively.

I have said here in the Well of this House two or three times that I have in my office at this very minute, and have had ever since I have been here, young people who have graduated from college using the N. Y. A. to enable them to do so. Successful old folk are prone to hark back to the good old times when their poverty was a blessing. I can hardly believe that poverty ever was a blessing, but I have heard it said that it was. Well, the proverbial poor boy 60 or 80 years ago who went to the city and later became a captain of industry had an easy time when compared with some I have known the last dozen years.

A few days ago a young, red-headed, freckled-faced, stalwart from Arizona calling at my office said: "Dean, do you remember a time when you saved me from sleeping on

the Bermuda?" He meant the Bermuda grass out in our warm valley.

I said, "I do remember one time when you and your roommate came to me late one evening and said, 'Our bed is gone.'"

"What happened?"

"Why," he said, "You know we were living in a little packing box not far from you on Van Ness Street. Well, the officers took our bed away."

These boys worked their way through school. I wager they lived on less than a dollar a week. They had such a small room that they had to have a double-deck bed, one bed above the other, in order to get inside the room with the bed there. They had rented that bed from a widow who had formerly run a rooming house, and the sheriff had come and taken the bed one day in their absence and they found themselves at nightfall with no bed. He joked and laughed about it a good deal. That young fellow now has a fine job, but he got his education and his A. B. degree working his own way through college with N. Y. A. aid while I was dean. I could multiply that case by a hundred, for I know that as many as 325 young people each year worked their way through school at the time I was dean of that teachers college, and they have become useful members of society now, self-respecting, and with heads up.

My secretary said to me just the other day, "Do you remember So-and-So?" one of my boys.

"Yes."

"Well, he graduated and is now married and has a good job."

"Yes; I understand."

Then my secretary said, "Do you notice in talking with him that he is more conservative than he used to be?"

The young man to whom he referred was a typical young college student, with plenty of brain power and with plenty of freedom in thinking. Now, after graduating from college with an A. B. degree and having a good job and married, he is a conservative young man. I cite this just to show that he has appreciated what the Government has done for him.

A 30-year war swept over Germany three centuries ago and left its mark upon that country for 200 years. A 10-year war has swept over our country, not a military invasion but a destruction just as devastating in this depression. These young people—and I have three of them, two sons and a daughter, who have grown to maturity during these 10 years and, thank God, they have got their schooling without any further help than dad and mother could supply—these are the young people of the so-called lost generation. Are they lost? Some of them are because we have been too niggardly in preparing for them. Youth is the time people must get the training they are going to need all through life. If it is not supplied to them at the proper time in youth, then they can never have it.

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

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I yield gladly to my friend from the far Northwest.

Mr. LEAVY. I do not believe there is another man in this House who has shown himself in his career in the House to be a greater friend of youth than the gentleman from Arizona now addressing us. In the thousands and thousands of young people whose lives have been touched beneficially by this type of appropriation has the gentleman ever heard of a single instance where it has had a detrimental effect?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Not one, not one.

In view of the fact that the N. Y. A. is sometimes confused with another organization sounding very much like it in alphabetical name, there are some who would besmirch the N. Y. A., some who would make us believe that is filled with pinks and punks. I know nothing derogatory of the N. Y. A. nor any other youth organization. Let me tell the Members there is nothing pink or punk about the thousands and thousands of young people I know out West who are getting help through high school and college with this fund.

I am not here advocating high salaries and automobiles for the administrative higher-ups, and yet we should equip them sufficiently. In my observation they do not behave like lords of the earth. I have seen local N. Y. A. leaders apply themselves with almost missionary zeal to their devoted task. However, my chief concern is in supplying the means to take care of these young people in this devastating period of change through which we are passing. I ask you not to be niggardly in your appropriations for this most vital work. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself a minute to correct the RECORD. A statement was made this afternoon in reference to the travel expenses in the National Youth Administration. I direct attention to the record of the hearings on page 621 where there is obviously a misprint in the printing of the hearings. It says, "Estimate of the travel expenses, total, 52 officers on annual basis, \$421,200." It very obviously should read, "Total, 52 offices on annual basis," because the preceding words indicate this is a misprint. So the conclusion reached by the gentleman from Minnesota—that the travel expenses amounted to about \$27 a day for these people in the offices under N. Y. A.—is very clearly in error. He was misled into the statement due to the misprint which appeared in the record of the hearings.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration providing an appropriation for the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor for the year 1941 calls for a reduction of the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget from \$6,185,000 to \$5,105,000, or a reduction of \$1,080,000. This is approximately a 20-percent reduction.

The committee, in its report on the bill, stated, and I quote:

They do feel, however, that until Congress shall adopt legislation amendatory of the Fair Labor Standards Act which will serve to clarify certain ambiguities in the existing law, and until those charged with the administration of the act have been able to bring about simplification of procedure, and clarification in the interpretation of the rules and regulations promulgated pursuant to any such amendatory legislation, it would be improvident on the part of Congress to approve a greatly enlarged administrative set-up that could only serve in lending further difficulties to an already confused administrative problem.

It is admitted by the proponents of the humanitarian Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 that it contains inequalities and perhaps ambiguities and should be amended accordingly. Carrying out this thought, the chairman of the committee introduced H. R. 5435, to amend the act. After full and exhaustive hearings before the Committee on Labor the bill was reported to the House. It was the committee's well-considered judgment that the bill, thus reported, met all reasonable requirements with respect to amending the act. It developed, however, that the amendments proposed in the bill did not meet with the approval of the adversaries of the act, many of whom were bent on either emasculating or repealing it. When H. R. 5435 was called up before the House it was promptly denied consideration by a majority teller vote.

The opponents of this humanitarian law, which has brought relief to the lowest of the low-paid workers of this country, have centered their attack on the agricultural provision which they consider to be the most vulnerable—with particular reference to the area of production. Defining the area of production in the farming sections of this country is very much the same as defining the area or boundary lines of every incorporated city or town in the United States. They must of necessity commence some place and end some place. The relative positions of a processing plant on the east side of a road and an identical place on the west side of a road—one within and the other without the area of production—is almost identical with that of the owner of property on the very edge but within a city limit and a property owner across the road who is outside of the city limit. The property owner who is just inside the city limit pays city taxes which, in many cases, are very high. His neighbor immediately across the road is not required to pay these taxes.

Defining such areas always has and always will be more or less an arbitrary matter. The same principle applies to

every special public-utility district in every city or to every irrigation, bridge, and other tax-assessment district in the country.

I cannot believe the farmers of this country, who, in the final analysis, receive tremendous benefits from the higher standards of living this legislation brings, are seeking the destruction of this humanitarian wage and hour law either directly or indirectly. There are exceptions, of course, some farm areas having processing plants which are located on the wrong side of the road and outside of the area of production. It may well be that those representing these exceptions have raised such a loud clamor that a perspective of the great good of this legislation is lost.

But, Mr. Chairman, these are the selfish interests of this country who would hamstring, emasculate, and repeal a law which has brought some degree of comfort to the underprivileged in the lowest strata of industrial workers in the United States and they are striving to accomplish their purpose through this limited class of farmers in different sections of the country.

Farmers with rare exceptions have common cause with wage earners. The fair-minded farmers, who are in the overwhelming majority, are conscious of the fact that there are 33,800,000 men and women in nonagricultural employment in the United States. They also know—and I refer to the hearings before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, 1941—that since 1932 Congress has appropriated in excess of \$6,000,000,000 for farm relief in one form or another. Every intelligent farmer is appreciative of the proportionate amount the nearly 34,000,000 nonagricultural workers of this country have contributed to this enormous sum without a murmur. The farmers also realize that the nonagricultural workers and their families are by far the largest group of consumers of products of the farm and that the amount of their products consumed is measured entirely by wage earners' purchasing power.

Mr. Chairman, these few adversaries of the humane wage and hour law have been working overtime resorting to all kinds of propaganda to poison the minds of unsuspecting people by stressing its inequalities and so-called ambiguities. Those who would emasculate and repeal the law would throw the underpaid workers back into the pool of despondency, and they have been totally blind to the graver inequalities that actually existed for years prior to the enactment of this law. Before its enactment, for example, 45,000 women engaged in textile and other light industries, located between the District of Columbia and the Hudson River, were receiving \$5 and \$6 a week and in many cases worked 9 and 10 hours a day. Textile workers in the State of Mississippi received from \$2.50 to \$7.50 a week. In the city of Atlanta, Ga., prior to the enactment of this law, there were two textile industries. The larger of the two paid its employees around \$15 a week; its competitor paid its employees approximately one-half of that sum, thereby forcing its underpaid employees to receive contributions from the local relief authorities. I am informed that the owners of the industry who were paying the higher rate contributed a substantial sum—I believe \$1,500—to the local relief fund, thereby contributing to the support of the employees of a cutthroat competitor who was paying starvation wages. Still there are those who complain of the inequalities under the law. These cases could be multiplied hundreds and hundreds of times, yet there are still those narrow-visioned or selfish individuals who complain of the inequalities under this law. The wage and hour law, which has eliminated this sort of cutthroat competition has been welcomed by every fair-minded employer, and I am pleased to state there are many thousands of such fair-minded employers in this country.

Before the enactment of this law, many unscrupulous employers of labor who paid starvation wages and, as a result, resorted to cutthroat competition, actually forced honest and conscientious employers of labor who believe in the just policy of live and let live to the alternative of meeting their terms or going out of business. These employers with high

ideals who craved this act are unalterably opposed to handicapping it by lack of adequate enforcement due to an insufficient appropriation to properly administer the law. They make the reasonable request that the plants of their unscrupulous competitors who are now flagrantly violating the law be given proper inspection and policing. Such law-abiding citizens who welcomed this act are entitled to this protection. That they are again subject to cutthroat competition by violators of the law is a proven fact, as court records will show.

I cite just a few of these cases of violation of the law for they emphasize the need of an adequate appropriation:

There were 380,000 people engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods for commerce earning less than 25 cents an hour when the Fair Labor Standards Act went into effect on October 24, 1938. That means 380,000 working 40 hours per week for less than \$10 a week.

This figure does not include an additional 200,000 industrial home workers, the exploitation of whom is one of the blackest spots in the economic life of America. Only a few weeks ago a group of knitwear manufacturers signed a consent decree with the Wage and Hour Division, agreeing to make restitution of wages estimated at \$250,000 to 10,000 of these home workers, mostly in rural districts of the East and South.

In the Federal court of Brooklyn, N. Y., a manufacturer of shade pulls and pot holders pleaded guilty to paying his home workers as low as 4 cents an hour. In court he was fined \$1,500 and given a suspended fine of \$6,000 on condition that he make restitution of \$4,500 to these employees. The sums that each of these poor workers drew in restitution was more than equivalent to all the pitiable wages paid them for the full first year of the operation of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

In the case of a manufacturer of similar products, also in Brooklyn, who defied the Wage and Hour Division, the case went to trial before a jury in Federal court. Before the Government had completed its case the defendants withdrew their plea of not guilty and are now awaiting sentence.

Following an investigation by the Wage and Hour Division, a Chicago hairpin manufacturing company agreed to pay \$110,000 in restitution to more than 300 families whose children had worked long hours, when they should have been at play, mounting hairpins on cards. At the same time the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor obtained a permanent injunction restraining this company from such practices in the future.

In the case of one of the largest glove manufacturers in the country, three of its officials were found guilty in a 19-count indictment of illegally withholding from 600 girl workers more than \$10,000 in wages.

The court imposed fines totaling \$7,500 against the company and its officials, and ordered them to make restitution to these girl workers within 90 days.

In Georgia a county relief investigator reported to the Wage and Hour Division that there was an employer, a run-away shop from New York, who paid his 100 workers such low wages—from \$4 to \$8 per week—that every family who was represented on its pay roll was on county relief.

Coming closer to Washington, over in Baltimore a few weeks ago in the Federal court, Judge W. Calvert Chestnut had before him two brothers who manufacture men's clothes. They had been indicted on charges of paying 175 women coat makers 10 cents an hour and less. There was one woman, a widow with three small children to support, who lived in a basement, who worked long hours and who still could not earn enough to keep her family from the verge of starvation. This partnership of brothers not only failed to pay them the minimum wage set up in the Fair Labor Standards Act but pleaded guilty to the charges that they had falsified their records in an effort to make it appear that the women were earning 25 cents an hour. In imposing sentence Judge Chestnut said:

Falsification of records is the most reprehensible of offenses under the Fair Labor Standards Act. These records are the chief defense of the employees from being cheated of their wages. Destroying the records is dishonest, corrupt, and it indicates conscious guilt.

He fined each of the defendants \$1,500, suspended an additional \$2,500 fine against each, and placed them on probation for 2 years.

