

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 6, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Infinite Spirit, above all the marvelous gifts of life we thank Thee for the faultless Teacher. How clear was His vision, how serene was His assurance, how positive was His utterance, and how beautiful was His life. We pray that every child of the cottage, every son of toil, every daughter of obscurity may be raised up in spirit and service to love and adore Him. With unwearied affection, unbroken patience, and undying hope may they find blessed encouragement in the humblest details of their lives. Heavenly Father, bring us all into the fullness of life, power, and self-forgetfulness. We would pour out our souls in deep solicitude because of unrest, turbulence, and perilous conditions in our land. We beseech Thee, blessed Lord God, to bring together Dives and Lazarus wherever they are. As they lean forward in the shadows of their defiant selfishness, may they realize what they are losing in their rush to get ahead. O do Thou bring the same standards of value and processes of mind to bear upon all men. We are grateful, dear Lord, for salvation, not so much from death, but rather unto life eternal. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3483. An act to provide for rural electrification, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3806) entitled "An act to establish a commercial airport for the District of Columbia."

THE NECESSITY FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF MILITARY AVIATION IN THE NATION'S PROGRAM OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein a radio address made by me last night on the subject of the need for further development of military aviation in the promotion of national defense.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address, which I made last night over the radio:

On July 2, 1926, Congress passed the act creating the Army Air Corps. Although nearly 10 years have elapsed, we still have a deficiency therein of 561 Regular and Reserve officers, and unless the American people are fully informed as to the facts and bring the matter to the attention of their Representatives in Congress the Air Corps will never be filled.

Let me illustrate: In 1931 only 33 additional officers were commissioned in the Army Air Corps; in 1932 only 18 additional officers; in 1933 only 28; in 1934 only 17 additional officers; in 1935, 46 additional officers; and in the first half of the fiscal year 1936 we had a loss of 2 officers. Thus during the last preceding 5½ years there have been added only 140 commissioned officers to the officer personnel of the Air Corps. At this rate it will require 15 years to add 300 officers.

During such a period many officers will have been killed, others will die from natural causes, still more will be disabled and retired, and some will be retired on account of reaching the age limit of 64. It has been well said that adequate preparedness, first of all for air defense, second for sea defense, third for land defense, will promote the peace of our Nation and enable the American people to carry on the arts of Christian civilization with actual security.

Last month I went to New Hampshire in an Army plane to witness the Air Corps maneuvers held by the Army Air Corps in New England and New York. When I speak of the Army Air Corps, of what do I speak? On February 12 it was reported in the press that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, of

which I have the honor to be a member, was seeking a corps of 4,000 planes by 1938. The press then reported that England had plans for 5,600 planes by March 1937, and that Germany now has from 7,000 to 10,000 planes.

As to America's inadequate air defense, let me quote from the testimony of Maj. Gen. Oscar Westover, Chief of the Army Air Corps, given before the Appropriations Committee in December 1935, in which he said, "It is estimated that not more than 736 airplanes now on order will be delivered during the fiscal years 1936 and 1937. During this time there will be estimated losses of 981 airplanes. The net result of these factors, therefore, will leave the Air Corps on June 30, 1937, with an estimated number of 779 project airplanes, with about 529 planes classed as obsolete on account of having passed the 5-year age limit. Such of the 529 as are suitable for retention will have to be continued in use in order to permit necessary flying by Air Corps personnel. The number and type of airplanes now available in our foreign departments makes the air defense of these possessions almost impotent, and the same lack of airplanes is greatly handicapping the ground force in the training for their part of the defense."

Hon. Harry H. Woodring, Assistant Secretary of War, also testified before the Committee on Appropriations on January 16, 1936, that "the Army Air Corps will have approximately 777 airplanes in its possession on July 1, 1936."

We get only 565 planes under the War Department appropriation bill which passed the House last month. Allowing for wash-outs and considering the recommendations of the Howell Commission and the Baker Board that we should have 2,320 planes, how does that leave us? Mr. Woodring was asked how many planes he was able to purchase under the 1936 appropriations, and he said: "A continuation of the appropriation of the above size will never permit the Army Air Corps to reach its desired strength, as it will only take care of approximately yearly losses." I am not one who advocates more airplanes than we need for national defense, but I do say that the best service we can render our constituents, our States, and the Nation is to provide for rational Air Corps development, so that we may carry on without the loss of a single life on account of inadequate preparation.

Gen. Oscar Westover, Chief of the Air Corps, testified that in the past 5 years 1,371 planes were delivered to the Army, while during that same time we lost 1,621 planes by obsolescence or wash-outs, leaving us with a loss of 250 planes during the last 5 years.

We are now nearly 10 years behind in the development of the Army Air Corps. The following is a list of airplanes on order or obtained during the last 6 years:

	Planes
1930.....	555
1931.....	364
1932.....	285
1933.....	118
1934.....	222
1935.....	401

It has been reliably estimated that we must have 800 planes per year if we are to increase the present strength of our air force. The general headquarters air force for adequate self-defense must have a minimum of 980 serviceable airplanes able to take the air at any time. In spite of this fact the maximum number yet supplied to the general headquarters air force is 383 planes. When the recent maneuvers took place in Florida General Andrews was able to take the air with only 162 serviceable planes.

As showing the utter inadequacy of this situation from the standpoint of national defense, let me emphasize the fact that all great nations now have huge airplane carriers, which are, in fact, floating landing fields, to enable them to carry aerial warfare to enemy shores. They also have floating seaplanes and mother ships.

We are advised that only 30 tons of explosives were dropped on London in the World War, resulting in the loss of 1,800 lives, while today planes are being constructed, any one of which will be able to drop 10 tons of explosives. This situation is well emphasized by the fact that German seaplanes of existing types now alight on the South Atlantic Ocean, between Africa and South America, to moor astern of a station ship (S. S. *Westphalian*). This vessel is an ordinary merchant type, supplied with aviation fuel and other serving facilities. Fuel and oil are transferred to the seaplane on the water. Meager reports mention experiments with a canvas ramp astern on which the seaplane may be hauled; also trials of canvas shelters for protection during refueling operations. The military significance of this commercial "mother ship" for seaplanes appears to have been ignored. As seaplanes become larger their ability to alight safely on the ocean increases. Acknowledging only the existing sizes of seaplanes, it is rather startling to contemplate that small, inexpensive merchant ships are capable of serving as ocean supply bases for transoceanic bombing planes.

The Federal Aviation Commission has been advised that seaplanes are now in course of design that can transport 10 tons for a nonstop flight of 2,000 miles. A single seaplane of that type—which is a prospect for the immediate future—then could drop 10 tons of bombs on any American coastal city simply by prearranging a rendezvous with a small servicing vessel at sea a thousand miles from the coast line.

These facts strongly emphasize that our homes in New England and throughout the Nation are no longer protected from air attacks, because of the wide extent of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and we must govern ourselves accordingly if we are to maintain adequate national defense.

In conclusion let me say that I am a firm believer in national economy, but the neglect shown in the development of Army aviation is nothing but false economy. While foreign nations are making available thousands of planes for attack and aggression, I ask you without further delay to advocate a policy of national defense by urging your representatives in Congress to enact legislation which will enable the United States of America to bring its Army Air Corps to 2,320 planes, as advocated by the unanimous report of the Baker Board and the Howell Commission.

The enactment of this legislation is essential to achieve a full realization of the words of counsel uttered by our first President, George Washington, when he said, "We should maintain a respectable defensive posture."

For the United States of America the development of air power because of its limited range is purely a weapon of defense, but such development as proposed herein is necessary for adequate defense.

In the matter of national defense we frequently fail to recognize the relative protection afforded by an adequate Navy. We must remember that the hostile fleet is the main objective of the home fleet, therefore depends largely on the action of the enemy. Since our fleet must be free to meet the enemy fleet, we cannot predict what portion of our coast will be protected by our Navy or how long such protection may last. As a result of this important factor we must realize the necessity of an adequate air force in the maintenance of an effective national defense.

THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST SETTLEMENT ON LONG ISLAND, N. Y.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. SOMERS of New York, chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, and Mr. DELANEY, of New York, the author of the bill, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 11323) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the first settlement on Long Island, N. Y.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Be it enacted, etc., That, in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the first settlement on Long Island, N. Y., there shall be coined by the Director of the Mint a minimum of 100,000 silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and fineness and of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; but the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the models for master dies or other preparations for this coinage.

SEC. 2. That the coins herein authorized shall be issued at par and only upon the request of the chairman or secretary of the Long Island Tercentenary Committee.

SEC. 3. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by said committee, and all proceeds shall be used in furtherance of the Long Island Tercentenary Committee projects.

SEC. 4. That all laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same; regulating and guarding the process of coining; providing for the purchase of material and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of the coins; for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting; for security of the coin; or for any other purposes, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein directed.

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.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to this request, and after the gentleman from Oklahoma has finished I shall ask that the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] may address the House for 5 minutes; but, with these two exceptions, we want to proceed with our appropriation bill, so that we may pass it today and then adjourn over until Monday.

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

There was no objection.

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to discuss with the House briefly a matter in which I believe every Member of the House is interested, and a matter surely in which every State of the Union is interested.

All of you can remember, and do remember, the outset of 1933, when over half a million boys, the youth of this land, were adrift on the highways and the byways of the Nation in search of employment, in search of something to do which would pay them sufficient funds to clothe them and furnish the necessities of life. They were so thoroughly and completely distributed over this Nation that there was a well-worn path along every highway made by the youth of this Nation thumbing their way along looking for a ride to take them some place where they might find employment. At the outset of this administration, of which nearly every Member of this House was a part, under the leadership of the great humanitarian now in the White House there was set up a program which took these half million boys off the roads, took them out of the courts where they had been forced through crime, and placed them in C. C. C. camps where they were given healthy, sanitary surroundings, wherein they were taught industry, and wherein they received for their labor sufficient compensation that each month they could send home to mother and dad \$25.

At the present time there are 430,000 boys in these camps, and there are 2,158 such camps in the United States, established at a cost of from \$16,000 to \$18,000 per camp. This brings me to my point: An Executive order has been issued which proposes to throw 94,000 of these boys back onto the roads and the streets of this Nation where they will again find themselves in the same shape they were before they were taken off the roads and placed in the C. C. C. camps. This Executive order states that on April 1 of this year the C. C. C. camps must be reduced from 2,158 to 1,703, and that on July 1 there will be a further cut to 1,456 camps from the present number of 2,158.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think the membership of this House can afford to sit idly by and see this thing happen. I say without fear of contradiction that this is one part of the recovery program about which none of you gentlemen has ever received complaint from your district. Therefore I think this House should take steps to stop this reduction in camps. More particularly do I feel it should be the business of this House to stop this thing since just recently Congress, at the direction of the President, passed an agricultural bill based on soil conservation. It may startle you to know that in nearly every instance these camps which are now being cut out are not taken from the Forest Service, are not taken from the Park Service, are not taken from the Reclamation Service, are not taken from the grazing service, but are taken out of the E. C. W. camps, which are those camps that carry on the work of soil conservation and the prevention of soil erosion.

Therefore, I say if we are to remain consistent in believing that soil conservation should be the basis of the agricultural recovery program as authorized by a bill which we recently passed, surely we cannot so soon after its passage blow cold and say that we will cripple that very program by taking out of existence the E. C. W. camps which have been established for the purpose of carrying on soil conservation, teaching the farmers of this Nation gully control, crop rotation, and how to stop their soil from washing into the rivers of the Nation.

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

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. EKWALL. Does not the gentleman think that instead of reducing the number of these camps this very fine work ought to be increased?

Mr. NICHOLS. I certainly do. I think in no instance should the personnel of the C. C. C. camps be reduced below 500,000. The present order will reduce them in the first instance to 336,000, and in July there will be a further reduction.

Mr. Speaker, one other thought. I have two of these camps in my district, one of which has been closed, and one ordered closed by this order. One of them was closed after the buildings had been built but a few short months. After the boys had been there but a few short months and the work barely started, they were taken away and the camp closed. The camp stands there today as a stark, grim example of something. I can hear the men in my district who

are unfavorable to this administration saying: "There is an example. There stands a sentinel which marks the folly of this administration." I want to help this administration avoid that criticism.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. One of the vital features that the C. C. C. camps are accomplishing, which cannot be accomplished under the soil-erosion plan in the farm bill, is the preservation of the forests of this country from destruction by fires through the building of trails.

Mr. NICHOLS. The gentleman is correct. They have not bothered so far the forest camps, however. I am mostly interested in the soil-conservation camps, and they are the ones the farmers are interested in.

Let me tell you another thing about this order. It provides that there shall be no new construction, which means if there is a camp located in a particular locality and a particular district, they cannot move that camp to another district and set it up there. The effect of this order is to say that a camp once established, if closed, must be taken down. You cannot move it into new territory. When this program was started I thought when we established one of these camps and they worked out a particular area the camp would then be moved. Oh, I know that was the plan, because they even provided that some of these camps must be constructed with this prefabricated material, which could be put up by bolting it together.

It was insisted that that material be used so that they could unscrew the nuts, knock down the buildings, and set them up in another place. But this order which is out now would make it impossible to move a camp from one place to another.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. As I gather from the gentleman's remarks, he is making an indictment against the administration for not having a "brain trust"?

Mr. NICHOLS. If the gentleman wants to assume I am making an indictment against the administration, he is entirely off his base. I am not making an indictment against the administration, but I think it is my duty as a Member of Congress not only to go along with the administration but when the administration is about to do something which, in my judgment, is wrong, I should have moral courage enough to tell the administration about it.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. The order, as I understood it, reduced all camps in the same proportion. Has that order been superseded and a new one issued?

Mr. NICHOLS. I think it has.

Mr. PIERCE. If that is true, it happened in the last few hours.

Mr. NICHOLS. I think that is true.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NICHOLS. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the gentleman's having any more time.

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

Mr. NICHOLS. When the C. C. C. camps were first established and the youth of this Nation found that in these they could find a haven of employment, a place where they could employ their time and at the same time furnish some relief to a depression-stricken old mother or father, or both, at home, it furnished for them a bright ray of hope and gave them a new lease on life.

At the outset of this program I am doubtful that the citizenship of the Nation, and particularly the farmers, thoroughly appreciated the great good that would flow from them, but surely after the establishment of the camps, and

after the splendid work done by the youngsters in these camps was realized by the farmers, and after they realized the importance of the work to the conservation of the soil, they became more enthusiastic about this portion of the recovery program than they did about any other part of the program. And now, just at the time when real benefit is being realized by the farmers from the operation of this portion of the program, it seems to me ridiculous to cut the heart out of the program by reducing it by such drastic proportions as proposed in the present order.

I wish to sound this warning to the administration, and it is an administration of which I have been proud, but that fact notwithstanding I still want to say that these boys who are now enrolled in these camps were at the outset of this administration a national responsibility, and if they were a responsibility at that time they are no less a responsibility now, and if through this order or the action of this administration these boys are to be again thrown out to shift for themselves at a time when private industry is not yet ready to absorb them, which will of necessity force them back on to the highways and the streets from whence this administration took them in 1932, then I fear for the penalty that this administration will be called upon to pay by reason of the fact that they so soon forgot the Government's responsibility to America's growing manhood.

I propose to make an effort to so arouse the Congress that the Members will protest this action in sufficient numbers to bring to the attention of the President and those around him the utter folly of carrying out this order.

I shall have on the desk of every Member of Congress on Monday morning a letter setting out the figures herein contained and urging them to sign a petition which I shall prepare, and have ready for signature on Monday, which said petition will be directed to the Chief Executive protesting to him this reduction.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] may address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, my object in asking permission to address the House for these few minutes was because I did not get a chance to speak on the bill in regular debate, and I was very anxious to put in the RECORD my thoughts upon something that must be in the minds of all Members of Congress at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in defense of the Columbia Broadcasting System for granting the use of their magnificent facilities to the leader of the Communist Party to tell his story. I am in no manner, shape, or form a Communist. The roots of my family go deep into the first settlers and the first families on American shores. I do believe in free speech and the free discussion of public questions. I think one of the worst things that could happen is to have the idea broadcast throughout the world that America is pursuing Russia's method, under the Czar, of suppressing free speech and the examination and study of various subjects; or pursuing the methods of Hitler, of Germany, or Mussolini, of Italy. This is America. May I refer briefly to my thoughts on this question?

Communism is a symptom of discontent and of a diseased social order, of a perverted economic or political system. It is an indication that economic disease has fastened itself upon the country. The true physician seeks the cause of the pain, and his treatment is toward the removal of that cause. We must attack the disease of which communism is the symptom; the cause must be removed. We can do nothing by suppression and persecution, which seem to me analogous to the methods employed by quack physicians whose treatment only deadens the nerves which carry the message of physical ailment.

What is the disease from which our social order suffers, the disease which is undermining the political health of nations, including our own Republic? Is it not discontent,

caused by unemployment, poverty, and resultant crime, child labor, penniless old age, unjust arrests, curbing of free speech and the rights of public assembly, abuse of injunctions, miscarriage of justice in the courts, maldistribution of wealth? Surely the cause can be found in a combination of these evils which are preying upon our social order and threatening to break the economic organization of our system. Bestowal of special privileges, through legislation, on the owners of great wealth may also be a contributing factor. The concentration of wealth leads directly to propaganda pressure through the press, radio, and lobbies, causing corruption and favoritism in government.

Our own responsibility as Congressmen is very great. Confidence in government can be maintained only through respect for legislative bodies. Suppression of free debate, gag rules, suspicion in regard to the appropriation of funds, partisan party votes on measures for public welfare—all these lead to distrust of government and to the desire for a new order.

Bureaucracy breeds communism. If I interpret history aright, it was the chief factor in the Russian crisis; yet we in Congress are witnessing continued extension of that system and we are giving it our tacit approval when we agree that all bills discussed on this floor must originate in departments or have departmental approval. Yes; I believe that the rules of this and other legislative bodies are an encouragement to communism. Every act of neglect or favoritism through legislation is a contribution to communism. Appropriation of public funds for luxuries and for special privileges certainly makes bitter hearts turn to communism.

The cure does not lie in restriction of civil and political liberties nor in suppression of free speech. Teachers' oaths seem to me utterly futile and a disgrace to our educational system. Let us in schools and colleges and through radio, press, and forum have full and free discussion with presentation of all points of view.

My friend and colleague from Texas, who spoke so eloquently on the subject of communism, seems to me to have gone astray in this matter. Usually he has lifted his voice for the downtrodden and the oppressed. Certainly, he has been one of the most useful Members of this body in moving toward a real remedy for potential communism in his effort to defeat dishonest and extravagant appropriations. Let us not revert to intolerance through fear of change and suspicion of the motives of other good citizens. The fact that my colleagues fear communism leads me to fear that they will not attempt to destroy its claim as the only alternative to our present unsatisfactory condition. My stand on this matter was taken many years ago when, as a member of the Oregon Senate, I cast the sole vote against a criminal-syndicalism bill which was, to my regret, incorporated into law.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Progress has always been made through the leadership of liberals, and not through reaction. The ships which brought the first immigrants to America brought to our shores those who came here as refugees from political and religious persecution. America has in times past been the home of the oppressed and the downtrodden. Let us again breathe the free air of our free Republic. Let us again make it possible for all our people to look forward with hope and ambition to economic well being and economic justice and fruitful opportunity. Let us assure our citizens of political honesty and of justice, then we shall have no fear of communism or its more terrible twin menace of fascism. Either one would be a denial of democracy. We must prove that democracy contains within itself the power to remove the injustices and economic inequalities which have brought doubt of our democratic system of government. Let us not confess incompetence, and let us not be blind to the real causes of discontent. I hope my friends on this floor will read what a student of history says in a recent article in

Harper's entitled "Progress and Catastrophe." He speaks of the shrinking and crumbling of the Roman world and suggests that it died at the heart and center because of the decay of agriculture and corruption in government.

We have largely within our hands the power to stay the march of these evil forces which are threatening our body politic. Let us devote our energy not to attacking the symptoms, not to deadening the nerves, but let us strike deeper in the attempt to cure the disease which is working at the vitals of this Nation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, we have been liberal with respect to time, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, has some resolutions that must come in today regarding his impeachment case he is to prosecute in the Senate. They are privileged resolutions, and we want to finish the consideration of the District bill today, and I hope the gentleman will not ask for more time than is necessary.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon may proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Today on the floor of this House we have an opportunity to restore faith, in a measure, in congressional justice toward our voteless friends of the District, by allowing adequate appropriations to fight ill health and poverty, and especially through repeal of an unwise restrictive amendment which strikes at the very heart of our educational system. [Applause.]