Early in 1938 a pecan-shelling company in San Antonio, Tex., which concededly handles a major portion of the shelled pecans which go into the commerce of the United States, applied to the Wage and Hour Division to employ between 2,500 and 3,000 learners at a rate of 15 cents an hour.

In the hearings held on this application it was shown that this company, which made a net profit of \$500,000 in 2 years, paid wages as low as \$3 and \$4 per week, which was supplemented by the employment of laborers 10-, 12-, and 15-year-old children.

Mr. Chairman, the new administration of this act—and they have a new administration—should be encouraged and the appropriation recommended by the Bureau of the Budget should be approved by this House. The law should be given a fair chance. The present Administrator should be given a chance to demonstrate what this law means to the underprivileged of this country. I repeat, there are inequalities in the law. The new Administrator should bring to Congress a number of amendments that will meet with the approval of the majority of the membership of the House. These should be recommendations that will correct the inequalities in the law.

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. The gentleman stated that the Administrator in due time will probably bring in proposed revisions of the law. In view of the fact that we are giving the Wage-Hour Division \$1,646,000 more than it had during the present year, does not the gentleman feel it would be well to wait until the new Administrator has had 6 months to see what he can do?

Mr. WELCH. I do not. The new Administrator, with his limited force, cannot adequately check up on violators such as I referred to, and there are hundreds more. He cannot do that unless we give him sufficient funds.

Mr. HOUSTON. Could he look after all these violators?

Mr. WELCH. And it is not an excuse that the people of this country will readily accept when they realize the attempt that has been made to handicap this humanitarian law which has brought a little sunshine to the poorest of our wage-earning class.

Mr. HOUSTON. I agree with the gentleman, so far as the law is concerned.

Mr. WELCH. Then give the law a chance.

Mr. HOUSTON. We are giving it a chance.

Mr. WELCH. Please do not hamstring it. The House of Representatives has the opportunity now to act justly, honestly, and for the greatest good of both agriculture and labor.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, those of us who represent agricultural districts and who realize the difficulties faced by agriculture and have the interest of the American farmer at heart, will again face a grave responsibility sometime this week when the agriculture appropriation bill is brought back to the House for action on Senate amendments through the conference report. It is known to all here that the House made no provision for parity payments to the American farmer when this year's appropriation bill was first before the House some days ago. The Senate on Friday restored the \$212,000,000 to provide parity payments for the American farmer, and I want here and now to call on the vigilance and fighting spirit of every Member of the House who realizes the plight of agriculture, to the end that this provision for parity payments be retained in the bill.

When you take into consideration the battles our farmers have faced through the years, they are an extremely reasonable class. If economy we must have and should have, and there is much merit in the contention that many of the

expenses of the Government should be cut down, the farmers, I am convinced, are willing to take their share of the cut. We have a Budget of about \$9,000,000,000, but according to my recollection the appropriation that first passed the House and was sent to the Senate provided only \$640,000,000 to cover every phase of agriculture. Now, 31 percent of all our people live on the farm. Probably in addition to this 10 or 15 percent of our people win their livelihood directly from the farm whether they live there or not. So we have here at least 40 percent of our population directly dependent on agriculture for support; yet, with all the money being spent for the upkeep of the Government, with all the benefits going out to different groups of our people and business, the agricultural group, the very largest group and the backbone of the Nation, receives from the House bill benefits amounting to only 7 or 8 percent of the Budget. This is unfair, it is unjust, and to balance the scales more equitably the \$212,000,000 for parity payments must be retained in the bill.

Gentlemen of the House, why is it that we have had such a fight on parity payments items in the House when the Senate had no trouble in placing the provision in the bill? Is it because representation in the House is based on population, which results in the representatives from the city areas being in the great majority here? Is it because the city representative here does not feel that benefits to farmers benefit the city people as well, and that if the farmer prospers, his prosperity flows on to the city? I hesitate to accuse you gentlemen from the city with being so shortsighted. The history of this country since Yorktown reveals that the manufacturing industry in the city, the store in the city, the salaried employee in the city, the laborer in the city, every one of them, have prospered in the same measure that agriculture has prospered, and that when the agricultural bloc of our population is driven against the wall, the repercussion is felt all the way up the line from the farm to the village, to the town, to the city, everywhere. Gentlemen, when you vote for parity payments for farmers you vote to help your own people in the city. When from 30 to 40 percent of our people are ground to the wall, when they have no hope left, their purchasing power dies with their hope, they cannot consume, and the manufacturer and the storekeeper in your city will suffer because the market for the products of his machine and factory has received a death blow too.

Now what is parity for the farmer? I have found in correspondence with some of my constituents that parity is not always clearly understood. Some Members of the House even seem by their utterances here to be slightly confused as to the meaning of the term. I think the best definition I have seen was set forth in the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as follows:

Parity as applied to prices for any agricultural commodity shall be that price for the commodity which will give to the commodity a purchasing power with respect to articles that farmers buy equivalent to the purchasing power of such commodity in the base period. The base period, except for tobacco, is the period of August 1909 to July 1914.

Parity as applied to income for agriculture shall be that per capita net income of individuals on farms from farming operations that bears to the per capita net income of individuals not on farms the same relation as prevails during the period from August 1909 to July 1914.

Or, stated another way by an expert on the subject:

Parity income for agriculture is that net income from farming operations per person living on farms which bears the same relation to the income per person not living on farms as prevailed in the 5 years before the World War. Or, to state it another way, parity income for agriculture is the same share of the total per capita income available for living that agriculture received in the 1909-14 period. The farm income available for living includes cash received from the sale of farm commodities, plus the estimated value of products consumed on the farm, minus the principal business operating expenses of the farmer. Nonfarm income available for living is the comparable income received by the individuals making up the nonfarm population.

Corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and tobacco are the farm commodities to which parity payments would apply. Eighty percent of our farmers are engaged in raising at least one of these five crops. On February 15, 1940, the farm price of corn was 54.7 cents, and parity price was 82.2 cents; wheat farm price was 84.1 cents, with parity price 113.2 cents; rice

farm price was 68.7 cents, with parity price 104.1 cents; tobacco farm price was 13.6 cents, with parity price 14.5 cents; and cotton farm price was 9.97 cents, with parity at 15.87 cents. It will be seen, therefore, that tobacco was the only commodity bringing above 75 percent of parity. It is intended that this appropriation will pay the cotton farmer from 1½ to 2 cents per pound, which, it is estimated, will raise the total price he receives on his product to 75 percent of parity.

Now, down my way, in my section of the great State of South Carolina, the farmers are mainly interested in parity payments as they may effect the cotton farmer. For years cotton has been our main money crop; I might say our only money crop, though we are getting away from that condition now, thanks to what this Democratic administration has done to promote diversification of crops as well as soil conservation. And let me say to you Representatives of farmers from other sections of the country where no cotton is planted that by helping the cotton farmer you are helping yourselves, because you are not forcing him into another field of competition with you. I say to you that if South Carolina farmers cannot make a living growing cotton, the inevitable result will be that they will raise for market other farm commodities instead of cotton, which will be thrown on the open markets of this country in competition with the commodities which you now raise for market exclusively. We can grow at a profit many farm products when adequate marketing and shipping facilities are provided. If cotton goes, we will be forced to raise corn, peas, oats, potatoes, and similar products not only, as now, for home consumption but to be thrown on the competitive

market with yours. In years gone by, South Carolina raised indigo as its principal crop; when the prices obtained for indigo ceased to provide a livelihood for our farming people, they quit indigo and began to raise rice; and when it was found that rice could not be raised profitably, on account of severe competition, our coastal country quit rice and began to raise cotton. Now it looks like we are going to have to quit cotton, because we cannot raise it under present conditions and live. At the same time we cannot quit raising it overnight and live either.

Mr. Speaker, for over a century the farmer has been waging a brave but uneven fight for life, liberty, and the right to pursue happiness. If perchance, in spite of the winds that blew, the rains that fell, and the droughts that came, his fields produced a fair crop, inevitably, on account of forces beyond his control, he did not receive fair prices for products wrung from the soil by the sweat of his brow. If prices for his produce went down, the prices of the things he had to buy did not go down in proportion. If prices for his crop perchance went up a little, the prices of the things he had to buy went still further up and far out of proportion. I have noticed in some of the newspapers, particularly of the Northeast, that it is being said that the farmer should not expect to have parity of income or fair exchange value for his products on any such basis as prevailed before the World War or during the base period that I mentioned. In reply, allow me to approach the subject a little more directly and plainly, so that anyone may understand. I am going to insert in the RECORD quotations of prices from the Sears, Roebuck catalogue, one of 1913 and one of 1940.

TABLE C.—Comparative prices for selected articles, Sears, Roebuck & Co., 1913 and 1940

Article	Unit	1913 catalog			1940 catalog			Price change, 1913-40	
		Page Nos.	Number of items listed	Average price	Page Nos.	Number of items listed	Average price	Amount	Percent
Work shirts.....	Each.....	310-313	34	0.57	324-327	60	0.73	+0.16	+28
Overalls (bib).....	Pair.....	432-434	10	.70	319-323	18	.97	+ .27	+39
Men's suits.....	Each.....	383-393	68	12.32	271-274, 277-279	34	18.08	+5.73	+47
Women's shoes.....	Pair.....	336-341, 343-346, 349-351	124	1.84	118, 119, 122-131	68	2.81	+ .97	+53
Common nails, 8d.....	100 pounds.....	1100	1	2.10	896	1	3.65	1.55	+74
Axes, single bit, 4-pound head.....	Each.....	1102	8	.96	904	1	1.89	+ .93	+97
Handsaws, 26 inches.....	Each.....	1110-1111	1	1.16	906	5	2.07	+ .91	+78
Spike-tooth harrows, 2-section 60-tooth.....	Each.....	1162	1	10.66	940	1	19.75	+9.69	+96
Corn planter, 2-row check.....	Each.....	1163	1	31.25	942	1	65.95	+34.70	+111

TABLE D.—Farm products equivalent in value to specified commodities, Jan. 15, 1913 and 1940

Commodities	Unit	Farm products											
		Pounds of cotton		Pounds of wool		Pounds of beef		Pounds of hogs		Bushels of wheat		Bushels of corn	
		1913	1940	1913	1940	1913	1940	1913	1940	1913	1940	1913	1940
Work shirts.....	Each.....	4.7	7.2	3.1	2.6	10.6	10.6	8.4	14.0	0.73	0.86	1.1	1.4
Overalls.....	Pair.....	5.8	9.6	3.8	3.5	13.0	14.1	10.3	18.7	.9	1.15	1.4	1.8
Men's suits.....	Each.....	102.0	179.0	66.0	64.0	228.0	262.0	181.0	348.0	15.8	21.4	25.0	34.0
Women's shoes.....	Pair.....	15.0	28.0	9.9	10.0	34.0	41.0	27.0	54.0	2.4	3.3	3.7	5.3
Common nails, 8d.....	100 pounds.....	17.0	36.0	11.3	13.0	39.0	53.0	31.0	70.0	2.7	4.3	4.2	6.9
Axes, single bit, 4-pound head.....	Each.....	7.9	18.7	5.2	6.7	18.0	27.0	14.0	36.0	1.2	2.2	1.9	3.6
Handsaws, 26 inches.....	Each.....	9.6	20.5	6.2	7.4	22.0	30.0	17.0	40.0	1.5	2.4	2.3	3.9
Spike-tooth harrows, 2-section, 60 teeth.....	Each.....	83.0	196.0	54.0	70.0	186.0	286.0	148.0	380.0	12.9	23.4	20.0	37.0
Corn planter, 2-row check.....	Each.....	258.0	653.0	168.0	235.0	570.0	956.0	460.0	1,268.0	40.0	78.0	63.0	124.0

Secretary of Agriculture Wallace has called our attention to certain items in this price schedule. Take work shirts for example. Work shirts could be ordered from the 1913 catalog for an average price of 57 cents. The average price in the 1940 catalog is 73 cents, an increase of 28 percent. At January 15 prices in 1913 it took 4.7 pounds of cotton to buy a work shirt. The cost now is the equivalent of 7.2 pounds of cotton, based on January 15 prices, or 53 percent more than in 1913. The cost of bib overalls has increased 39 percent in dollars and cents. In terms of cotton, the cost has increased from 5.8 pounds to 9.6 pounds, or 66 percent.

Common nails have not changed much, if any, since 1913, but the price has gone up 74 percent. At January 15 prices for hogs in 1913 it took 31 pounds of hogs to buy 100 pounds of eightpenny nails. But at January 15 prices in 1940, it took 70 pounds of hogs to buy 100 pounds of eightpenny nails, an increase of 126 percent. The quality of an ordinary 4-pound ax probably is not better now than in 1913, but the price has almost doubled, rising from 96 cents to \$1.89—an increase of 97 percent. The amount of wheat required in exchange for a 4-pound ax has increased from 1.2 bushels to 2.2 bushels, or almost double what it was 27 years ago.