IMPEACHMENT OF HALSTED L. RITTER

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the three resolutions which are the usual resolutions offered when an impeachment has been voted by the House, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be read and considered en bloc.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know that I understand the situation we are in at the present time. Will the gentleman restate his request?

The SPEAKER. The request is to have read the three resolutions and have them considered en bloc.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I may say to the gentleman from New York, they are the three resolutions usually offered and they are in the language used when the House has voted an impeachment.

Mr. SNELL. And the gentleman from Texas wants them considered at one time?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

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

House Resolution 439

Resolved, That HATTON W. SUMNERS, RANDOLPH PERKINS, and SAM HOBBS, Members of this House, be, and they are hereby, appointed managers to conduct the impeachment against Halsted L. Ritter, United States district judge for the southern district of Florida; that said managers are hereby instructed to appear before the Senate of the United States and at the bar thereof in the name of the House of Representatives and of all the people of the United States to impeach the said Halsted L. Ritter of high crimes and misdemeanors in office and to exhibit to the Senate of the United States the articles of impeachment against said judge which have been agreed upon by this House; and that the said managers do demand that the Senate take order for the appearance of said Halsted L. Ritter to answer said impeachment, and demand his impeachment, conviction, and removal from office.

House Resolution 440

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate to inform them that this House has impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors Halsted L. Ritter, United States district judge for the southern district of Florida, and that the House adopted articles of impeachment against said Halsted L. Ritter, judge as aforesaid, which the managers on the part of the House have been directed to carry to the Senate, and that HATTON W. SUMNERS, RANDOLPH PERKINS, and SAM HOBBS, Members of this House, have been appointed such managers.

House Resolution 441

Resolved, That the managers on the part of the House in the matter of the impeachment of Halsted L. Ritter, United States district judge for the southern district of Florida, be, and they are hereby, authorized to employ legal, clerical, and other necessary assistants and to incur such expenses as may be necessary in the preparation and conduct of the case, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers approved by the managers, and the managers have power to send for persons and papers, and also that the managers have authority to file with the Secretary of the Senate, on the part of the House of Representatives, any subsequent pleadings which they shall deem necessary: *Provided*, That the total expenditures authorized by this resolution shall not exceed \$2,500.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Texas one further question? Is this exactly the procedure that has always been followed by the House under similar conditions?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Insofar as I know, it does not vary from the procedure that has been followed since the beginning of the Government.

Mr. SNELL. If that is true, while, of course, I think the House made a mistake, I have no desire to delay carrying out the will of the majority of the House in the matter.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. The only difference between this and other such cases is that our colleague from Texas has asked only for \$2,500, which is very small in comparison with amounts heretofore appropriated under such conditions.

Mr. SNELL. It will be found that is all the impeachment will be worth before you get through. [Laughter.]

The resolutions were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE TOWNSEND PLAN

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute and a half on a subject of great national interest.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—I shall not object to this request—but I shall object to any further requests.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, the question of the effect of poetry on our great national issues has been seriously neglected. I have three verses here concerning Townsendism, of which I think the House ought to have the benefit. These verses were sent to me by my good friend Herbert L. Davis, of the board of assessors here in Washington.

HELLALOoya

Clear the tracks you whippersnappers!
Out the way you flaming youth!
Gangway, fashion plates and flappers!
Your old gran'dad's heard the truth.
From the old men's home he's hoppin',
Dancing like a crazy man,
Singing, shouting, "Hell's apoppin'!",
Gran'dad's read the Townsend plan.

[Laughter.]

He has painted up his crutches,
Polished up his wooden leg,
Gave his other tooth some touches,
Took his toupee from its peg,
Says he's found the youthful fountain
And the primrose path he'll seek.
He'll be comin' round the mountain,
Whoopee! Fifty bucks a week!

[Laughter.]

Tell the chorus girls and laddies
With the cars they'll see no more;
Now they'll meet their sugar daddies
In their wheel chairs at the door.
When your old man has expended
All the fifties that he can
Our cares are o'er, depression's ended,
Gloom is dead—so's your old man!

[Laughter.]

—By Ted Breton.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary of the House may be permitted to sit this afternoon during sessions of the House.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11581, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. NELSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

For main and pipe sewers and receiving basins, \$100,000.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon just before the Committee rose there were certain insinuations made against the superintendent of schools of the District of Columbia, Dr. Frank Ballou, on the ground that perhaps he favored communism or its teaching in the public schools in Washington.

I do not know anything about the facts pertaining to the schools of this city or communism being taught in these schools. But I have known Frank Ballou from boyhood. I was born in the adjoining town where he lived. He and I attended the same school at the same time. I know his whole family history. I know his antecedents, the kind of people they are, and they were, and under what conditions and surroundings he was reared and educated.

I know there is not a single thing in the history of this whole family that would lead anyone to believe that he had any such tendency. While I have not seen him in years, and only a few times since he has been in Washington, yet I know as well as I know that I am standing on the floor of this Chamber at this minute that there is not one drop of blood in his whole fiber that is favorable to communism or the teaching of communism in the public schools in Washington. I am not going to let this insinuation go by without making a protest, based on my own personal knowledge of the man, his character and his history for all these years. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro-forma amendment. I ask the minority leader and every Member of this House to get the hearings from the Committee on Appropriations, which came off the press Monday, and read all of the testimony of Dr. Frank Ballou. I ask you to read the answers that he gave me, the answers that he gave the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], and the answers he gave the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. JOHNSON].

I ask also that you get those hearings and read all of the evidence that Dr. Ballou's professor in charge of history and social studies, George Jones, gave, and then you can form your own conclusions.

You will find in those hearings that from 1929 to 1934 Dr. Ballou was a member of the commission of the American Historical Association, appointed through the instrumentality of Dr. George S. Counts, a notorious Communist, but whom Dr. Ballou is pleased to call "a left winger." The commission prepared conclusions and recommendations for schools. Dr. Ballou served for 5 years on that commission, and was its secretary. The recommendations of that commission, consisting of 17 members, were published in one volume. Four of the members, including Dr. Ballou, refused to sign it, and not one of the four filed any dissenting opinion about it. Dr. Ballou did not dissent.

You will find in our hearings that both George Jones and Dr. Ballou admitted time and time again that the book *Conclusions and Recommendations* was communistic.

There is no question about it, and you will find that very book, which George Jones said was terrible, has been placed by order of the school administration, and a bulletin pre-

pared for that purpose, in the school library of every teacher in Washington and required by that bulletin to be so placed. They will find that magazine after magazine and book after book had been approved by Dr. Ballou and his Board of Education, because Mrs. Henry Gratton Doyle, the president, said books and magazines that Dr. Ballou recommended they approved, and had been approved in the schools, and only when the parents of the school children made a protest was there any action taken to eliminate books from schools. Take the history by Acorn, a communistic history. The parents of the children finally required the Board of Education to eliminate it from the schools. Take this magazine Scholastic. I wish you would read the evidence upon it, and I wish you would read the evidence of the editor of that magazine where for 4 hours, on examination by my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] and the other members of our committee, he was made to admit that things appeared in that magazine that were not sound pedagogy, that were subversive, and that every man recognizes as communistic, seeking to break down this Government.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] is wrong when he says that it is just a symptom of dissatisfaction among people. Communism today is more than that. It is a strong, organized effort to break down orderly government and to destroy our Government by force and violence. But we are not going to allow them to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I move that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I direct the minority leader's attention to page 3499 of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, upper left-hand corner of the page. I made this remark:

Does the gentleman from Texas feel that that little "red rider" put upon an appropriation bill would inculcate within the bosom of this superintendent of schools a different social philosophy or a different economic philosophy?

I am wondering if that remark on my part could be considered an insinuation that I believe that this superintendent of schools did entertain such ideas?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman has addressed me I suppose he expects me to reply.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Certainly.

Mr. SNELL. I had not seen the gentleman's remarks. I had special reference to statements made by the chairman of the subcommittee, and in reply would say that I read the evidence which Dr. Ballou gave before the committee. That is full of insinuations that were put in there by the chairman, in my judgment.

I do not care to go into a discussion of this communistic proposition, but I wanted to say to the House what I knew about the character of Dr. Ballou, and I am willing to stand on that regardless of what may be said in regard to these hearings.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, as distasteful as it is, I agree with the gentleman for once. It is somewhat surprising that a gentleman from Texas, who claims to be a Democrat, a Jeffersonian Democrat, has not read a little of Jefferson. Thomas Jefferson very pointedly made the remark and forecast that if such legislation as the gentleman from Texas seeks to hold on to is ever placed on the statute books, because it is what they call coercive legislation, stifling freedom of speech and freedom of thought, half of the people would become hypocrites and the other half would be fools. If the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] believes that to be a wholesome situation within a country, a situation that is desirable, that is his privilege. I am of opinion, Mr. Chairman, that the efforts of the gentleman

from Texas, either intentionally or unintentionally, advisedly or ill-advisedly, are being directed to creating a scheme of fascism on this country. Can he point out in Germany or in Italy that such legislation is not in vogue, or, even if it is not legislation, that they do not compel teachers to do just what he wants them to do; and if they do not do it, that into the concentration camps they go? And, remember this, our C. C. C. camps are not far from concentration camps. There is just an element of difference between them. To make the gentleman's position secure, he should have compulsory enforcement of what we call enlistments to the C. C. C. camps and make concentration camps out of them. Then he will have a well-rounded program.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

For dust prevention, sweeping and cleaning streets, avenues, alleys, and suburban streets, under the immediate direction of the Commissioners, and for cleaning snow and ice from streets, sidewalks, crosswalks, and gutters in the discretion of the Commissioners, including services and purchase and maintenance of equipment, rent of storage rooms; maintenance and repair of garages; maintenance and repair of non-passenger-carrying motor-propelled vehicles necessary in cleaning streets and purchase of motor-propelled street-cleaning equipment; and necessary incidental expenses, \$400,000: *Provided*, That appropriations contained in this act for highways, sewers, and the water department shall be available for snow removal when specifically and in writing ordered by the Commissioners.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Yesterday things happened upon this floor which I do not particularly approve. I was a participant in them voluntarily and, I think, advisedly. The position that I took upon this Washington, D. C., appropriation bill was a serious position. I recognized at the time that the suggestions I made would not be honored or entertained at this time. I wanted them to come in early because it takes about a year for a good idea to penetrate the intellects of some people and we should give it time. That was my only purpose.