Corn planters are essentially the same now as in 1913, but the price has gone up from \$31.25 to \$65.95—an increase of 111 percent. The important point for the corn producer is the amount of corn it takes to buy a corn planter. In 1913 it took 64 bushels of corn to buy a two-row check planter. Today it takes 124 bushels. Thus the real price to the corn producer is now double what it was in 1913. At January 15 prices this year it took 124 bushels of corn to buy a two-row corn planter.

In 1913 a long-handled round-point shovel could be purchased for 48 cents. The cheapest shovel of this type quoted in the 1940 catalog is for sale at 79 cents, an increase of 65 percent. Twenty-seven years ago a three-tine hay fork could be bought for 39 cents. A similar fork today costs 79 cents, or 103 percent more.

All of the articles referred to are essentially the same now as in 1913.

It has been said here that parity payments are nothing but a subsidy to agriculture and therefore unwise. I agree that the payments amount to a subsidy, and I assert that agriculture cannot prosper with the lopsided economic set-up in this country unless it is subsidized. Why not subsidize the cotton farmer, when the manufacturer of the cloth made from the farmer's cotton is subsidized through the tariff? Why not subsidize the cotton farmer when the manufacturer of the ax, the shovel, the hoe, the plow, the rake, and the nails which he buys at exorbitant prices are, themselves, subsidized through the tariff? Gentlemen, the tariff placed this intolerable burden on the shoulders of the American farmer—the tariff pressed this crown of thorns against his brow. For a hundred years or more the tariff has been in operation in this country in one form or another. The tariff has made one part of our economic body strong but, at the same time, it has caused the right arm of this body, namely agriculture, to wither away. There are two remedies for this condition—one, the tariff must either be cut down to a plane with agriculture; or, two, agriculture must be subsidized up to a point where it will be equally protected with industry. We who are in favor of this appropriation are subscribing to the philosophy of Mahomet:

If the mountain will not come to Mahomet, Mahomet will go to the mountain.

Gentlemen of the Republican side of this House, some of you helped to pass the iniquitous Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of a few years ago. Some of you still cling to the theory that the salvation of this country rests only in huge subsidies paid through the tariff to big business and manufacturers of this country and that there is no justice in parity payments for the farmer. I suggest that you study a little further into the philosophy of the patron saint of the Republican Party tariff policy and you will find that, even though Alexander Hamilton was the father of the high-tariff system in this country, he realized and taught that there could be no permanent prosperity with a high-tariff system unless a subsidy or bounty is paid to agriculture to offset it.

I quote Hamilton on this subject:

Bounties are sometimes not only the best but the only proper expedient for uniting the encouragement of a new object of agriculture with that of a new object of manufacture. * * *

The true way to conciliate these two interests is to lay a duty on foreign manufactures of the material, the growth of which is desired to be encouraged, and to apply the produce of that duty by way of bounty, either upon the production of the material itself or upon its manufacture at home, or upon both. In this disposition of the thing the manufacturer commences his enterprise under every advantage which is attainable, as to quantity of price of the raw material, and the farmer, if the bounty is immediately to him, is enabled by it to enter into a successful competition with the foreign material.

You gentlemen have followed Hamilton in his high-tariff doctrine. You have quoted him year in and year out as authority for the wisdom of your actions heretofore, but never, never, do we hear a word out of you as to what Hamilton said must be done for agriculture if the tariff is to be a blessing to all of our people.

Far be it from me to criticize this Democratic administration for what it has done for the farmer. I remember 1931

and 1932 when the cash income of the farmers dropped to \$4,358,000,000 and in 1939 it rose again to almost \$10,000,000,000. No President in the history of the country has shown the interest in the farmer nor has proposed as much legislation for the benefit of the farmer as President Roosevelt has. Never before in any Congress has so much legislation been passed in an effort to help the farmer. Many of his problems have been solved by this Congress. He has been taught the value of woodlands and trees; he has been taught the benefits of diversification; he has been shown that under a one-crop system he cannot prosper; he has been instructed in the way to fight insects and plant diseases; he has been given the benefits of his country's credit system; he has been given lower interest rates; and, best of all, he has been taught how to conserve the soil upon which he lives and which he loves so well. We have the Soil Conservation Act, which is a success. We have the Loan Act. We have set up the Farm Credit Administration. We have the Agricultural Adjustment Act. We have the Tenant Purchase Act, which gives to every tenant the chance and the hope that sooner or later he may be master of his own land and king in his own castle. The people of this country are coming to realize that love of the good earth, love of the sweet, pungent odor that comes from the fresh-plowed dirt, love of the sound of breezes whispering through the trees above the soil a man calls his own—that love of these things brings with them good citizenship, the backbone of any nation.

In these trying times, with war all around, no one knows what sacrifices may be required of American citizenship in the years ahead; but, come what may, the United States will be ready then if we remember now that men do not give their lives cheerfully for a boarding house; they work, fight, and die cheerfully only for their homes, their farms, and for governments that make these blessings possible.

No one who has not experienced the pathos of a farmer's fight to own a farm, or to hold the one he already owns, can fully sympathize with his problems; only those who have carried such a burden can know the weight crushing the shoulders of those who still do. Faced with the tariff, an unknown market, an uncertain price, he plants his seed in the spring with a prayer; he faces the long summer and plows ahead. If the floods, and the winds, and the droughts, and the insects pass him by for a season, still he finds himself at the mercy and in the hands of those who have trafficked on his miseries for centuries.

A few weeks ago Edwin Markham, a great poet, died, but he left us lines that will never die:

THE MAN WITH THE HOE

Bowed by the weight of centuries he leans
Upon his hoe and gazes on the ground,
The emptiness of ages in his face
And on his back the burden of the world.

[Applause.]

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBBS].

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, since I was about 16 years old I have been looking for the United States Government, as well as the State of Georgia, in which I live, to go into bankruptcy. In other words, as far back as I can remember I have heard the hue and cry that if the Federal Government kept spending as it had and was spending, the Government was headed toward bankruptcy. I am now 51 years of age and I have not seen it yet. The point I make is we will not go into bankruptcy so long as we provide employment for the youth of our Nation. I want to add my endorsement to the N. Y. A. plan.

Mr. Chairman, I got up to speak principally on the C. C. C. Upon the creation of the Civilian Conservation Corps in the spring of 1933, 5 years prior to my election to the House of Representatives, I maintained close observation of the activities of that organization because of its direct effect upon Georgia and Georgians.

The initial plans, aims, and purposes of the Civilian Conservation Corps were immediately recognized as principal needs of the pine forests and agricultural sections of my native Georgia.

Being a lifelong resident of a State with enormous and invaluable natural resources, having among its industries those which are products of the soil, it is not difficult to understand why the people of my State welcomed such a program as inaugurated by the Civilian Conservation Corps.

In that category of natural resources I place the enormous naval stores, lumber, and recently introduced paper-pulp industry, in addition to agricultural enterprises, all of which depend upon the richness of the good earth for success.

With the advent of the Civilian Conservation Corps there came into Georgia at a most crucial time a medium for the preservation of all those industries, upon which depends the livelihood of thousands of my fellow Georgians. Long had been realized the necessity and imperativeness of drainage, soil conservation, soil-erosion control, forest preservation, and the perpetuation of those God-given things from which Georgians derive their greatest source of revenue.

Before the coming of the Civilian Conservation Corps feeble and unsuccessful efforts, augmented by futile educational programs, had been launched in hopes of saving depletion of Georgia's vast timber and naval-stores resources. Woods burning, destroying millions of future pines, was a general practice, reforestation was not popularly accepted, and Georgia's vast pine forests were in a state of rapid depletion.

But only 7 years ago there came into being the Civilian Conservation Corps to present solutions to those problems which had confronted Georgians for generations and for the correction of destructive practices which were proving disastrous to the State's forest resources.

Being from a State which produced 800,000,000 board feet of lumber in 1935 and representing a district which produces 25 percent of the entire output of naval stores in the United States, and being a native of a section which produced 634,520 barrels of turpentine in 1937, it can readily be seen why I, like other Georgians, welcomed the coming of the Civilian Conservation Corps, designed specifically for the preservation and perpetuation of those resources which mean so much to the future of Georgia.

But aside from rendering my people and State such a magnificent and invaluable service, I have come to the realization that the Civilian Conservation Corps not only is an organization for the preservation of our resources for generations to come, but is a builder and rebuilder of previously wasted American youth.

Bringing into its fold a total of 2,600,000 American youths the Civilian Conservation Corps has developed those youths from needy and unfortunate circumstances into self-supporting, independent members of society, improving the employability and physical condition of young men.

Those who have seen service in the Civilian Conservation Corps have learned the responsibility of providing for dependents, have become better American citizens, hold a greater respect for law, and have developed into useful Americans instead of sinking into a state of human derelicts and public charges.

As a prosecuting attorney for a period of 16 years, I am in thorough accord with the opinion of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who declared that the Civilian Conservation Corps has been one of the most important, if not the most important, factor in the reduction of crime among the youth of this Nation.

The Civilian Conservation Corps has taken off the roads and the railroad freight trains young boys who might have drifted into underworld activities and has delivered them into useful citizenship. It cannot be denied that this work has had a most welcome effect upon law enforcement and that is the observation of all law-enforcement officers throughout the United States.

However, returning to the program of the Civilian Conservation Corps, I am strongly favorable toward its continuation on the principles upon which it was inaugurated nearly 7 years ago. There probably is no other Federal agency which is more highly appreciated by the entire people of this country than the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Speaking for the people who I represent in the Congress, and I am certain that I express the sentiments of my entire Georgia, the Civilian Conservation Corps has been an indispensable unit in the future welfare and development of my State.

That which preserves our natural resources, that which provides solutions to problems of distressed people, and that which builds men into fine American citizenship should not ever be stricken from the activities of our Federal Government. [Applause.]

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], a member of the committee.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I wish at this time to discuss the Federal tax collections under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and grants to States for administration of unemployment compensation under Title III of the Social Security Act.

Under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, sections 1600-1611 of the Internal Revenue Code, a Federal tax of 3 percent of pay rolls is levied upon employers of eight or more in industry and commerce. Against this tax each employer in a State with an unemployment-compensation law approved by the Social Security Board may credit his contributions under such State law up to a maximum of 90 percent of the Federal tax. In general, this results in an employer paying 2.7 percent to a State unemployment compensation fund and 0.3 percent to the Federal Government, making a total of 3 percent. In States where merit rating or individual employer experience rating exists, as in Wisconsin, the employer pays whatever rate is applicable to him under the State law and continues to pay three-tenths of 1 percent to the Federal Government.

The three-tenths of 1 percent paid to the Federal Government is collected by the Bureau of Internal Revenue of the Treasury Department and covered into the general fund of the Treasury like any other general tax. It is not earmarked by law in any way.

Under title III of the Social Security Act the Social Security Board makes grants for the purpose of assisting the States in the administration of their State unemployment compensation laws. By June 30, 1940, the Federal grants, including expenses of the Social Security Board, for this purpose for the period since January 1, 1936, will have totaled \$177,000,000. The net Federal revenues from the three-tenths of 1 percent pay-roll tax, after deduction of various tax refunds, will have totaled approximately \$297,000,000, or nearly \$120,000,000 more than has been expended for grants to the States for administration of their unemployment compensation laws and for the administration of the Social Security Board's activities with respect to unemployment compensation. The exact amount would have to be determined after June 30, 1940, on the basis of the income and expenditures shown on the Treasury's books.

The main reason for this excess is due to the fact that while it became effective January 1, 1936, it was not until July 1, 1939, that all of the States were paying unemployment compensation benefits. Of course, during the period when benefits were not paid administrative costs were low, since the main task of the State's administrative agencies was only to collect contributions. However, when benefit payments began it was necessary to greatly extend the employment service and provide for local facilities for handling claims for benefits. It is reasonable to assume that if all of the States had begun benefit payments on January 1, 1936, when contribution collections began, the Federal grants for necessary administrative expenses would have been considerably greater. During the first few months of benefit payments the State administrative costs were running about 12 percent of the State tax collections. This cost has now been brought down to about 7½ percent. To the extent that State administrative costs stay below 10 percent of State collections they will, of course, also be less than the 10 percent of the 3-percent pay-roll tax received by the Federal Government.

While the operating costs of the State systems are now well below 10 percent, a period of greater unemployment among insured workers would decrease contributions and increase the administrative costs of claims work, which would probably result in administrative cost in excess of 10 percent.

Only future experience can adequately indicate the amounts necessary for this purpose. The extension and operation of individual employer experience rating in all States will increase administrative cost. Increased expansion of the job placement activities of the local public employment offices may also require more time and money in the future. Offsetting such increases are the economies being made by the more efficient planning of operations as the States gain the necessary experience. It may be mentioned in passing that during the early years of the British system of unemployment compensation administrative costs were regularly well above 10 percent of the collections. To be sure, the initial coverage was small but these costs ranged from 26 percent in 1913 down to 10.5 percent in 1922-23, and were less than 10 percent for only 3 years up to 1932. At this point I would like to call the attention of the House to page 30 of the record in which you find the following comments:

The ratio of administrative cost to benefits paid varies widely in the different States. Too widely in the opinion of the committee. The Board should give this matter immediate consideration with a view of reducing the variables that enter into the picture. For instance, in Montana the administrative cost was 4.5 percent, in Mississippi it was 17.6 percent. There is real opportunity here for stabilization of administrative costs with resultant economies, and the committee will expect efforts to be made in this direction.

This agency had an appropriation of approximately \$368,000,000 in 1940. Their Budget proposal was approximately \$432,000,000. After extensive hearings and extremely careful consideration, the committee recommends in this bill \$421,200,000. This is a saving of approximately \$10,630,000 under the 1941 estimates. This saving was made possible by deducting approximately \$10,000,000 from the grants to States for old-age assistance. In addition, \$330,000 was deducted from the item of salaries and expenses of the Social Security Board and \$300,000 from the Unemployment Compensation Administration, and your committee feels that the recommendation it has made in this bill and which was voted on by the members of the Appropriation Committee as a whole should be sustained by the Members of the House, because we gave it our most intense and serious consideration. [Applause.]

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, there are several matters in this bill in which I am very much interested and about which I wish to talk in the few minutes which I have at my disposal. The first is the wage and hour appropriation.

The Appropriations Committee proposes to reduce the appropriation recommended by the President for the Wage and Hour Division by \$1,346,400—20 percent of the total amount recommended by the President, which was \$7,486,000. This would reduce the recommended appropriation for salaries by \$1,035,000.

This would be a crippling reduction. The Division is now operating on the basis of annual expenditures of \$7,716,000. Moreover, when the Wage and Hour Division appeared before the Appropriations Subcommittee of the House in July 1939 to ask for additional sums in the deficiency bill the statement was made, and apparently was understood, as appears in the record, from both sides, that the rate of expenditure at the beginning of the fiscal year 1941, by reason of appropriations then made, would be annually \$7,716,000; that is, that the money which was available for the fiscal year 1940, through the regular and deficiency appropriations, would be spent in increasing amounts each month, so that in the final month of that year and the first month of the fiscal year 1941 the annual rate of expenditure would be \$7,716,000. Consequently the appropriation recommended by the President is

\$230,000 less than the annual rate that was contemplated last July.

The proposed reduction in the amount recommended by the President would mean a reduction in the inspection force of 350 men—more than a third of the total inspection staff contemplated. In addition, a very substantial number of attorneys in Washington and in the field must be discharged or furloughed without pay.

The results of such reductions on inspection are obvious. With the enforcement staff so reduced it will be simply impossible for the Division to achieve adequate enforcement. Inadequate enforcement means nonuniform discriminatory enforcement. Employers who have been voluntarily complying with the labor standards prescribed by the act will be subjected to price competition by chiselers whom the Division will be powerless to bring to book. As a result of this situation noncompliance could be expected to spread like fire or pestilence. It would become too unprofitable to comply and too easy to violate. For that reason I am opposed to the cut proposed by the committee.

With reference to the National Youth Administration, there are between four and six million young men and young women who are out of school and looking for jobs but unable to find them. We are not going to get anywhere by blaming these young people because they have been unable to find work because there simply are not enough jobs to go around.

Leaders of industry, education, and labor have recognized the fact that our youth are caught in a desperate situation with no place to turn. In October 1939 the American Youth Commission, a non-Government and nonpartisan organization headed by such men as Owen D. Young, of General Electric; Henry I. Harriman, past president of the United States Chamber of Commerce; and Robert E. Wood, of Sears, Roebuck, recommended a program of public work for all young people unable to find jobs in private industry.

That program would have cost over one and one-half billion dollars a year. Certainly, if the leaders of big business are willing to come out and urge a program of that proportion for jobless youths, it is because a careful study has convinced them that our young people are faced with a serious situation—a plight much more desperate than we may realize.

Certainly, if the leaders of business, education, and labor come out with a billion-and-a-half-dollar youth program, we ought to be willing to go at least part way with them, and the best place to put the money is in the National Youth Administration.

An appropriation of \$125,000,000 for the National Youth Administration would be a small amount to make available in the face of this obvious need, but it will do more good than any other money this Congress can appropriate.

The record of the National Youth Administration is ample proof that, dollar for dollar, the appropriation for this agency is the best investment we can make. Any way we look at it—from the standpoint of youth or from the standpoint of our own future security and welfare—the dollars we spend to fit our young men and young women to become useful members of society is a gilt-edged investment.

The National Youth Administration is fitting young men and young women for jobs in business and industry and is placing them in private employment just as fast as jobs open up. There is a turn-over on N. Y. A. work projects of between 9 and 10 percent a month, which means a turn-over of more than 100 percent a year. Between one-third and one-half of the youths who leave N. Y. A. projects do so to take jobs in private industry. That is pretty good evidence that our youth are eager and ambitious and that the N. Y. A. is giving them the right start.

Through N. Y. A. jobs, youths who otherwise would grow up in idleness and despair are being taught sound habits of work and are getting the chance to acquire the basic experience they need to get private jobs.

This year the National Youth Administration, with an appropriation of \$100,000,000, provides part-time work for

about a half-million out-of-school youths. If you could see these young people before they go to work for N. Y. A. going from factory to factory and from farm to farm, most of them without a dime in their pockets, many of them hungry, on the verge of despair, you would know what it means to them to be unable to find a job. Then if you could see them on their N. Y. A. jobs, see how eagerly they go about their tasks, how eager they are to work and to learn, you would know what a whale of a difference a chance to work and a few dollars in wages make.

Every N. Y. A. project has been operated in cooperation with some local public agency. The schools, the playgrounds, the parks, and public buildings these young people have built are going to benefit all of the people in the community.

Hundreds of thousands of young men and young women have been tided over an emergency. Their labor has gone to enrich the entire Nation. Their skills have been conserved, they have learned how to work, and their morale has been preserved, and those are benefits which will accrue to the whole Nation, both in the present time and in the future.

It has cost the Nation about \$268 a year for each out-of-school youth employed by the National Youth Administration. That is a low price to pay for human welfare.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak now briefly about the National Labor Relations Board. No one in this House is in any doubt about how I feel with regard to the present administration of the National Labor Relations Act. I believe the majority members of the Board, Mr. Madden and Mr. Smith, could well serve the interests of our country and of the present administration by promptly tendering their resignations, and I have so stated publicly a number of times. However, to cut the National Labor Relations Board appropriation, as the committee proposes to do on the ground that the number of incoming cases decreased from 10,430 during 1938 to 6,904 last year, and because during the current 6 months of the fiscal year the cases show a rate of about 6,000 a year, it seems to me is not logical. If this comparison stood alone as a reflection of decreased Board activity I would be eager to make proportional savings in administering the Labor Act.

The 10,000 cases coming to the Board in 1938 represented the flood of unfair labor practices, charges, and petitions for elections submitted by labor as soon as the act was declared constitutional. The Labor Board was not staffed to meet this emergency. It was forced to triple its staff overnight, and still found on its hands a heavy backlog of cases which, in addition to new incoming cases, has caused a 3-year struggle for the agency to clear its docket and give that speedy resolution of cases which in the labor field is peculiarly important. I am told that the Board is current as to its representation cases, that is, it only requires an average of 1 month to decide a case where the proper bargaining representation is in dispute. The difficulty lies with the unfair labor practices cases. These average well over 1,000 pages of testimony each and are much more difficult cases to adjudicate than they were in the earlier days of this act.

That the decreased numbers of incoming cases is a poor index of Board work to be done is shown by the fact that the number of cases pending actually stood at its highest point at the end of the last fiscal year. There were then more than 4,000 undecided cases on the Board's books. Awaiting review today are more than half a million pages of testimony which in themselves would represent nearly a year's work if no single new case were entered. Labor in fact is submitting new cases, both A. F. of L. and C. I. O., in about equal numbers, and while the total is less than in the peak year of 1938 there are still enough of them to keep the Board's staff working overtime.

In 5 years they have closed 22,000 cases, involving 4,000,000 workers. The simple fact is that an inundation of cases in 1937-38 swamped them and they have never quite been able to catch up.

It must also be noted that cases are becoming more complex. A dispute settled informally by one of its field agents requires infinitely less time and energy than one which goes

to formal hearing and demands the services of trial attorneys, trial examiners, review attorneys, and final consideration by the Board. In 1937 the number of cases necessitating such formal handling jumped 50 percent over the preceding year. The life cycle of other agencies, such as the Federal Trade Commission, shows a tendency over the years toward conducting few but much more time-consuming cases. It would seem a strange thing to suggest this as a reason for depriving the agency of the means to do its work.

Insofar as reducing the Board's staff would deprive workers quick access to the Labor Act, it would be unwise in the public interest as well as in their interest. We established this act so that workers might have a channel for their complaints instead of nurturing them in secret or carrying them to the picket line.

Take \$57,000 away from the Board's trial-examiner's section and you reduce their number by one-quarter. Already each trial examiner is handling 30 cases a year. That is less than 10 working days in which to sit upon a case and write a formal report. It is impracticable to reduce that time further. By making that one cut you would make it necessary for the Board to refuse to undertake 25 percent of its hearings. You leave 250 cases a year to be resolved by strikes instead of by law.

In conclusion I wish to point out that serious misunderstandings exist as to the function of the Board's division of economic research. It is proposed to wipe out this section entirely, as the supposition held by some Members that its principal duty is to pry into the financial standing of employers to the advantage of employees. The first duty of the section is to explore data to discover whether the Board, under the commerce clause of the Constitution, has the right to jurisdiction over an industry in which a labor dispute has arisen.

For its first 2 years the principal fight on the validity of the Labor Act centered on the contention that it could not apply to manufacturers. The research to contest that claim was done by this same economics section of the Board's staff, and so well done that the Supreme Court took judicial notice of the fact that these great social problems are not decided in a vacuum but must be considered in the light of the complex interrelations of modern industry. The carefully prepared studies of the Board's research division entered largely into the favorable decisions of the Supreme Court in the first five cases by which the act was first upheld on April 12, 1937, and have played a continuing part in supporting the jurisdiction of the act in contested fields. Briefs prepared by the research division have been cited by the Supreme Court and Circuit Courts of Appeals in cases where the Board itself was not involved.

The importance of the economic brief in aiding the courts is stressed in a recent article in the University of Chicago Law Review which cites 19 cases in which economic data was presented and then points out that the party resorting to such presentation won 16 of the cases while those who failed to develop economic factors won only 3 cases. Seven of the 16 successful suits were those of the Labor Board, using data prepared by its economic research section.

The work of the Labor Board is currently subjected to the most critical public analysis of any Government agency. There is no danger that you will not be apprised of what it does with its funds.

I do not question the sincerity of the members or the staff of the Labor Board, however, I hold no brief for them, but I believe it is a mistake to starve these agencies to death. If they are to be eliminated, let us do it directly. [Applause.]

I regret that the subcommittee has included in the bill a section denying the possibility of civil service to employees of the National Youth Administration. Since the House recently passed H. R. 960 it would seem to me that such a restriction should not remain in this measure.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself enough time to make a statement which I believe it is important be made at this time.

I have no question as to the sincerity and honesty of purpose of my colleague from Georgia who has just spoken, but I feel that he is mistaken as to the facts with regard to the effect of these proposed reductions in Budget estimates upon the operations of the Wage and Hour Division. I wish to call the attention of the Members, not only for the benefit of those present, but for the benefit of those who may have the opportunity to examine the Record prior to our session tomorrow, to the statistics set out on pages 345 and 346 of the hearings, showing the total number of supervising inspectors, senior inspectors, and inspectors stationed at Wage and Hour Division regional and branch offices on February 1, 1940.

In connection with that information I shall state that I have before me the printed bill which was for consideration before the subcommittee and which contains certain information with regard to the number of field and departmental employees of the Wage-Hour Division during the fiscal years 1939, 1940, and 1941. It will be observed from these statistics that the total permanent field employees for the fiscal year 1940 were estimated at 896 when the officials of the Wage-Hour Division came before the Appropriations Committee in order to secure the appropriation of sufficient funds to carry on the work of their organization for the present fiscal year. It is also to be observed that the total number of permanent field employees estimated for in the 1941 Budget is 2,018, as against 896 for the present fiscal year.