There is one thing I should like to call attention to that I did not call attention to yesterday, and this is all that I will have to say on the District bill today unless I am forced to say something more, and that is the intolerable situation under which the taxicab drivers must operate, as their relationship goes on with the police department of Washington, D. C.

There are no people who are being persecuted in their effort to eke out a little livelihood more than the taxicab drivers of this District.

As one example, a boy who is a student of comparative literature, who drives a cab, taking his master's degree at George Washington University, goes to class in the morning. His class lasts for 2 hours. In front of the school they have a 2-hour parking limit. He went to class the other day in his taxicab and he came out 3 minutes late. In other words, 2 hours and 3 minutes, and a policeman was there waiting for him. It cost that boy \$5. Is that law enforcement or is that persecution? The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the traffic department would not know anything about traffic laws if half of them had not been former taxicab drivers. That is the manner in which they learned the traffic laws.

What do you think of policemen, making a good salary, using taxicabs and daring the cab drivers to ask for the fare? They do this in uniform—and some even in plain clothes—going to shows and church.

I, for one, will oppose any increase of the police department until the department is purged of these petty racketeers with a uniform, gun, club, and star on. There are good policemen and policemen who believe in law and order, who enforce the law for the good of the public, but as it is now they are a menace already. Why make it a greater one?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 1 minute. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, we members of the committee pay no attention to the quips that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ZIONCHECK] lodges against us. I feel sorry for him. He has my deepest sympathy. When he first came

here, and especially last year, he did splendid work. I was proud of him; but something has gone wrong with him.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman cannot do that in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I know I cannot, but I was trying to find out whether he knew it. [Laughter.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES, PUBLIC PARKS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For personal services, \$351,910.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] was on the floor, and I raised the question as to the amount of taxes paid by real-estate owners in the city of Washington. The reply was that it was at the rate of \$1.50 per hundred, or \$15 a thousand.

I hold in my hand a real-estate tax receipt which I paid a short time ago on a little piece of property that I own, which is a very ordinary home. The rate for 1933 was \$77.05 per thousand, or \$7.70 per hundred. The rate for 1934 was \$99 per thousand, or \$9.90 per hundred. This property is valued at \$5,010 on the tax-assessment rolls. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee how much tax would have to be paid in Washington, D. C., on that valuation?

Mr. BLANTON. How much did the gentleman have to pay?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I had to pay \$533.84.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman had had his property located in Washington, instead of paying \$533.84 taxes, he would have had to pay only \$75. He would have had to pay only \$2 on his automobile for personal-property tax. He would have had to pay only \$1 for his license tags. He would have gotten water for his family at \$6.60 per year. He would have had no income tax to pay; no sales tax; no inheritance tax; no estate tax; no gift tax to pay at all. In addition to that, he would have had all of his trees furnished, sprayed, pruned, and looked after and replaced. He would have had his garbage and ashes gathered free. He would have had his trash gathered free. He would have had the benefit of all the wonderful sights of Washington.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I should also like to state that my water bill runs at the rate of \$11 per quarter, or \$44 per year.

Mr. BLANTON. As against about 50 cents a month here.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I should also like to say that the previous year the tax on that little piece of property was \$455.03, or there was an advance in 1 year from \$455.03 to \$533.

Just this morning I received a tax statement for this year's taxes on that same property, which shows that the rate is \$96 per thousand or \$9.60 per hundred.

Last night's Star and this morning's Post carry editorials criticizing the Members of this Congress for our refusal to go along helping the real-estate owners of this city in further reducing their burden of \$1.50 per hundred on real-estate taxes, when out in my country we are paying \$9.90 per hundred.

Mr. MILLARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. MILLARD. What is the real value of your property? You say it is assessed for \$5,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The market value of that property today is \$10,000.

Mr. MILLARD. That is a 50-percent assessment?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is a 50-percent assessment. At the rate of \$533 per year you can make your own calculation. The property has a value of \$10,000 today, and there is a 50-percent assessment, \$5,000, and the tax is \$533. The way I figure it, that is about 5 percent per year. In other words, within 20 years the property is entirely eaten up by State, county, and city taxes.

Mr. FORD of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. FORD of California. What would that property normally rent for in the gentleman's city?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That property would normally rent for about \$135 a month. However, for several years conditions have not been normal. At present the property is renting for a gross figure of only \$75 per month, and out of this must be paid all decorating, plumbing, and other repairs to building. Also sidewalk service, such as cleaning snow—and this is a very large item in the wintertime—must be paid, and many other incidental items, such as fire insurance, tornado insurance, and so forth. After all, the net income from rents is just about enough to pay the taxes. When I hear of Washingtonians complaining about their little rate of \$1.50 per hundred and see such editorials as appeared last night and this morning against Members of Congress because they will not further burden people out in the country in favor of the real-estate owners of Washington, it makes me furious. These real-estate operators and owners here in the District who so complain have been pampered too much at the expense of the other people of this country, and it is time we put on the brakes. Such complaints, especially when we find these owners here refuse to pay their taxes for years back as has been testified, are insults to the intelligence of people who study this whole situation. I shall vote for the bill with its reduced allowance and trust the Members of this body will stand by their vote if the Senate attempts to increase the appropriation.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman has just told us is in the mind and heart of every Member of Congress. The people in Washington are God's chosen people, and Congress has always been generous to them; Congress has never been ungenerous.

In just a few minutes we will have finished this bill. On behalf of our committee, I want to thank the Members of the House for the consideration shown the committee and for the confidence they have had in the committee and the help they have rendered in passing this bill, which grants the largest appropriations to the District of Columbia it has ever had in its entire history.

With regard to health matters, we have not cut down one single penny for health. If you will secure facts from any comparable city in the United States, you will find that we provide more doctors at higher salaries and more health facilities to Washington than any other comparable city in the United States provides.

We have made some cuts on enormous salaries, cuts on salaries that are unconscionable. For instance, the committee saw fit to cut Dr. Bocock's salary. He gets \$7,500 a year. He has no expenses. He is furnished his light, his heat, his board and lodging, and everything. His \$7,500 is free of expenses. That is more than any Congressman here gets, because it costs us about \$2,500 a year to get back here and to stay here; and it costs him nothing, yet he does not pay one single dollar in taxes to the District of Columbia.

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. LUCKEY. Calling the gentleman's attention to the fact that according to statements carried in the papers some time ago there are 22,000 families on relief in Washington, D. C., does not the gentleman think that Washington, D. C., is a luxury for the Congress?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLS. I wish the chairman of the subcommittee would point out to me one Member of Congress who can live in the city of Washington for \$2,500 a year. It costs me more than that.

Mr. BLANTON. I have to sell a piece of property every 2 years to get to stay here. [Laughter.] I am getting poorer and poorer all the time.

Mr. NICHOLS. I should like to know the Congressman who can stay here for \$2,500 a year.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not talking about the cost of living in Washington. I am talking about the cost of getting re-elected and getting back here.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call on the Washington newspapers in all fairness—I want to urge them—to print in their papers in the morning and tomorrow the taxes they pay this District; show the property they have and let the Washington people know exactly what these newspapers pay on their valuable properties. I want them to show the Washington people what the owners of these papers pay on their homes, their magnificent homes here, and on their property. If they will do this, no person in Washington will ever say, "I am voiceless and voteless." They will say, "Thank God for the Congress of the United States."

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 6. No part of the funds appropriated in this act shall be available for the payment of the salary of any officer or employee of the District of Columbia whose salary as such officer or employee is \$2,400 or more per annum who is engaged in any outside business or profession in addition to his official duties.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I direct the attention of the Committee for just a moment to section 6 of this bill, which provides that nobody who may be an officer or employee of the District of Columbia at a salary of \$2,400 or more can participate in this appropriation if engaged in any outside business or profession in addition to his official duties. I think that is a fair statement of the substance and intent of section 6.

I quite appreciate the purport and the intent of the committee in inserting this section in the bill. They believe that certain sinecures have been set up whereby doctors and others have been on the pay roll of the District of Columbia when, at the same time, they have been pursuing their private professions, the income of which was rather lucrative. I fully sympathize with the purpose of the committee, but may I point out, for instance, some of the things this section will do?

A number of men in the corporation counsel's office would come within the purview of this section, because their salaries are in excess of \$2,400, and they teach law in some of the night law schools. Now, if teaching law in a law school can be called a business or a profession, then these gentlemen clearly come within section 6 and cannot participate in the appropriations in this bill.

There are teachers in the Washington schools who are contributing to magazines. If this is a business or profession, they will have to forsake their creative contributions if they are compensated for it; otherwise they cannot be paid out of the appropriations in this bill.

There are some doctors who give service to clinics and dispensaries who come within the \$2,400 provision. If so, they must forsake either their regular medical practice or their job with the District of Columbia. I appreciate, of course, that abuses can arise and have arisen, but, insofar as the medical profession is concerned, I am wondering whether you can get a specialist of any repute whatever to go even so far as to give consultative advice in the District of Columbia or any other municipality for \$2,400 a year. Will he forsake his larger lucrative medical practice? No. What he will do will be to stop giving service to the District of Columbia or to any of these institutions and dispensaries and go on with his regular business. The result of section 6 will be that you will penalize this District, because medical experts whose services now are available to the District but whose private emoluments run up into thousands of dollars every year will come within the purview of this section.

They will not give up their regular job, so they will cease giving consultation and advice to the dispensaries, the clinics, and institutions of the District.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that I fully appreciate the effort to abolish a lot of these sinecures, but in so doing they are going to penalize a lot of innocent people who are giving their talented professional service to the District at the

present time. I am not so sure but what the harm that will be created by section 6 will be infinitely greater than any good that might be accomplished.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. There is nothing here which would prevent that publicly minded professional specialist rendering the service gratuitously in return for the benefits he may secure in the use of clinical appliances and other things provided by the District.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That may be true, but we live in a rather selfish world and we know that in practice such expert professional advice will not be given by men who have studied a lifetime and expended huge sums of money to gain that professional repute.

I know full well that it will be suggested that men drawing good salaries should not be engaged in teaching or writing or doing other things. That is but half the story and that argument can be demolished easily enough. I submit that years ago Frank Kellogg, one time Secretary of State for the United States, used to come to the Law School at Minnesota and lecture on constitutional law. He was an authority. He was a high-salaried lawyer, but his salary and his income had nothing to do with it. It was a question of fitness and ability. His ability was recognized, and I for one was grateful for the privilege of hearing him lecture. Had section 6 been in vogue in Minnesota at that time, Mr. Kellogg would have had to forsake the practice of law or give up his occasional lectures. The losers, of course, would have been the students. So the losers here may be the students in the law schools and there is no use of trying to obscure the issue by loud argument about salaries. They have nothing to do with it.

Once I took an insurance course. One of the lecturers was a man who wrote a million dollars' worth of insurance a year. Is there anyone who will contend that since he was engaged in another profession, he would have to give up the insurance business or he could not lecture? You know what he would do. He would forget lecturing but the students who wanted to hear first-hand testimony from a real go-getter in that field would be the losers, and what a ghastly and short-sighted policy that is.

As for the doctors, may I suggest that if the Mayo clinic were located here what a privilege it would be to have some of their brilliant doctors give of their time to the public clinics and dispensaries of the city. Yet, if they were on the pay roll, they would have to continue on such a \$2,400 job full time and give up all medical practice or give up the job for the city. Who loses? Is it the doctor? Such compensation would be but a bagatelle for a high-grade specialist and obviously he would forget it and continue his medical practice. The result is that the people—the people in distress; the people in need of expert diagnosis and treatment—would be the losers. Salaries have nothing to do with it and no amount of noise is very persuasive on that matter. Suffice to say, in conclusion, that if section 6 remains in that bill it will abolish the few sinecures, but, at the same time, deprive the people of this District of talented professional service for which people in other sections come miles to engage. In a way the matter would be laughable if it were not a grim tragedy.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendment thereto close in 5 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—yeas 52, noes 10.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro-forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, relative to the corporation counsel's office, some of whom the gentleman from Illinois wants the privilege extended to be able to teach night classes in law schools, may I say that one of them gets \$8,000 a year. That is a pretty good salary. Two of them get \$6,750 apiece. That is a pretty good salary. We do not have many of that kind of men back home. Another one gets \$5,800 and another one \$4,600.

Mr. Chairman, I was on the circuit bench for 8 years. If I had taught a class of law students in a law school at night I would not have been able to hold court the next day. It took all of my time, energy, and resource to hold court.

If they will do well their duty, and perform the best service, they will not have any time to teach law classes in schools at night.

Let us take the courts here, for instance. There are in the District of Columbia four police court judges who try misdemeanors. They get \$8,000 a year apiece. They pay no income tax; they do not respond to emergency matters. When we take something off our salary they do not take it off theirs. There is situated here also a municipal court. There are five municipal court judges each getting \$8,000. That is twice as much as the Governor of the great State of Texas receives today.

If I were a young student in a law class, I would want them to give more attention to the lectures which they deliver. I would not want them to come down there unprepared. It takes time to prepare a lecture to be delivered to a law class.

Let us see about some of these other judges. Let us take the supreme court judges in the District of Columbia. The chief justice gets \$10,500 a year, which is more than we as Congressmen receive. They have no expense. A law clerk is furnished to them. They have this and that furnished them. They get 3 months' vacation in the summertime, and all of these judges receive \$10,000 a year, except the chief justice who gets \$500 a year additional. They pay no income tax and they accept no cuts in salary during depressions.

Let us take up the court of appeals. There are five judges of the court of appeals who get \$12,500 a year apiece. When we took a cut in our salary we asked them to take a cut in their's and they refused to do it. When we asked them to pay an income tax they refused to pay it. We as common Congressmen have to pay an income tax out of our salary among the other drains on our income, but these judges do not do that. They have 3 months' vacation in the summertime and yet they want to lecture at night for more pay.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to stop that. [Applause.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Can the gentleman give any good reason why an employee of the District of Columbia should hold two jobs with ten or twelve million people out of employment?

Mr. BLANTON. No.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can give a good reason for that, and I will give the gentleman a good reason.

Mr. BLANTON. I refuse to yield.

Mr. Chairman, I want the Members to read pages 300, 301, and 302 of the hearings. There are three pages of doctors on the pay roll of the District of Columbia, doctors on the pay roll of the people here. There are three full printed pages of doctors' names. Now, I never voted on an amendment affecting one single doctor. When the health department matter come up I refused to vote on any of those things. Every amendment with respect to the health situation and the doctors was taken care of by my colleagues on the committee. I did not vote on these matters because I knew the newspapers would say I was prejudiced; therefore, I did not vote. The committee wants to stop them from holding two jobs.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 82, strike out all of section 6.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. No part of the funds appropriated in this act shall be available for the payment of rental of quarters for any activity at a rate in excess of 90 percent of the per annum rate paid by the District of Columbia for such quarters on June 30, 1933: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to leases made prior to the passage of this act, except when renewals thereof

are made hereafter: *Provided further*, That the appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this paragraph shall not be used for any purpose, but shall be impounded and deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia.

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to say a few words in regard to the matter of safety in respect of vehicular traffic in the District of Columbia.

If there were any vices in this country killing off as many people as are being killed daily by our automobiles, the entire country would be up in arms about it and would want to do something to stop it.

During the past year of 1935, there were over 34,000 people killed in automobile accidents in the United States, and no one knows how many were maimed for life. We had 38,000 killed in the World War, and we devoted all the energies of this great Government to bringing a stop to that conflict as soon as possible. We use every power at our command to stop wars that would kill off people, and certainly this is a most important matter to the people of the country.

After having given this traffic matter considerable study by reason of being assigned to such duty on one of the committees of this House, I believe I would be derelict in my duty if I did not call the matter to your attention.

I want to call the attention of the House and read a statement from the chief of the traffic bureau of Chicago, who says in a letter to me:

The most effective way to reduce accidents and at the same time act as a deterrent to reckless driving is the old-fashioned method, for which no substitute has yet been produced, namely, the presence of well-trained, intelligently supervised, and properly disciplined uniform policemen, distributed to man all important intersections. Records prove that 70 percent of serious accidents occur at crossings; consequently it is obvious that the police officers' presence will not alone have a preventative effect on accidents but will have a moral effect on the conduct of motorists. Furthermore, the desired effect in assisting pedestrians is combined with the prevention of accidents.

Engineering is good, but our experience teaches that many motorists ignore the notices which such engineering stands for in the absence of policemen.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARPENTER. I cannot yield unless the gentleman will get me some more time.

Mr. BLANTON. We shall be pleased to do that.

Mr. CARPENTER. Very, well; I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I wish to say to my friend from Kansas that I know something about the splendid work he is doing on this traffic matter, and I believe that every Member who knows about it appreciates his work, and I am glad that he has taken occasion to put these figures in the RECORD.

Mr. CARPENTER. I am not coming in here to criticize this committee; I want to be helpful in this matter. I do not know whether we ought to have more patrolmen added to the force, or utilize some of those we now have for this purpose. My only interest in the matter is in line with my obligations as a Congressman to our constituents who come here and use the streets in an effort to do something that will make our streets as safe as possible, together with my obligation as a Member of Congress in regard to the government of the District of Columbia and to make it as safe as possible for those residing here.

I have a similar statement from Mr. Fowler, the first deputy commissioner of the police department of New York, who states:

Conspicuous patrol on the highways of the uniformed force, particularly the motorcycle and mounted divisions. Moral effect of the presence of the uniformed officers on the highways is invaluable in creating respect and obedience to all regulations.

Mr. Fowler put his statement in the form of recommendations, and this is one of them.

I also have here the statement of Captain Smith, who appeared before our committee this morning. He is the man who has under his control the entire traffic division of the police department. He is the head of that particular department and ought to know whereof he speaks. He made this statement before our committee this morning:

I have made a study of traffic, and I think that I am qualified to state that, insofar as I have been able to learn, one of the main difficulties that we have in the District of Columbia today is a lack of personnel.

I would like to remind this committee that in 1928 there were 93 motorcycles in use in the police department; today there are approximately 54, notwithstanding the large increase in automobile registration, the increase in the population of the District of Columbia. We have less motorcycle men enforcing the traffic regulations today than we had approximately 10 years ago.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARPENTER. There has been a great increase in the number of automobiles coming into the District of Columbia from Maryland and Virginia and from all over the United States.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARPENTER. I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not a fact that the large number of automobiles owned and operated by the residents of the District of Columbia is augmented by thousands and thousands of Government workers and others who work here in the District of Columbia, but live in nearby Maryland or Virginia?

Mr. CARPENTER. The gentleman is right, according to the information presented to our committee.

I have here some very interesting figures showing the increase in registrations in the last 10 years in the District of Columbia, as follows:

In 1925 we had 103,000 motor vehicles registered here.

In 1930, 155,000 motor vehicles registered.

In 1935, 208,000 motor vehicles registered.

This does not include the vehicles that my colleague from West Virginia just mentioned.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARPENTER. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I think the gentleman should also point out the fact that there is an automobile for every two people who live in the District of Columbia.

Mr. CARPENTER. Yes; the District of Columbia has a greater percentage of automobiles per capita than any other city in the United States.

Mr. SHORT. The next city is Detroit, with one for every eight of population.

Mr. CARPENTER. And Chicago is next.

Mr. BLANTON. Our subcommittee welcomes at all times any of our colleagues appearing before it on any matter in which they are interested. We have had several colleagues before us during the past week, and some items were put in the bill which they proposed.

Mr. CARPENTER. I appreciate that, but we did not get organized until it was too late, and have just developed this information for the most part since your committee has completed its hearing. And might I say that much of this information has come to us the last day or two since this bill has been debated here in the House.

Mr. RANDOLPH. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say that the gentleman from Kansas is chairman of a subcommittee that has in the last few days brought out splendid suggestions and recommendations from their investigation and study, which will aid greatly in solving the traffic problem here. I commend the committee members for their work.