It will also be observed that for the fiscal year 1940, according to the statistics which have been inserted in the hearings and to which I have made reference, the Wage-Hour Division had employed as of February 1 in its field inspection service only 334 inspectors of the three types to which I have made reference, although it would have been authorized to have employed 398 under its estimate as approved by Congress for the present fiscal year. The estimates for 1941, which have been reduced in what I consider to be a very reasonable way by the committee, contemplated the addition of a sufficient number of inspectors to raise the number to 661, or approximately double those which the Wage-Hour Division had in service on February 1, 1940.

So that not only will this proposed reduction, which is still so comparatively small in amount as to leave this division \$1,644,000 more for the next fiscal year than it had for the present fiscal year, not result in the discharge of any portion of their field inspection force, but it will be sufficient to allow them to employ inspectors considerably larger in number than those that they had in their employment on February 1, 1940, and if they need additional inspectors for this year they are authorized, under the terms of the current appropriation bill, to increase the number from 334 to 398, as estimated for the present fiscal year.

I have not undertaken to discuss the departmental employment, but similar figures will be found in the record relating to that employment, and I think it is important for the House to know that not only will this reduction below the Budget estimates not have the result which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] and the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], who preceded him, anticipate, but that it will provide for a considerably larger field force of inspectors than is now in the service or was in the service on February 1, 1940.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Of course, my colleague knows that I would not question in any way the facts that he has before him there, but I am somewhat at a loss to understand the facts as related by my colleague, in view of the statement made to me last Thursday evening by the Director of this division, Colonel Fleming, in the presence of a member of the gentleman's subcommittee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE], that if the committee's recommended appropriation went through it meant an actual dismissal of present employees, and it is upon that type of information that I have made the statement I made here this afternoon.

Mr. TARVER. I am sure that the gentleman was misled. It is possibly true that the Wage-Hour Administrator contemplates greatly enlarging the number of his force between now and July 1, so that, with the enlarged number that he may contemplate having July 1, it would be necessary to have a considerably larger appropriation in order to pay their salaries in full for the next fiscal year, but this evidence, which is in the hearings and which I trust my colleague will examine, shows that he only had on February 1 334 of these field inspectors, when he was authorized to have had 398 if he so desired, and that the appropriation which we propose for the next fiscal year will provide for the employment of largely more than the number which he now has in his employment.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. At the same time they had ample money to place all the employees which the law permitted them to use. Is not that correct?

Mr. TARVER. Absolutely true. The estimates were based upon the number of employees which they anticipated they would need.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RAMSPECK. May I say to my colleague that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] and myself were talking with Colonel Fleming about this matter, and the gentleman from South Carolina had stated to me previously that the recommended appropriation would not require the dismissal of any of the present employees. I asked Colonel Fleming about that in the presence of the gentleman from South Carolina, and he said that was a mistake—that it would require the dismissal of a considerable number of the existing employees.

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman will examine the statement which I refer to in the Record he will find that it is the evidence of Colonel Fleming as given to this committee, and the evidence is as I have stated it, and it shows there is no prospect of the dismissal of any employees by reason of the reduction which is contemplated below the Budget estimates.

Mr. HOUSTON. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to know how an increase in the appropriation of \$1,644,000 will entail the dismissal of any employees.

Mr. RAMSPECK. If they pay them out of that money, of course, they would have to dismiss some of them if they do not get the money, if they have them now.

Mr. TARVER. The point my colleague is making is that we are not only not taking the million dollars off so far as this year's appropriation is concerned, but we are proposing to add \$1,644,000 to what they had this year, and therefore there is no possibility that I can see or that is disclosed by the Record, that this action, if approved by the House, will result in the decrease of the field force of the Wage-Hour Division.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Is it not true they had a deficiency appropriation of a very large amount which the gentleman is not taking into consideration?

Mr. TARVER. All of it is included in the figures I have quoted to the gentleman.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman means he is adding \$1,000,000 over and above what they had with the deficiency appropriation.

Mr. TARVER. With the deficiency appropriation; yes, indeed.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Has the committee taken into consideration the additional work which has been entailed by the recent decisions, and I am referring particularly to the decision in the shoe industry, which requires quite a number of inspectors to enforce?

Mr. TARVER. Is the gentleman talking about the appropriation for the Wage-Hour Division or the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The Wages and Hours Division.

Mr. TARVER. The Committee took into consideration all pertinent facts as disclosed by the rather extensive hearings which were held by the Committee, and without any intention to hamper the work of the Wages and Hours Division in any way whatever, decided that the amount which we have recommended to the Congress would very reasonably provide for all of their activities during the next fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, one of the oldest and most widely discussed subjects is youth. In past years we thought mainly of the romance of youth rather than an actual youth problem. We thought in terms of the pleasures only young people enjoy; we delighted in comparing the younger generation to our own; we viewed with alarm new trends and attitudes prevailing among the youth group; we gave little thought of the problem of jobs; or, if we did, we thought mainly of the romance attached to preparing for and entering adult life.

This was a grand and glorious period in our history. Little did we realize how fortunate we were in having a western frontier which absorbed young people who were unable to find opportunity at home. We did not know that we would later face a period when the youth problem would become painfully realistic. We were not prepared to face reality—not even at a time when 4,000,000 young people were known to be out of school, unemployed, and hopelessly looking for jobs.

We did find a partial solution to the problem in the establishment of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration. These agencies have made a powerful impact on American life; they have conserved youth resources; they have restored hope, courage, ambition to youth; they have provided educational opportunity and work experience; and at the same time their work has added to our national wealth. I take great pride in pointing to the work of these agencies as examples of effective action to alleviate a grave youth problem.

But I am not one who feels that present measures are adequate. We are still unwilling to face reality and make adequate provision for youth. The most glaring evidence of this is the proposed reduction of the National Youth Administration appropriation from \$100,000,000 to \$85,000,000.

This agency has been not only a most needed one, but one which has met with popular approval in every section of the Nation. The N. Y. A. student-work program, which enables needy young people to continue their education, has been accepted as a part of the local education program. It has enabled hundreds of thousands of youths to take advantage of established educational facilities. Youth Administration projects for out-of-school youth have preserved the morale, the skill, the energy, and prepared for regular employment hundreds of thousands of unemployed, nonschool, young people.

What is the threat of unemployment to American youth? Four millions of enterprising and ambitious young people are faced with an appalling fact—that there are not enough jobs, temporary or permanent, to give them the foundation to take up a normal life. We talk about economy without recognizing what economy means to thousands of young people who have not a chance to work. The National Youth Administration received \$100,000,000 from the Congress for this year. Are we going to permit any less to be appropriated to this worthy agency for the continuance of its programs of education and employment of needy youth?

A decrease of \$15,000,000 will reduce by 123,000 the average employment of youth by the National Youth Administration. The immediate results of this reduction will be that the education of over 75,000 will be stopped and another 48,000 will be forced to accept idleness as a vocational pursuit. For the amazingly low per capita cost of less than \$135 a year, 746,268

young men and women are kept in school, given counseling and legitimate work experience.

Every effort is made by the N. Y. A. officials to get these young people off the part-time N. Y. A. job into private employment. Turn-over from the work projects is between 90 percent and 100 percent in the course of a year. And over 31 percent who leave the projects are able to get private jobs, chiefly because they have had some sound work experience and some proper guidance from people who are interested in their welfare. The 435,000 who are helped to stay in school are justifying this work opportunity. They are able to make good grades—most of them are in the upper half of the student body—and they work under faculty supervision to earn their small monthly stipend.

The National Youth Administration is a sane, sound, and economical Government program and is valid from every point of view that may be projected. I believe that we should direct our efforts toward increasing the appropriation of the National Youth Administration to a sum sufficient to employ every one of the 340,000 who are already certified and awaiting assignment at this time, but who cannot get on the National Youth Administration program because there is not enough money to employ them. We cannot permit this waiting list for jobs to be jumped up by another 125,000 or more.

A reduction of \$15,000,000 would have the immediate effect of cutting N. Y. A. employment by 123,000 youth—78,000 N. Y. A. jobs for enabling young people to continue their education and 45,000 jobs for out-of-school unemployed youth. It would deny the right to earn equality of educational opportunity to 78,000 potential students. It would prevent 45,000 nonschool youth from obtaining work experience and training they need in order to hold a regular job.

Reduction of the N. Y. A. appropriation is not true economy, it is waste—waste of youth resources. Unemployment among youth is the greatest menace to democracy—its results are idle minds dominated by dismay, despondency, and despair. Such minds are rusty for constructive thinking, but ripe for crime and ideology.

To many other agencies of Government a fund reduction of \$15,000,000 would not be so drastic. But the N. Y. A. program is administered at the extraordinarily low per capita cost of \$135 per year. What other agency or department of Government has produced equally effective results so cheaply and so economically? What other agency has received the same widespread public approval? What other agency could give substantial assistance to 123,000 persons on appropriation of \$15,000,000?

In deciding upon this appropriation let us think of the value of education and employment to young people. Let us try to put ourselves in the shoes of young people who have not either the opportunity to attend school or to work. Let us consider the handicaps which youth faces without training. Think of the adults who suffer because of this lack of education or training. And finally, let us think of the ill effects which a poorly equipped citizenry will have on our society.

I favor equality of opportunity; I favor a youth population healthy in body and mind; I favor an educated citizenry. I endorse the record of the National Youth Administration and will support an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for this agency. [Applause.]

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. HOUSTON. May I say to the gentleman from Ohio that this is the last speaker today.

Mr. BENDER. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this bill before us is so important, containing so many matters of importance, that it is rather impossible to think of starting at this late hour of the day, particularly in 10 minutes, to discuss it. There are only one or two items to which I wish to address myself very briefly. My thesis mainly is the following: I believe very earnestly that with the economic situation as it

is in this country today it is wrong for us to require the curtailment of any work program by so much as one person. With private employment decreasing, we are doing a very bad thing economically if we curtail employment on Government programs at the same time. There are two main items in this bill where that factor is involved. One of them is the National Youth Administration and one of them is the Civilian Conservation Corps. It has already been pointed out by previous speakers this afternoon that in the case of the National Youth Administration a cut of \$15,000,000 under the appropriation for this year will mean that approximately 123,000 young people would have to be laid off the program. I shall support amendments to raise the N. Y. A. appropriation to \$100,000,000. I presume that everybody is familiar with what it costs to give to one group of young people an opportunity to continue in school and to another group of young people an opportunity to earn a living and at the same time get work-training experience. Under the high-school-aid program the average cost is \$4.23 per month per student. This is what these young people earn to keep themselves in school. It seems to me that this program is an integral part of the American idea of educational equality, and that to cut that program the slightest bit would be eminently wrong. Incidentally, the N. Y. A. itself has virtually no administrative expense in connection with the school-aid program. It is administered by the heads of the schools and colleges which the young people attend. On the works program it costs an average of \$18.86 a month for wages to these young people. A man connected with the California State Employment Service told me one day that if all the young people between the ages of 18 and 24 who were registered at his office had had N. Y. A. training experience his placements in that age group would have been 33½ percent higher than they had been. That is to say that the N. Y. A. experience meant that much increase in the possibility of placing these young people in private jobs. I do not know of anything anywhere in the whole gamut of governmental activities where it is so clear that attempts at so-called economy mean that we are spending people in order to save dollars.

The N. Y. A. has been a boost to young people. It has not been a long-time employment program. We find that the turn-over of N. Y. A. employment has been between 90 and 100 percent a year on the out-of-school work projects. Of course, in the school age it is not that rapid. There are about 4,000,000 young people, it is estimated, between 18 and 24 who today are unemployed and not in school. Of these, about 9 percent are affected in some way or other by the N. Y. A. program. There are at the present, according to the best information I can get, somewhere around 300,000 young people who are actually certified to go to work on the N. Y. A. who cannot be put to work because of lack of funds. I think it is the wrong time to add to this confusion, which is just what it is, in the minds of the youths by requiring another 123,000 young people to be placed in that same position by taking from them the opportunity which N. Y. A. work affords.

I would like to indicate in the few moments what some other people beside myself think about this N. Y. A. program. The California Legislature at its last session, which was certainly not a session marked by its generosity in making appropriations, nevertheless voted 65 to nothing to allocate one-half of 1 percent of all State relief funds for the sponsoring of N. Y. A. relief projects.

This is the same legislature that made reductions in the appropriations in general for relief, which were very severe and which have resulted in cuts in the ordinary budgets of California people who are unfortunate enough to be on relief of about 40 percent.

Raymond Clapper, on January 31, wrote a column about N. Y. A., which I inserted in the *Record*. I would like to read one paragraph from that column. It is as follows:

Even if N. Y. A. is going to add a few million dollars to the national debt, I as a taxpayer consider it a good investment—insofar as the money goes to these students and not to padded overhead. For here you are giving a chance to the most ambitious young men and women, the ones with real stamina. They are willing to put themselves through work that would be disdained by eastern college boys who are being educated on dad's checkbook to grow up as

smug reactionaries. This country will be better off for these young people who, in 2 or 3 years, will be out teaching the next generation. I could write much more and give you more facts. But it isn't popular copy. Some people might think I was a "red"—those people who don't know Americanism when they see it.

I believe that this N. Y. A. program is the best immediate answer that we have to anybody who might attempt to teach doctrines to the young people of this country that we do not want them to learn. The problem that we face is a great national problem. Our young people have had nothing whatsoever to do with bringing about the situation of unemployment. They are not the people to be asked to pay the price for our failure to solve it more quickly. It is our minimum duty to see to it that not a single one of those young people has to be laid off this year as a result of our action.

I have a letter that I unfortunately do not seem to be able to put my hand on at the moment, but I can tell you about it. It is a letter from a man who used to be my boss when I worked as a clerk in the office of an automobile company. He lives in Wisconsin. He is a Republican. He has been on the Republican county committee for a long time. He has been associated more recently with the N. Y. A. He has been actively engaged in the work. In his letter he tells me that in his judgment this is one of the very best programs that we have in this country. He pays a high compliment to the way it has been run in his State and says he hopes that nothing will happen which will cause this program to be curtailed.

I would like to say a few words about the C. C. C. program. Here we have a case of a great Nation that has an unemployment problem, a Nation also which only in the last 4 or 5 years, indeed, only since the present administration came into power, has begun to realize not only the value of its natural resources but the extent to which those natural resources have been depleted; the extent to which the life-giving soil of the Nation is being washed away into the oceans.

The C. C. C. program has been an attempt to combine the energies of youth with the saving of the soil and forests and other natural resources of America for future generations. We sometimes hear people talk about passing the national debt on to the next generation. I do not want to do that. I think there are ways it could be avoided, incidentally, without curtailing any of these programs; but I am not going to speak about that today. But what could be more serious than to pass on to the next generation a Nation whose soil resources had been so seriously depleted that its agriculture could not be profitably or effectively carried on? I believe N. Y. A. and C. C. C. should both be given at least the same amount of money as they had last year. These employment programs are the wrong place to try to save money, for to the youth of America they make all the difference between feeling that you have an opportunity to build your country on the one hand and feeling that your country does not need you on the other hand.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, we have heard some very interesting talks this afternoon along the line of the unemployment problem. I am firmly convinced that there is only one way in which we are going to solve unemployment, and that is by actually getting back into employment the 9,000,000 now without jobs.

We talk about four and one-half million unemployed youths. The problem is not going to be solved through W. P. A., P. W. A., or relief organizations, although I have been one of the most consistent supporters of these efforts; but I do believe that there is a plan which if put into effect would completely wipe out unemployment in this Nation. What does W. P. A. and P. W. A. create? Yes; fine projects; they were needed, but they create static things, things that are not consumed. What we must go into is more employment in the consumer-goods industries, employment in the factories of this Nation, the 116,911 factories. If we are going to accept the program that 10,000,000 unemployed and 30,000,000 employed is the normal situation, all well and good for

those who wish to accept that philosophy, but I cannot. I want to see men, both youth and middle age, employed in industry at real wages, and a real provision in the law for security for the aged. We have over \$6,000,000,000 too much inventory on the shelves that cannot be taken up unless there is increased buying power. Five minutes is entirely insufficient time in which to discuss this great problem.

The 8,000,000 unemployed in 1935 would have earned about \$10,000,000,000 had they been employed. Their unemployment represents a loss of \$10,000,000,000 buying power in this Nation. The only way we can solve this problem is by insuring the employment of 3,000,000 additional people in the factories of this Nation. Why do I say 3,000,000? Because for every person employed in the factories two additional persons would be employed in auxiliary occupations, which would mean a total of 6,000,000 additional, making 9,000,000 all told. I would have the Government put up 40 percent of the wages of the new employment that these factories would create. In other words, 40 cents out of every dollar of new employment would be put up by Government and 60 cents by the employer in every line of work. A definite time might be set at which to fix normal employment, and from and after that date every employer of labor who added new labor to his pay roll would have assistance from the Government to the extent of 40 cents on the dollar of the employees' wages, the Government paying 40 cents and the employer 60 cents. Such a program would mean that these men would be earning wages on which they and their families could live and definitely take care of the unemployed. It would take people off of relief and put them in real jobs. A surprising thing is that it would not cost much more than W. P. A. or P. W. A. It would cost the Government about \$4,500,000,000 to meet this extra subsidy, but the increased national income of over \$20,000,000,000 would take care of the additional cost over and above the present program. [Applause.]

I have introduced H. R. 933, which sets up this program. It is before the Ways and Means Committee. We should have hearings. The bill provides vocational training for youth; security for those that cannot be employed because of age or physical handicap. It provides for a joint committee of the House and Senate to cooperate with labor, agriculture, and industry to set up a real permanent program for this problem, because this plan of mine would be in effect for 3 years and at the end of that period this joint committee would be ready to report on a permanent basis.

I invite you to read my bill to create 9,000,000 jobs. I feel convinced you will acknowledge it will do the job. I cannot cover its provisions in my limited time here. The youth problem must be met by meeting the problem of unemployment so that they will be able to face the world with confidence in the future and respect for their Nation. If we do not meet it, our Nation will not long endure.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. RAYBURN, having resumed the chair, Mr. BUCK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 9007, the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill, 1941, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further general debate on the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill, H. R. 9007, be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday, March 27, 1940, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the afternoon the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] made some remarks in which he desired to include certain telegrams and letters. He was called away earlier in the afternoon and requested me to ask that he be permitted to include them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include certain telegrams and a letter in the remarks I made this afternoon in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a radio talk I made last Thursday night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement issued by the Department of the Interior, Bituminous Coal Division.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects and to include in one of them a letter from John F. Selle, of Gainesville, Fla., and in the other excerpts from an address delivered before the Democratic Club at Pomona, Calif.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article appearing in the New York Journal-American of Sunday, March 24, entitled "Shall We Amend the Constitution? Third Term Issue Again Raised," by George Rothwell Brown.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a quotation from the Patriot.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the dean of the University of Oregon.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

There was no objection.

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the one hundred and nineteenth anniversary of the independence of Greece; an independence that was achieved after 7 years of continuous struggle on the part of a subjugated, yet indomitable, race against the then mighty Turkish Empire, whose domain extended over large parts of Asia, Europe, and Africa. This latter fact, in itself, makes the success of the Greeks of the third decade of the nineteenth century the more admirable. Our own independence, also achieved a few decades earlier, under very difficult circumstances, had undoubtedly influenced the Grecian patriots in their own determination to free themselves, no matter what the cost in blood and suffering would be.

During the time that has elapsed since March 25, 1821, when the Archbishop of old Patras blessed the uprising of the people of the historic Grecian mainland and the islands of the Aegean Sea, Greece has grown in territory, and has vastly advanced in every field of human endeavor. As an example, I may mention the Greek merchant marine, many units of which are daily touching our American ports along both oceans and the Gulf, and are proudly flying the Greek flag throughout the watery expanse of our globe—about 700 of them—making an aggregate of approximately 2,000,000 tons. It comes next to that of France, and is the ninth largest in the world.

Greece and Turkey have put aside animosities of the past and, for several years now, have been showing the way to genuine cooperation and mutual respect among nations. They are doing more than quite a few other nations are doing to promote civilization, goodwill and peace, in this war-tired era of ours, when international lawlessness reigns, and small or weak nations are being devoured by larger or strong ones.

Greece, along with brave Finland and Hungary, has not forgotten her debt to the United States—in recent years. Of course, what she pays represents only partial payments on account of interest on part of the loans made to her, but the fact remains that she pays something. In other words, she is making an honest effort; an effort that is duly appreciated in this country, I am sure.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I am expressing the sentiment of the House when I heartily congratulate the people of Greece, as well as our splendid Americans of Greek descent, on the occasion of the one hundred and nineteenth milestone of the precious independence of that historic land, the mother of civilization and democracy. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, Selma Super Service. Again Selma leads the world. Alabama's "Central City" shows the way.

A taxicab driver of my native town of Selma, Buddy Kyndard, found an egg on the rear seat of his cab. Not knowing to whom he should return it, he pulled off a fur-lined glove, put the egg in it, and stuck the glove and the egg in the dash box of his car. Being a taxicab running 24 hours a day the egg was kept warm. On yesterday morning, Easter, the famous Easter rabbit may have laid some eggs, but the egg in the glove celebrated Easter in its own way—by giving birth to a baby chick.

I maintain that this modern use of the facilities of today for a novel purpose is worthy of the attention of Congress. If Washington follows Selma's example, and every taxi here does such double duty, broilers and friers will soon be plentiful.

Hatching by taxi, the latest practice in the poultry world. Another adventure in leadership started in one of the most progressive cities on God's earth. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Ludlow] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE CONDITION OF THE POOR IN AMERICA AND CHANGES NEEDED IN OUR RELIEF SYSTEM

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a letter I have received from John K. Jennings, Work Projects Administrator of the State of Indiana.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, as the time is approaching when Congress must pass a relief act for the fiscal year 1941, it seems appropriate that we, as conscientious legislators, should be giving careful consideration now to the condition of the worthy destitute people of our country who deserve and must have assistance.

As much as I would like to see poverty vanish from the earth, I am impressed as I read my daily mail and as I come in contact with the situation throughout the country that we still have an appalling lot of it left with us—not only poverty but deep distress and poignant suffering. All of the time I am receiving appeals from constituents who are tramping the streets looking for work that cannot be found; whose families lack food and clothing and medical care; whose dwellings in some instances have been absolutely without heat during the subzero weather of the coldest winter we have had in many a year. The appeals that are coming to me have the ring of truth and sincerity, and I believe that the malingerers—of whom there will always be a certain number—are a small and inconsequential fraction compared with the total suffering population. With many of the writers I am personally acquainted, and I know they are as good people as you or I. Without fault of their own, they are the tragic victims of relentless economic forces.

This is the gloomy and sorrowful picture that is still before us as we prepare to frame the Relief Act for 1941. People will differ in their opinions as to what created that picture and as to why, in the moving panorama of events, the picture does not change so as to present a more pleasing vista. My own view is that there will never be any satisfactory solution of the relief problem until business and industry are given the proper stimulus and encouragement to resume normal operations and to take over into regular jobs the millions now on the relief rolls. For a long time the businessman has been the "forgotten man" of our national equation. No one in authority has warmed up to him. No one in authority has said to him, "What can I do to assist you?"

Businessmen and industrialists have had the daylights scared out of them by the enormous spending which threatens our national solvency, by excessive and burdensome taxation, and by the many unwarranted incursions of the Government into fields of private enterprise. These untoward developments have left business prostrate and hopeless, in a condition where it may truthfully be described as atrophied, or perhaps petrified would be a better word. With businessmen and other employers in this desperate state of complete prostration, is it any wonder that hundreds of my constituents, and hundreds of your constituents, are tramping the streets looking for work and not finding it? Whenever they approach a factory door they are hailed with the answer before they can open their mouths, "Sorry, but we are not hiring anyone."

As I said before, people will differ over what caused the picture, but no one can doubt the picture itself. Go to any center of population in the United States and you will see it there in all of its unloveliness. And, after all, it does not greatly matter what caused it, for the fact remains that it is there, and it must be reckoned with. It is a condition, and not a theory, that confronts us.

The inescapable realization that we have this tremendous problem on our doorstep and that it must be dealt with in a humane way is what prompts me to make the suggestions I am about to make which are born of my personal observations in my earnest efforts to serve the people of my district. According to my way of thinking, the Work Projects Administration never has been, and never will be, a satisfactory instrumentality for handling the relief situation. Quite aside

from its enormous overhead cost, it is objectionable because it makes fish of one and fowl of another among our worthy unfortunates. One applicant gets on the roll and draws his \$58.50 a month. Another applicant, exactly as worthy as the first, cannot get on the roll at all, and he and his family have to subsist on a food order of the township trustee amounting at most to a few dollars a week. Since it is impossible to find jobs for all eligibles on the W. P. A. rolls, the operation of the W. P. A. law inevitably divides the great relief population of the country into two groups—a fair-haired group that gets employment at a living salary and an unfortunate group that cannot get employment and must starve or subsist on hand-outs of the township trustees. This unequal treatment is a constant festering cause of distrust and jealousy and a glaring violation of the fundamental Jeffersonian theory of "equal rights to all; special privileges to none." My personal thought is that the relief problem could be better handled by Federal grants-in-aid to the States, the distribution of the funds to be on a scale that would reach every person who really needs relief and on a basis of absolute equality to all, the grants to be administered by local officials who are thoroughly familiar with the relief situation in their various communities.