Mr. CARPENTER. Now, the police are doing splendid work in protecting school children of this city. Do you know that there were only two children between the ages of 5 and 14 killed in the District of Columbia in 1935?

The police are doing very efficient work, but they have a great deal to contend with, such as parades, escorts, and so forth, not to mention the peculiar plan of the city, with its many circles and diagonal streets intersecting from all

angles that makes it one of the most difficult cities in this country in which to drive.

All I want to do is to call attention to this important matter. There may be amendments added to this bill in the Senate to increase the personnel of the traffic division of the police department, or otherwise helpful to it, and if there should be any I should like to have them given favorable consideration by the conference committee and again here on the floor of the House. We should like to have 25 additional motorcycle police. We do not want any more police simply to arrest people. That would not get us anywhere. We want the necessary traffic police to save life and limb, which all the evidence before our committee indicates we do not have at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARPENTER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Does not the gentleman think that we ought to have additional signal lights?

Mr. CARPENTER. Well, that is a moot question. Some think we ought to have more lights, and some think that we ought to have fewer lights, and thereby traffic would be speeded up. Others are very much vexed because traffic lights have not been placed at intersections near where they live or trade.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill without amendment to the House, with the recommendation that the bill be passed.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NELSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11581) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back without amendment, with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

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 third time, and was read the third time.

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

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from New Jersey demands the yeas and nays. All in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Seven Members have arisen; not a sufficient number.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 138, noes 11.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from New Jersey makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty Members present; not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 290, nays 26, answered "present" 1, not voting 113, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]

YEAS—290

Adair	Ayers	Biermann	Bloom
Allen	Bacharach	Binderup	Boehne
Andresen	Bacon	Blackney	Boland
Arends	Bankhead	Bland	Bolton
Ashbrook	Barry	Blanton	Boykin

Brewster	Farley	Ludlow	Richardson
Brown, Ga.	Fernandez	McAndrews	Risk
Buchanan	Fiesinger	McClellan	Robertson
Buck	Fitzpatrick	McCormack	Robison, Ky.
Buckler, Minn.	Flannagan	McFarlane	Rogers, N. H.
Burch	Fletcher	McGrath	Rogers, Okla.
Burnham	Focht	McKeough	Rudd
Caldwell	Ford, Calif.	McLaughlin	Russell
Cannon, Mo.	Ford, Miss.	McLean	Sanders, Tex.
Carpenter	Frey	McLeod	Schneider, Wis.
Cartwright	Fuller	McMillan	Schuetz
Cary	Gavagan	Maas	Scrugham
Casey	Gearhart	Mahon	Secrest
Castellow	Gehrmann	Main	Shanley
Chapman	Gifford	Maloney	Shannon
Church	Gilchrist	Mansfield	Short
Citron	Gillette	Mapes	Smith, Conn.
Claiborne	Gingery	Marshall	Smith, Va.
Cochran	Granfield	Martin, Colo.	Smith, Wash.
Coffee	Green	Martin, Mass.	Snell
Colden	Greenway	Mason	Snyder, Pa.
Cole, Md.	Gregory	Massingale	South
Cole, N. Y.	Guyer	Maverick	Spence
Colmer	Gwynne	May	Starnes
Connery	Haines	Mead	Stefan
Cooley	Halleck	Merritt, Conn.	Stubbs
Cooper, Tenn.	Hancock, N. Y.	Merritt, N. Y.	Summers, Tex.
Costello	Harlan	Michener	Sutphin
Cox	Hart	Millard	Taber
Cravens	Harter	Miller	Tarver
Crawford	Healey	Mitchell, Tenn.	Taylor, S. C.
Creal	Higgins, Mass.	Moran	Taylor, Tenn.
Cross, Tex.	Hildebrandt	Mott	Terry
Crosser, Ohio	Hill, Ala.	Murdock	Thomason
Crowe	Hill, Knute	Nelson	Thompson
Culkin	Hill, Samuel B.	O'Brien	Thurston
Cullen	Hoffman	O'Connell	Tinkham
Cummings	Hope	O'Connor	Tobey
Curley	Houston	O'Leary	Toian
Daly	Imhoff	O'Malley	Treadway
Darden	Jacobsen	O'Neal	Turner
Darrow	Jenkins, Ohio	Owen	Turpin
Dempsey	Johnson, Okla.	Palmisano	Umstead
Dies	Johnson, Tex.	Parks	Utterback
Dietrich	Johnson, W. Va.	Parsons	Vinson, Ga.
Dirksen	Jones	Patman	Vinson, Ky.
Disney	Kahn	Patterson	Wallgren
Ditter	Keller	Pearson	Walter
Dobbins	Kennedy, Md.	Perkins	Warren
Dockweiler	Kerr	Peterson, Ga.	Wearin
Dondero	Kinzer	Pettengill	Weaver
Dorsey	Kleberg	Pfeifer	Welch
Doughton	Kloeb	Pierce	Werner
Doutrich	Kniffin	Plumley	Whelchel
Doxey	Knutson	Polk	Wigglesworth
Drewry	Kocialkowski	Powers	Wilcox
Driscoll	Kramer	Rabaut	Williams
Driver	Kvale	Ramsay	Wilson, Pa.
Duffy, N. Y.	Lamneck	Ramspeck	Wolcott
Duncan	Lanham	Randolph	Wolfenden
Dunn, Miss.	Larrabee	Rankin	Wood
Eckert	Lee, Okla.	Ransley	Woodrum
Edmiston	Lemke	Rayburn	Woodruff
Eicher	Lesinski	Reece	Woodruff
Ekwall	Lewis, Colo.	Reed, Ill.	Young
Engel	Lewis, Md.	Reed, N. Y.	Zimmerman
Englebright	Lord	Rich	
Faddis	Luckey	Richards	

NAYS—26

Amle	Holmes	O'Day	Scott
Brown, Mich.	Hook	Patton	Somers, N. Y.
Burdick	Hull	Peyster	Thom
Dingell	Kennedy	Rogers, Mass.	Tonry
Dunn, Pa.	Marcantonio	Sadowski	Zioncheck
Ellenbogen	Nichols	Sauthoff	
Gasque	Norton	Schulte	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Kopplemann

NOT VOTING—113

Andrew, Mass.	Cooper, Ohio	Greever	McSwain
Andrews, N. Y.	Corning	Griswold	Meeks
Barden	Crosby	Hamlin	Mitchell, Ill.
Beam	Crowther	Hancock, N. C.	Monaghan
Beiter	Dear	Hartley	Montague
Bell	Deen	Hennings	Montet
Berlin	Delaney	Hess	Moritz
Boileau	DeRouen	Higgins, Conn.	Oliver
Boylan	Dickstein	Hobbs	Peterson, Fla.
Brennan	Duffey, Ohio	Hoeppe	Pittenger
Brooks	Eagle	Hollister	Quinn
Buckbee	Eaton	Huddleston	Relly
Buckley, N. Y.	Evans	Jenckes, Ind.	Robinson, Utah
Bulwinkle	Fenerty	Kee	Romjue
Cannon, Wis.	Ferguson	Kelly	Ryan
Carlson	Fish	Kennedy, N. Y.	Sabath
Carmichael	Fulmer	Lambertson	Sanders, La.
Carter	Gambrell	Lambeth	Sandlin
Cavicchia	Gassaway	Lea, Calif.	Schaefer
Celler	Gildea	Lehlbach	Sears
Chandler	Goldsborough	Lucas	Seger
Christianson	Goodwin	Lundeen	Sirovich
Clark, Idaho	Gray, Ind.	McGehee	Sisson
Clark, N. C.	Gray, Pa.	McGroarty	Smith, W. Va.
Collins	Greenwood	McReynolds	Stack

Steagall	Taylor, Colo.	West	Wilson, La.
Stewart	Thomas	White	Withrow
Sullivan	Underwood	Whittington	
Sweeney	Wadsworth		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
General pairs:

Mr. Corning with Mr. Christianson.
Mr. McSwain with Mr. Crowder.
Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. McReynolds with Mr. Lehlbach.
Mr. Lea of California with Mr. Carlson.
Mr. Kelly with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Huddleston with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Oliver with Mr. Pittenger.
Mr. Reilly with Mr. Hollister.
Mr. Sears with Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Seger.
Mr. Whittington with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Montague with Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts.
Mr. Lambeth with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Griswold with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Boylan with Mr. Stewart.
Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Cooper of Ohio.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Andrews of New York.
Mr. Eagle with Mr. Fenerty.
Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Cavicchia.
Mr. Sisson with Mr. Buckbee.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Collins.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Higgins of Connecticut.
Mr. Deen with Mr. Boileau.
Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Lundeen.
Mr. Gray of Indiana with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Mitchell of Illinois.
Mr. Quinn with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Crosby with Mr. Ryan.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Montet.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Evans.
Mr. Bean with Mr. Wilson of Louisiana.
Mr. Gildea with Mr. Dickstein.
Mr. West with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Schaefer with Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Beiter with Mr. Stack.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. White.
Mr. Carmichael with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Gassaway with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Brennan.
Mrs. Jenckes of Indiana with Mr. Sanders of Louisiana.
Mr. Dear with Mr. Meeks.
Mr. Ferguson with Mr. DeRouen.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Brooks.
Mr. Hamlin with Mr. Peterson of Florida.
Mr. Clark of Idaho with Mr. Duffey of Ohio.
Mr. Monaghan with Mr. Kennedy of New York.
Mr. Goldsborough with Mr. Sandlin.
Mr. Sirovich with Mr. Underwood.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. GASQUE changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Oklahoma, Mr. GASSAWAY, is detained on account of illness. If he were present, he would vote "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed and lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

PRINTING OF HEARINGS BEFORE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution prepared by Mr. Wold, the clerk of the Joint Committee on Printing, to provide for some additional copies of the hearings. The supply has about been exhausted. This is a bill which the people of Washington are particularly interested in, and many of their organizations want copies of these hearings. In order that the Committee on Appropriations may provide them, Mr. Wold has prepared this resolution, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. If the copies are printed while the plates are already up, it will cost very little money to have additional copies printed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, empowered to have printed 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held during the current session before the subcommittee of said Committee on the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1937.