But if we are to continue the illogical Work Projects Administration relief system—and I am satisfied we shall have it next year and perhaps for years to come—I for one shall vote every dollar of appropriations necessary to make it workable, or as nearly workable as it can be made. While we are making vast appropriations that are not necessary, surely we can and should appropriate a sufficient sum to relieve misery and to save and protect the great human values. When I first ran for Congress I announced that when it came to an alternative between dollars, on the one hand, and the humanities, on the other hand, my voice and my vote and my influence, for whatever they might be worth, would always be on the side of the humanities, and on that platform I still stand.

The point I wish especially to make, which I regard as fundamentally important in the further consideration of our relief problem, is that, whatever the amount of the appropriation for the Work Projects Administration for 1941 may be, arrangement should be made so that favoritism will cease and it will be distributed as equitably as it can be distributed among all worthy certified applicants. To effectuate this purpose it will be necessary, I think, to make some changes in the relief law.

First, let me say that the plan I have in mind is necessarily based on conditions as they exist in Marion County, Ind., as that is the only region on which I have full and definite information, but it is to be assumed that conditions there are typical of other cities over the country.

There are many hundreds of persons certified as eligible for W. P. A. employment who cannot be placed. A great number of these fall within the A classification, being persons with 6, 8, and 10 dependents. There are no jobs for them, and they therefore are on the relief rolls, barely keeping body and soul together. Many of these people have been on relief rolls for many months, and it obviously is undermining their health. This is especially true in the case of children. As the money and jobs are limited and are not sufficient to take care of all persons, spread of employment is vital.

Several benefits are now being paid by the Federal, State, and local units of government to persons with no means of support. In Indiana persons receiving old-age assistance get on an average of \$17 per month, many less, some more. Persons receiving dependent children's aid receive \$20 for the first child, \$18 for the second, and gradually decreasing amounts for the others. This is reduced in some cases, according to the standard of living of the family, and the average amount being paid is somewhere between \$40 to \$50 for families of five and six. Widows of veterans receive \$30 per month in most cases. Persons on relief, if single, get a grocery order of \$1.45 per week, two persons get \$2.05, three persons \$2.45, and so forth, with a family of eight receiving \$4.05. Rent is not paid unless the family is evicted, and in no case for single persons. The grocery order is supplemented

in some cases with a ton of coal a month, clothing, and milk. These benefits, with the possible exception of a widow with a large family of children receiving dependent children's aid, do not in any way compare with the W. P. A. income and there is jealousy and suffering. It would appear that the benefits should be standardized.

Then, too, there is a cry from employers in private industry that the W. P. A. wage is beyond what they can pay for similar duties and hours, as, for instance, in the case of domestics.

In my opinion, the following plan would go far to spread the work, standardize the relief, and eliminate competition with private employment:

Set a wage scale by the hour and give enough hours of employment to single persons to equal a wage of \$25 per month; to persons with one dependent, \$40 per month; two dependents, \$45; three dependents, \$50; four dependents, \$55; and five dependents or more than five dependents, \$60.

This would in no way decrease the buying power and would not decrease the wage scale. Persons on relief have no buying power and it is an economic truth that persons in the low-wage scale have to spend their entire earnings for the necessities of life. In other words, there would be a greater possibility of saving and limitation of buying power if one person received \$60 per month and another was on relief than if the \$60, or more than \$60, was divided between the two recipients. Thirty dollars would necessarily have to be expended for food and shelter.

At first blush, those in class C—single persons—and class B, the other deferred class, might object to a lower salary than is provided in the existing scale, but they should bear in mind that under my plan they would, at least, have a chance to secure employment, though at the reduced rate, while under the employment-quota limitations now imposed on W. P. A., and likely to be imposed at all times in the future, they probably will be unable to secure employment at all, because there will always be enough persons in the A classification to consume the entire quota. After all, a single person has to live and a wage of \$25 a month is better than no wage at all.

The great virtue of my proposed plan is that it would spread the money so that many who are now on trustees' relief, which is hardly sufficient to keep body and soul together, would get work jobs on W. P. A., to which they are entitled if W. P. A. benefits are to be spread universally and equitably, as they should be spread.

On February 28, the last date for which complete statistics are available, there were in the United States 2,325,896 persons on W. P. A. work-relief rolls, but there were 1,000,000 others equally eligible for employment and equally worthy who cannot get work. In my home State, Indiana, there were 65,063 on the W. P. A. and 27,000 other eligibles who cannot get on the W. P. A. under the existing provisions of the law. Of these 27,000, about 3,500 are in my home city, Indianapolis. In all fairness and justice do we not owe the same duty to the 1,000,000 in the Nation, the 27,000 in Indiana, and the 3,500 in Indianapolis, to help them to get employment that we owe to their more fortunate fellow citizens who are already on the rolls?

Some other changes in the law and in the administrative practice under the law are worthy of our consideration. I think at this time the 18-month provision, requiring all on work relief to leave the rolls for at least 30 days after 18 months' service, may be right in principle. It keeps the rolls from being frozen and it affords the 1,000,000 eligible unemployed almost the only hope they now have left of ever being given W. P. A. employment. However, in its present form it is too harsh. Under its operation all who are on W. P. A. 18 months automatically go off, regardless of their circumstances. A relief worker may have an invalid wife and a dozen dependent children, but he goes off the roll automatically the same as persons with few responsibilities.

A little flexibility should be written into the law to permit the Administrator to exempt from the automatic dismissal order a relief worker when he—the Administrator—is convinced that exceptionally cruel and inhuman hardship would result from his dismissal. Another amendment I would advocate would give a veteran's wife a preferential

right to employment if the veteran is unable to work, and I would give a preference also to a veteran's widow. Similar preferential rights are given to wives and widows of veterans generally in the public service, and I do not know of any good reason why the same should not extend to W. P. A. employment. Proper limitations also should be thrown around the so-called 5-day provision. This is the administrative rule which marks for dismissal workers who fail to report for duty 5 consecutive days. It would appear that in the way this provision is now being administered some very worthy persons are being unjustly penalized. People cannot help getting sick, and there are many other bona fide reasons why they cannot always report on time. Many letters have come to my office from workers stating that, although they furnished doctors' certificates explaining and justifying their absence, they have not been able to secure reinstatement on the rolls. Some of those who were off 5 days without being in any way at fault have been 13 months trying to get back on the rolls, but without success.

Another change in the law I think might well be made would be an amendment providing that a larger percentage of relief workers shall be employed in the various activities connected with administration, such as office work.

After all, this is a relief law and why should not eligible relief applicants be employed in administrative positions which they are capable of filling, rather than others who are not in need of relief? One advantage would be that the relief money would go much further, because every non-relief administrative employee is paid a much higher salary than the earnings of a relief worker.

My mail is proof of the fact that there are many competent clerks, stenographers, typists, teachers, and others among certified relief applicants who would be glad to have the opportunity to do administrative work. The law needs to be recast in this particular, as well as in others.

Consideration may also properly be given, I think, to amending the sponsorship provision that has been in existence since January 1, 1940, requiring the sponsor to provide a flat 25-percent contribution to the cost of the project. While I believe thoroughly in local responsibility and the obligation of local units in the matter of relief, yet the fact remains that in many localities resources have become so depleted that insistence on the 25-percent provision will mean that there will be no projects and that the W. P. A. will collapse insofar as those communities are concerned. At the present time in my home county there are approximately 4,000 families, eligible and certified, awaiting W. P. A. employment who cannot be taken care of, due to lack of projects. If we are to maintain the W. P. A. system, I believe some sort of flexibility will have to be introduced into the sponsorship provision. I will close my remarks by presenting a letter dealing with the sponsorship problem from John K. Jennings, the Indiana work-projects administrator. It is as follows:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION,
Indianapolis, Ind., January 25, 1940.

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: With regard to an expression of my views on the sponsorship provision contained in the current act, in general, I am of the opinion that the fundamentals of the provision are both desirable and operative. However, I believe that some modifications, if adopted, would serve to correct certain existing objectionable features and result in a more equitable administration of the law.

It is my thought, based upon experience in applying this phase of the act, that it has been made too inflexible, with the result that it forces an undue hardship upon economically and financially distressed counties where the need for a work program is really greatest.

As you know, this provision in its present form provides for a flat 25 percent sponsor contribution throughout the State. Theoretically the State administrator can vary such conditions at his own discretion as long as the stipulated State average is maintained. Actually, however, such discretionary powers are nonexistent. It is impossible to overcome the losses incurred in low sponsor contributions with corresponding higher contributions from other localities for the reason that sponsors, in general, demand equal treatment. In consequence of this fact it is a financial impossi-

bility for certain distressed areas to maintain a sufficient number of projects for their local eligible unemployed.

I know you are familiar with the so-called stranded population groups here in our own State. I refer to the coal and stone sections, where, because of mechanical improvements, coupled with economic upheaval within the industry, many skilled workers in these fields are not only without employment but can look forward with no hope whatever of ever again being employed in the industry for which they have been trained. In these localities the unemployment load is exceptionally high and the need for a work program is greatest. Local tax rates have actually increased to the point of being confiscatory. Tax delinquencies are correspondingly high. In some of these counties over one-half of the population is now receiving some form of public assistance.

It is utterly impossible to conceive of governmental units in these localities sponsoring projects sufficient to take care of their unemployed and, at the same time, meet existing sponsor contribution requirements.

It is also unfair to compel such a group to meet the same restrictions in these respects as are required of sponsors in the more prosperous areas. It is my feeling that if some flexibility were injected into the present law in order to relieve this distressed group, little difficulty would be experienced in requiring the remaining sponsors throughout the State to comply with the regulation in its present form.

I recognize that the congressional appropriation committee might entertain some objection to a greater liberalization along the lines which I have mentioned for the reason that they lack the confidence that certain W. P. A. officials would administer the law in strict accordance with its true intent. It is my thought, however, that if such a feeling exists, it should call for corrective measures along other lines and would not justify failure to correct legislation which might be at the present time reacting against localities in greatest need of assistance.

If I can be of any assistance in providing you with further information on this or kindred subjects, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN K. JENNINGS,
State Administrator.

[Applause.]

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 26, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on the following dates on the matters named:

Wednesday, March 27, 1940:

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Wednesday, March 27, 1940, at 10 a. m., on the following bills providing for Government aid in the lumber industry: H. R. 7463 (ANGELL) and H. R. 7505 (BOYKIN).

Tuesday, April 2, 1940:

H. R. 7169, authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to establish additional boards of local inspectors in the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation.

Tuesday, April 9, 1940:

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Tuesday, April 9, 1940, at 10 a. m., on the following bill: H. R. 7637, relative to liability of vessels in collision.

Tuesday, April 16, 1940:

H. R. 8475, to define "American fishery."

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold hearings Wednesday and Thursday, April 10 and 11, 1940, at 10:30 a. m. each day, on H. R. 8441, to afford greater protection to the purchaser of patent rights; H. R. 8442, to prohibit proof of acts done by an inventor in foreign countries; H. R. 8443, to give the Commissioner of Patents power to protect inventors by establishing adequate standards of professional conduct among attorneys; and H. R. 8444, to permit the assignee of an application for letters patent to make certain supplemental applications.

COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Insular Affairs on Tuesday, March 26, 1940, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 8239, creating the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Indian Affairs on Wednesday next, March 27, 1940, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 5918 and H. R. 6796.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On April 2, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., there will be continued before Subcommittee No. 4, of the Committee on the Judiciary, a hearing on the bill (H. R. 7534) to amend an act to prevent pernicious political activity (to forbid the requirement that poll taxes be paid as a prerequisite for voting at certain elections). The hearings will be held in Room 346, House Office Building, and will be continued on the following dates: April 3, April 9, and April 10, at 10:30 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS ON FLOOD-CONTROL BILL OF 1940 BEGINNING APRIL 1, 1940, AT 10 A. M., DAILY

The hearings will be on reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, and on amendments to existing law. The committee plans to report an omnibus bill with authorizations of approximately one hundred and fifty to one hundred and seventy-five million dollars covering the principal regions of the country.

Maj. Gen. Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, the president of the Mississippi River Commission, the assistants to the Chief of Engineers, the division engineers, and the district engineers will be requested to submit additional statements as individual projects are considered and as desired by the committee.

1. Monday, April 1: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects on the White River and tributaries.

2. Tuesday, April 2: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects in reports on rivers in Texas and the Southwest.

3. Wednesday, April 3: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects in the Los Angeles area and in the Pacific Northwest.

4. Thursday, April 4: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects in Colorado and other western areas.

5. Friday, April 5: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Mississippi River and other tributaries.

6. Saturday, April 6: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for other drainage-basin areas for other projects in other parts of the country.