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

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this concurrent resolution will go then to the Committee on Printing, and upon being reported out by them, it will become a privileged resolution, and can be called up by the chairman of the committee as a matter of right. Hence, for the present, I ask the Public Printer to preserve the type on these hearings, so that should the House pass this resolution, additional copies of the hearings may be printed without much additional expense.

SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on the District of Columbia may continue its hearings during the session of the House on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

COMMERCIAL AIRPORT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I call up a conference report on the bill (H. R. 3806) to establish a commercial airport for the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3806) to establish a commercial airport for the District of Columbia, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

"That there is hereby created a commission to be known as the 'District of Columbia Airport Commission' (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission'), to be composed of three Members of the United States Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, three Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and three persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, who because of their official positions are interested in the development of a commercial airport in the District of Columbia. No person shall serve on the Commission who has any financial interest direct or indirect in any site or sites for said airport which may be the subject of consideration. The Commission shall proceed immediately after its appointment and organization to examine all available data concerning potential sites for commercial airports and to inspect such potential sites, and shall select a site for such purpose with due regard to the cost of its acquisition and development, its safety, and its adaptability to the requirements of commercial aviation and national defense.

"Sec. 2. The Commission shall preserve its decision and selection in confidence, and shall make a confidential report thereon to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives if Congress is not in session: *Provided, however,* That said report shall be made not later than June 30, 1936.

"Sec. 3. The members of the Commission shall receive no salary as such, but shall be reimbursed for actual expenses incurred in the discharge of official duties as such commissioners. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$100,000, to be charged one-half to the moneys in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia and one-half to the moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, of which not to exceed \$10,000 shall be used for the purpose of employing appraisers and other assistants, and \$90,000, or so much thereof as is necessary, shall be used for the purchase of land and buildings, or for the negotiation of options to purchase land, or land and buildings." And the Senate agree to the same.

VINCENT L. PALMISANO,
JACK NICHOLS,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

WILLIAM H. KING,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3806) to establish a commercial airport for the District of Columbia submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate amendment strikes out all after the enacting clause, substituting other provisions in lieu thereof.

Section 1 of the Senate amendment authorizes the President to appoint a District of Columbia airport commission of seven members, specifying their qualifications and duties. The substitute agreed to in conference provides for a commission of nine members, three to be appointed by the President of the Senate, three by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and three by the President.

Section 2 of the Senate amendment provides that a confidential report shall be made to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives during the second session of the Seventy-fourth Congress. The substitute agreed to in conference further provides that this report may be made to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives if Congress is not in session; also that the report must be made not later than June 30, 1936.

Section 3 of the Senate amendment provides that members of the Commission shall receive no salary as such, but shall be reimbursed for actual expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties; also appropriates \$1,000, to be charged one-half to District of Columbia funds in the Treasury of the United States and one-half to United States funds not otherwise appropriated, for the purposes of the act. The substitute agreed to in conference authorizes the appropriation of \$100,000, to be charged one-half against moneys in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia and one-half against the moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and specifies that not to exceed \$10,000 is to be used for employing appraisers and other assistants and \$90,000, or so much thereof as is necessary, for the purchase of land and buildings or for the negotiation of options to purchase land or land and buildings.

VINCENT L. PALMISANO,
JACK NICHOLS,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman from Maryland a question, if he will yield for that purpose.

Mr. PALMISANO. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SNELL. Did the gentleman notify the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that he was going to call up this conference report this afternoon?

Mr. PALMISANO. I did not.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman from Illinois told me he was interested in the report and wanted to make some remarks in regard to it.

Mr. PALMISANO. The gentleman from Illinois signed the report.

Mr. SNELL. I do not know what remarks he wanted to make, but I feel the gentleman should have been notified by the chairman of the committee when he was going to call up the report.

Mr. NICHOLS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLS. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was a member of the conference committee and signed this report.

Mr. SNELL. I understand that. I understood, however, that he wanted to say something when the report was brought in. That is all I know about it. Of course, this is a highly privileged matter.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I may say I did not intend to call up this report until I found that there was no other business before the House after the appropriation bill had been concluded.

Mr. SNELL. I understood there would be nothing else this afternoon either.

Mr. PALMISANO. That is the only reason I called it up. I did not intend to call it up this afternoon.

Mr. SNELL. I think the majority member should notify the minority member, even if he did sign the report, when he is going to call up the report.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Was not the gentleman from Illinois on the floor a moment ago? I thought I saw him.

Mr. SNELL. We have not been able to find him. He did not know it was coming up today. I did not know it was coming up today. I appreciate your right to call it up, but I am just calling attention to the fact that the minority member should be notified when a conference report is brought in.

Mr. PALMISANO. I want to say that I did not intend to ignore the minority member.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] did want to say something on the report, but he is attending a committee meeting now. We have notified him.

Mr. PALMISANO. Perhaps if the gentleman will get in touch with him, we may be able to prolong the discussion until he arrives.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman explain what he has done, and we will try to get the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] here.

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, for 3 or 4 years there has been an effort to get the Government to take over and operate a commercial airport in the District of Columbia. A measure of this character was pending before the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman, and that committee acted adversely upon it. Such a measure subsequently was pending before the Committee on Military Affairs, and I understand that committee did not take favorable action upon this matter. Thereupon such a measure was introduced and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. Now, we have a proposal, which has proceeded to the stage of a conference report, to start the Federal Government in the matter of taking over a commercial airport in the city of Washington.

I am sure that everyone is interested in a proper airport in the District, whether it be under municipal operation or controlled by private enterprise. I think that Washington, through P. W. A. funds or W. P. A. funds or other available funds, is entitled to the same consideration with reference to benefits to be received as any other city in the country in the matter of municipal or commercial proposals, but probably to no more. The Government has its own Army airfield here and its own naval station. Now, in accordance with the terms of this conference report provision is to be made to start with \$50,000 of Federal money for the purpose of purchasing or procuring options on some of this land, and I have what I think is a reasonable fear that this will just be a predicate for further and considerable sums.

With reference to a local airport, there has been complaint on the part of some of the stockholders that the returns on their investments have been by no means satisfactory.

It seems they have received no dividends, and the implication has been made in some quarters that this particular measure is an effort to get the Federal Government, through the Congress, to relieve private parties in the District of Columbia of a troublesome and embarrassing situation. Personally I do not believe, especially in view of the fact that this is a commercial matter and no part of a system of developing Washington's proper beauty, that there is any more obligation upon the Federal Government to buy and operate or subsidize a commercial airport in this city than there is in the city in which I live or in which my friend from Michigan lives.

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

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. MAPES. The gentleman states that this same subject matter has been before three committees, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, of which the distinguished gentleman from Texas is chairman, the Committee on Military Affairs, and now the Committee on the District of Columbia. This is rather an interesting statement. How did these three different committees get jurisdiction of the same subject matter?

Mr. LANHAM. That is difficult for me to say. I do not know why it was originally referred to our committee, but our committee, after lengthy hearings, decided adversely. I do

not know just exactly what the military angle was that caused its reference to the Committee on Military Affairs. It is a District of Columbia proposition, of course, and I can see reasons why it should have been sent to the Committee on the District of Columbia; but I think I am correct in the statement that three committees have acted upon this matter, two unfavorably and one favorably.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman suffer an interruption?

Mr. LANHAM. Certainly.

Mr. KVALE. I want to compliment the gentleman on the work his committee did in connection with this bill when it was before his committee, but I think he will agree with me that he and his committee did not go completely to the bottom of the entire story.

Mr. LANHAM. I think that probably is true, but we did go into the story enough to decide not to report the measure favorably.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to have some further information about this bill. It looks to me like the camel's nose under the tent. What is the final obligation on the Federal Government with reference to this proposal going to be?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I may say to my distinguished colleague from Texas that the policy as to whether or not this is to be a municipal airport financed entirely from the funds of the District of Columbia, or what sort of airport it is to be, has not yet been determined, and this House will have an opportunity to pass on it by approving or disapproving the action of this commission.

I was a member of the subcommittee which for 4 months last year conducted hearings on this airport bill. The question was before the subcommittee in the form of a bill to construct an airport at a specific point. The committee, after having gone thoroughly and completely into the subject, was not of the opinion that that would be the proper location for an airport, but we did receive a sufficient amount of information to convince us that there was a dire need at this time for an adequate airport in the District of Columbia.

Your committee, therefore, rather than attempting to impose something on this House and pass a bill creating an airport at the expense either of the Government or the District, thought it would be better if a commission were created, non-salaried, for the purpose of more thoroughly and completely studying the situation in order to select an adequate and proper site. When this study has been made the commission will submit its report to the House and the House will have an opportunity to say whether the findings of the commission are proper or not. This commission will be composed of nine members, three members from the House, three members from the Senate, and three members appointed by the President. It will be one of their functions to determine whether or not this shall be a municipal airport, a national airport alone, or an airport constructed with funds from the District and from the Federal Government. The adoption of this conference report does not decide these questions.

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

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Is it not a fact that the report contains the statement that part of these funds are to be used for the purchase of land?

Mr. NICHOLS. The gentleman is correct; but he will remember that this provides only \$100,000. Of this, \$10,000 is to be expended for the employment of experts to help the commission make a proper selection, and the remainder of the money is to be used to purchase an option. I do not believe any Member thinks we can purchase and construct an airport for the District of Columbia for \$100,000. If Congress believes that the funds for this project should come 100 percent from the District of Columbia, then when the report of the commission finally is adopted the House can make this provision.

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

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. KVALE. The gentleman as one of the conferees then will make the positive statement on his responsibility as a conferee that this does not in any way obligate or bind this Congress or any succeeding Congress to purchase an airport at their own price.

Mr. NICHOLS. To purchase an airport at their own price?

Mr. KVALE. That is right. Certain demands were made in the past and I expect them to be made in the future. I want it made clear at this time that the conferees in this action did not pledge themselves to go ahead and yield to any demands which may be made upon them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I may say that the bill which is under consideration simply confers upon this commission the authority to select a site. That is all it does. The commission selects a site; then, of course, it is necessary for the commission to come back to the Congress in order to get the necessary money with which to purchase the site, and at that time the House will have every opportunity to say whether or not the judgment of the commission is sound.

Mr. EDMISTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. EDMISTON. If that is all this Commission is going to perform, what is the necessity for their having \$100,000?