7. Monday, April 8: Senators and Members of Congress, Department of Agriculture, and other governmental agencies.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1486. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, United States House of Representatives, amounting to \$40,000, for the fiscal year 1940, to remain available until expended (H. Doc. No. 678); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1487. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Transportation Act, 1920, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1488. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to define the limitations of section 408, War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1489. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a copy of a proposed bill to amend section 7 (c) of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, as amended (U. S. C. title 7, 499g (c)); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1490. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the establishment of boundary lines for the Wilmington National Cemetery, N. C., by means of an exchange of quitclaim deeds with the owners or claimants of adjoining lands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Concurrent Resolution 51. Concurrent resolution to extend the time for the filing of the report of the Joint Committee on Forestry; without amendment (Rept. No. 1827). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 436. Resolution providing for the consideration of appropriations and language for the National Youth Administration in connection with the consideration of the bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1828). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 9000. A bill to provide more adequate compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1829). 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,

Mrs. O'DAY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 166. An act for the relief of Nathan Kaplan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1830). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. O'DAY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 1326. An act for the relief of Janet Hendel, nee Judith Shapiro; without amendment (Rept. No. 1831). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. O'DAY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 1328. An act for the relief of Lena Hendel, nee Lena Goldberg; without amendment (Rept. No. 1832). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. O'DAY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 1478. An act for the relief of Haim Genishier, alias Haim Satyr; without amendment (Rept. No. 1833). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. O'DAY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 1870. An act for the relief of Dionis Moldowan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1834). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. O'DAY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 2030. An act for the relief of Mira Friedberg (Mira Dworecka); without amendment (Rept. No. 1835). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. O'DAY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 2492. An act for the relief of Dane Goich; without amendment (Rept. No. 1836). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. O'DAY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 2527. An act for the relief of Mary Nouhan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1837). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. O'DAY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 7955. A bill for the relief of Louis Rosenstone; without amendment (Rept. No. 1838). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8223) granting a pension to Laura B. Stewart, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. R. 9037. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H. R. 9038. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of the Choctaw Indians of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEAVY:

H. R. 9039. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Secretary of the Interior and Stevens County, State of Washington, to construct, maintain, and operate a highway bridge across the Kettle River, near Kettle Falls, Wash.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 9040. A bill to provide domiciliary care, medical and hospital treatment to certain veterans of the World War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 9041. (By request). A bill to provide that assistant or deputy heads of certain bureaus in the Department of the Interior shall be appointed under the civil service laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 9042. A bill to establish and maintain parity prices for agricultural products, to preserve the American market for the American farmers, to encourage the establishment of new industries, to create and safeguard opportunities for the constructive employment of American land, labor, and capital by effecting a better coordination of Federal lending, marketing and accounting policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 9043. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the inlets and outlets to Lake Hendricks, S. Dak., and Minn., for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 9044. A bill to continue, for an additional year, the Sugar Act of 1937, and to apply the limitations on direct-consumption quotas to 1940 and 1941; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 9045. A bill to divest certain activities of their interstate character; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 9046 (by request). A bill to authorize the construction of the Pine Flat-Kings River project in California; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 9047. A bill to provide for the transfer of United States prisoners in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 9048. A bill to provide for national recovery by raising revenue and retiring citizens past 60 years of age from gainful employment and provide for the general welfare of all the people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOUSTON:

H. R. 9049. A bill to provide for Federal cooperation with the States in the development of aircraft landing areas adequate to provide for the national defense, the Postal Service, and civil aeronautics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEAVY:

H. R. 9050. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Secretary of the Interior and the State of Washington to construct, maintain, and operate a highway bridge across the Spokane River, Wash.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 9051. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Secretary of the Interior and the Great Northern Railway Co., to construct, maintain, and operate two railroad bridges across the Kettle River, near Kettle Falls, Wash.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 9052. A bill to amend section 24e, National Defense Act, as amended, so as to eliminate the requirement of 2 years' practice for eligibility for appointment in the Dental Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 9053. A bill to amend the National Defense Act, as amended, so as to provide for retirement of assistant chiefs of branches and of wing commanders of Air Corps with the rank and pay of the highest grade held by such officers as assistant chiefs and wing commanders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS of Louisiana:

H. R. 9054. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Black River, Catahoula, and Concordia Parishes, La., with a view to control of floodwaters; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H. R. 9055. A bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the birthplace of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow at Portland, Maine; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 9056. A bill authorizing the Supreme Court to prescribe uniform rules for the admission of attorneys to practice in certain courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 9057. A bill to amend the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 9058. A bill making pension provisions for certain veterans herein; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCHWERT:

H. R. 9059. A bill to amend the World War Adjusted Compensation Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUTPHIN:

H. R. 9060. A bill amending the act of February 27, 1936 (49 Stat. 1144); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THORKELOSON:

H. R. 9061. A bill to deny appropriations to the Inter-American Bank or a similar financial institution, or convention relating thereto, and to deny it a charter; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 9062. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes," approved June 22, 1936, as amended by the act of May 15, 1937; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 9063. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain property in San Francisco, Calif., to the city and county of San Francisco for street purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 9064. A bill to authorize an appropriation for a weather bureau station at Boston; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 9065. A bill to amend the work-relief provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. J. Res. 497. Joint resolution authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of Sitka Harbor, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FLAHERTY:

H. J. Res. 498. Joint resolution authorizing the acceptance of the invitation of the Government of Italy to participate in the Rome Universal Exhibition to be held at Rome, Italy, in 1942; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GEYER of California:

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution to make declaration for continuation of peace; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THORKELSON:

H. Res. 439. Resolution to investigate the Securities and Exchange Commission and the National Policy Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. Res. 440. Resolution to investigate the administration and adequacy of the Securities Exchange Act and related acts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JONES of Ohio:

H. Res. 441. Resolution to provide for a report to the House with respect to employees and their compensation engaged in political, publicity, or propaganda activities; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 9066. A bill authorizing the appointment of Walter E. Dobbins, Jr., as a captain, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H. R. 9067. A bill for the relief of Reasor Reed; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 9068. A bill for the relief of George S. Chapman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. R. 9069. A bill for the relief of Fayette Willis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 9070. A bill for the relief of W. A. Bessent, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 9071. A bill for the relief of Eugene George Dietrich; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 9072. A bill granting a pension to Mary Jessie Drehmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland:

H. R. 9073. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain officers and men of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the value of personal effects lost, damaged, or destroyed in a fire aboard the Coast and Geodetic Survey launch *Mikave* at Norfolk, Va., on October 27, 1939; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 9074. A bill to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain personnel or former personnel of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps for the value of personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire at the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., on October 27, 1938," approved June 19, 1939; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KELLER:

H. R. 9075. A bill granting a pension to Isabel Hamilton; to the Committee on Pensions.

LXXXVI—215

H. R. 9076. A bill for the relief of Bruno Capogrecco; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 9077. A bill granting a pension to Annie E. (Clark) Lingle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KITCHENS:

H. R. 9078. A bill for the relief of Charlie Fuller Dillard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H. R. 9079. A bill for the relief of Edmund W. Beaumont; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 9080. A bill granting an increase of pension to Olive M. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

H. R. 9081. A bill for the relief of Isidore Stillman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. R. 9082. A bill granting an increase of pension to Viola Andrews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 9083. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma R. Payne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 9084. A bill for the relief of Jessie McHenry; 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:

7109. By Mr. ANDERSON of California: Petition signed by Niels Johnson, of San Jose, Calif., and Annie Slaght, Edwin Slaght, and 28 other citizens of California, urging that the Seventy-sixth Congress enact the improved General Welfare Act, House bill 5620, to relieve the suffering of needy citizens over 60 years of age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7110. By Mr. BELL: Petition of a number of ladies from his district urging immediate action on the equal-rights-for-women amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7111. Also, memorial of the Baptist Ministerial Alliance of Kansas City, Mo., regarding its unanimous vote for an embargo on war materials and munitions shipped to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7112. By Mr. CARLSON: Petition of 21 citizens of Rexford, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 1, the Patman bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7113. By Mr. FLAHERTY: Petition of the United Steel and Metal Workers, Chelsea, Mass., opposing the adoption of any amendments to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

7114. By Mr. THOMAS F. FORD: Resolution of the Council of the City of Los Angeles urging the Congress to provide in any future legislation providing appropriation for the continuation of the work-relief program under Work Projects Administration that sponsor's contributions necessary for the carrying on of projects designed to provide useful work for unemployed citizens be based upon the magnitude of the local relief problem and ability of the local sponsoring body to provide such contributions, rather than upon any fixed minimum percentage of the costs of proposed projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7115. By Mr. GEYER of California: Resolution urging that the remedy of the condition of the migratory workers of California be carried out under a national program; to the Committee on Rules.

7116. By Mr. GOSSETT: Petition of Ed Vantine, secretary of the Townsend Club of Quanah, and other citizens of Hardeman County, Tex., favoring passage of Townsend old-age pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7117. Also, petition of R. S. McDonald and other citizens of Montague County, Tex., asking for enactment of the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7118. By Mr. JONKMAN: Petition of 17 citizens of Zeeland, Mich., and vicinity, recommending the enactment of House bill 8748, the so-called farm debt adjustment bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7119. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of Walther & Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Maloney bill (H. R. 8893); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7120. Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, concerning Senator TOWNSEND's proposal to terminate foreign silver purchases by the Federal Treasury; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

7121. Also, petition of the Amalgamated Machine and Instrument Local No. 476, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Geyer bill (H. R. 7534), Murray bill (S. 3365), Marcantonio bill (H. R. 8615), and Smith bill (H. R. 8813); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7122. Also, petition of the Missouri Egg and Poultry Shippers Association, Kansas City, Mo., concerning the Shipstead bill (S. 2753); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7123. Also, petition of the Bricklayers Union, Local No. 9, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Wagner-Steagall housing bill (S. 591); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7124. Also, petition of the New York State Waterways Association, Inc., concerning House Concurrent Resolution 48; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7125. Also, petition of the New York State Waterways Association, Inc., concerning MARTIN J. KENNEDY's resolution 360; to the Committee on Rules.

7126. Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, concerning Government expenditures and economy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7127. Also, petition of the veterans of the United States Veterans Hospital, Castle Point, N. Y., favoring legislation for increase in pension of permanently and totally disabled veterans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7128. Also, petition of Sidney Hillman, general president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, favoring Budget recommendation for Wage and Hour Division appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7129. Also petition of the Women's Equal Opportunity League of New York City, favoring equal-rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7130. Also, petition of the Federation of Cicero Real Estate Owners, Inc., Cicero, Ill., concerning aid to the stricken nation of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7131. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Missouri Egg and Poultry Shippers Association, Kansas City, Mo., concerning the Shipstead bill (S. 2753); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7132. Also, petition of Walther & Co., Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning enactment of the Maloney bill (H. R. 8893); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7133. Also, petition of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, New York City, protesting against the use of animals in testing new explosives; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7134. Also, petition of the Women's Equal Opportunity League, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7135. Also, petition of the Merchants Association of New York, concerning Senator TOWNSEND's bill to terminate foreign silver purchases by the Federal Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7136. Also, petition of the Federation of Cicero Real Estate Owners, Inc., Cicero, Ill., urging support of a bill to aid the stricken nation of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7137. By Mr. RICH: Petition of sundry citizens of Picture Rocks, Pa., protesting against the shipment of war materials to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7138. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Edwin C. Jepson, traffic manager, Wheeling Steel Corporation, Wheeling, W. Va., and other citizens of Wheeling, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 2009, the Wheeler-Lea transportation bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7139. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the New Jersey Press Association, opposing the Patman chain-store bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7140. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Cambridge, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the appropriations for Work Projects Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7141. Also, petition of the city of Chelsea, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to presenting a distinguished-service citation of Capt. Joseph A. Gainard of the steamer *City of Flint*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

7142. Also, petition of the United Wholesale and Warehouse Employees of New York, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the involvement of the United States in the war, and loans to any belligerent country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7143. Also, petition of the Oil Workers International Union, Hammond, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 591 and the United States House Authority program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7144. Also, petition of Carver County Welfare Office, Chaska, Minn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to merit system or civil service concerning county welfare boards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7145. Also, petition of the United Association of Journeymen Plumbers and Steam Fitters of the United States and Canada, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the United States Housing Authority program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7146. Also, petition of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Salt Lake City, Utah, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the United States Housing Authority program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7147. Also, petition of Hollywood Central Young Democrats, Inc., Hollywood, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to discriminatory legislation and Senate bill 1871, commonly known as the Hatch Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7148. Also, petition of the International Union United Automobile Workers of America, Local No. 5, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to United States Housing Authority program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7149. Also, petition of the Philadelphia Industrial Union Council, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the antialien bills; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

7150. Also, petition of the city clerk, city of Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the work-relief program under the Work Projects Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7151. Also, petition of the Missouri Egg and Poultry Shippers Association, Kansas City, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Shipstead bill (S. 2753); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7152. Also, petition of the Sheet Metal Workers International Association, Tacoma, Wash., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to United States Housing Authority program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.