Mr. NICHOLS. I just explained that. It is going to be necessary to employ appraisers, probably. There will be several sites—probably a dozen of them—submitted to the Commission. Those sites will have various values placed on them by the owners of the sites, and it will be necessary to have competent men to appraise the land, to advise the Commission what the actual value is, and to find out whether or not the owner of the site is placing a proper value on it. That will cost some money. You cannot get appraisers to go out and appraise property and work for nothing. Then there will be the necessity to have advice from other experts; for instance, aeronautical experts, who will advise the Commission whether the particular site that the Commission picks in the first place is a good one. It will be necessary for the Commission to know whether that site, after it is developed, is a proper site and whether it would make the proper kind of an airport that the Capital of the United States should have.

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. Is it not a fact that the purpose of the \$100,000 is really to get options on the property in order to protect the Commission against real-estate men who would promptly jump the price when they found out the purpose of the investigation?

Mr. NICHOLS. I thank the gentlewoman for calling that to my attention. That is exactly right.

May I state another purpose of the \$100,000? When the commission goes out and starts to looking for sites, if it becomes public knowledge that they are looking at a particular site or contemplating the purchase of a particular site, of course that site will immediately enhance in value. Therefore one of the reasons for putting this \$100,000 appropriation in here is to make it possible for the commission to quietly, and without having to come back to Congress and make a lot of noise about getting the money, investigate the matter and tie up the site with an option in order to hold it, so that it may be purchased at a certain figure if and when the Government decides it is a proper site. The commission may take an option on a half a dozen of them.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman speaks of the report carrying an appropriation. That is an inadvertent statement. It only authorizes.

Mr. NICHOLS. That is absolutely true. It is only an authorization.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I want to emphasize also that it will be the experience of this commission that if not a sufficient amount of money is given for options to be taken upon these properties and the personnel necessary to advising the commission with reference to these properties and to the actual needs, we will find ourselves laid open to every real-estate agent in Washington, who will come here with automobiles to carry the commission about looking at certain ground.

Mr. NICHOLS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. If this \$90,000 is used for option purposes and the commission comes to the Congress and the Congress does not approve after the money has been put up, is that \$90,000 lost?

Mr. NICHOLS. I do not know. It would depend on how you would put your option money up and what the terms of the agreement were.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. This is a commercial airport to be run by private parties?

Mr. NICHOLS. No.

Mr. LANHAM. Is it to be run by the Federal Government?

Mr. NICHOLS. It might be run by the Federal Government.

Mr. LANHAM. If it is to be run by the Federal Government, I think the Congress is entitled to know that. If it is not to be run by the Federal Government and is to be a private operation, why is there any more reason to have a congressional committee deciding where this private concern shall have its airport in Washington than in any other city? [Applause.]

Mr. NICHOLS. Certainly my friend from Texas does not think that the Federal Government is going to go out here and purchase some land for an airport, then turn it over to a corporation, individual, or partnership to be run for profit? That certainly is not going to happen.

Mr. LANHAM. I am not in favor of the Federal Government purchasing land for this purpose at all.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I think the House ought to know what it is doing in connection with this proposition. I do not think we should go ahead and spend a lot of money without clearly understanding the situation. I will tell you what this is all about. It provides for a commission to consider the proposition of an airport for the District of Columbia. It provides an authorization for an appropriation of \$100,000, 50 percent, or \$50,000, out of District funds and \$50,000 out of the Treasury of the United States, to be paid for by our folks back home.

Now, if we are going to have an airport for the District of Columbia, we ought to have it paid for out of District of Columbia funds and not out of the Treasury of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. The gentleman, of course, is familiar with the fact that the Federal Government and some of my people back home have paid millions and millions of dollars in a 100-percent grant to build airports in cities all over the United States under this administration.

Mr. TABER. Let them get a grant here then, rather than take money out of the Treasury from other funds.

Let me tell you another thing that this report does:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$100,000 to be charged, one-half to the moneys in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia and one-half to the moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, of which not to exceed \$10,000 shall be used for the purpose of employing appraisers and other assistants.

The District of Columbia has its own assessors, who know more about property here than anybody else around here, and they know more about its value; and \$90,000, or so much thereof as is necessary, is to be used by this Commission without any check on it for the purpose of purchasing land and buildings or for options on land and buildings.

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

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. When you take an option on property you put up money, and if you do not close that option you forfeit the money; is not that correct?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then, if this Commission takes options in the amount of \$90,000 and comes back here and puts this in the lap of the Congress, they will say, "Either do what we want you to do or your \$90,000 is gone." Is not that the fact?

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

I do not want to see the Congress of the United States put itself in this kind of position. I hope it will vote down this conference report and let this conference committee go back and bring in a bill that charges this entirely to the District revenues if it is going to be done, and also put in some proper safeguards so we will not have so much money in it for such things as options, and so it will not be possible to go to work and hire a lot of appraisers and other technicians when the District of Columbia has plenty of them on its pay roll now. [Applause.]

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

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Does not the gentleman from New York think that this is too much Government interference in private business?

Mr. TABER. Why, certainly, it is. [Applause.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I realize the temper of this House that we now face in the debate upon the conference report. I hesitate to rise and speak at this time knowing the time which has been spent on the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and now this further conference report brought here for our attention. I do so, however, to remind the membership of this House that for more than 10 years this Congress has been faced with the Washington airport problem.

We have had, as has been brought out by the gentleman from Texas, several committees that have studied this situation. We come to the Seventy-fourth Congress, and we find nothing done as yet upon a problem which is not only important, but which is tragic in its far-reaching importance, not only to the National Capital but to the Members of this body who represent the 48 States. You say that the Federal Government has no responsibility in this matter. It certainly has. There are at least 50 to 100 Members of this House who use the commercial airlines of this country coming into Washington and going from this city in the discharge of their business.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Does not the Federal Government and also individual Members of Congress pay for all the service they get from the local airport?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Absolutely, but let us remember that the other capitals of the world not only have their army and navy airports owned by the country in question but they own their commercial airports as well in the capitals of those nations.

We have had committee hearings on this subject in the District of Columbia Committee for month after month. The Senate has also wrestled with the problem. We were faced with this old trouble of doing nothing for the National Capital of this Republic in the way of an airport. I believe the membership of this House today should realize that we owe an obligation in this matter, and I appeal to the Members at this time that we not allow ourselves to go into

another session of Congress and do nothing now about a matter which is paramount.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. McFARLANE. In regard to what other countries have done that have airports in their capitals, if the gentleman is referring to Europe, practically everything in Europe is under government ownership. Does the gentleman have in mind any airport similarly situated where the Government has been Santa Claus to the cities? If so, let us hear about it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In this country today our Government is contributing in the State of Texas, in my own State of West Virginia, and in practically every State \$45 out of every \$100 being expended upon municipal airports under the Public Works Administration, and I wish to say further before I yield again that under Works Progress Administration funds the Federal contribution runs 10 to 1 in many cases where Federal and local funds are being used, and that the talk of \$75,000 or \$100,000 meeting the needs in the purchase of an airport in the District of Columbia is folly. The airports of this Nation that have been created, we realize, cost many times this amount; in fact, the testimony shows they cost anywhere from \$2,000,000 to \$10,000,000.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. I stated in my remarks that the city of Washington had just as much right through P. W. A. and W. P. A. to get grants as any other city, but the city of Washington has no more right from the standpoint of Government subsidies in the running of an airport than any other city.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I want to say that I can realize the reasoning and thinking of the gentleman from Texas, but we say there are certain obligations on Members of Congress. We are faced for the first time in 10 years with something specific. Let us see about this matter of P. W. A. or W. P. A. help.

Mr. NICHOLS. Will the gentleman from West Virginia yield to me for a statement?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, with reference to W. P. A. money, I want to say at the outset of this Congress, Mr. Johnson, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, sent a letter to the membership of the House, or the District Committee, wherein he suggested that if the Members of Congress or the Members of the House would say it was agreeable to them the Department of Commerce would attempt to get the funds and develop an airport in the city of Washington. Your committee of the House immediately answered and said it was agreeable to us and the House of Representatives.

Mr. LANHAM. What committee?

Mr. NICHOLS. The Committee on the District of Columbia. We told him it was agreeable to us, and if that could be done we would stop the legislation now in conference.

That same communication was sent to another body, and the Committee on the District of Columbia of that body immediately told the Assistant Secretary of Commerce to keep its hands off; that they would not permit the Assistant Secretary of Commerce to use any of the W. P. A. funds for that purpose and did not want them meddling in the matter.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. This conference report says not to exceed \$10,000 is to be used for employing appraisers and other assistants, and \$90,000, or so much thereof as is necessary, for the purchase of lands and buildings or for negotiation of options to purchase land or land and buildings. What would be the situation confronting Congress if they used the \$90,000 for that purpose and Congress did not desire to buy the land—thought it was a higher price than they ought to pay?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I want to say in answer to the gentleman that I am not in agreement with everything that the committee of conference has done. Perhaps I am not answer-

ing directly, but this commission that is to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, because it knows the temper of the House and the Senate, will keep within bounds in the purchase of a site.

Mr. SNELL. But to me you have a pig in a poke. If these people go out and get options on a million dollars' worth of land and put up \$90,000, we are going to lose the whole \$90,000 or take the land. Is not that so?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I can well understand why the gentleman makes the observation he does. Let me again remind him, we have here Senator KING, Senator TYDINGS, Senator AUSTIN, and as Members of the House we have the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PALMISANO], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I feel certain this House can place a high degree of confidence in these men, and the three to be appointed by the President, to do their duty, and I think we could trust their good judgment and follow that committee, and bring to a head the tragic situation, as I have repeated, and show not only to the National Capital, but to America, that we as Members of the House and the Senate realize our responsibility in respect to this question. That is the best that I can do.

Mr. SNELL. I am not saying anything against the intelligence, the character, or the ability of the Members of Congress mentioned, but I still desire to have something a little more definite, considering my experience in the past, before agreeing to these indefinite authorizations and indefinite appropriations.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I can well understand the gentleman's observation.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman speaks about confidence we have in these six Members of the House and the Senate, but what confidence are the people back home going to have in us pretty soon if we do not stop these expenditures; and another thing, where are you going to get the money?

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to myself. I call the attention of Members to the fact that a bill passed in the first session of this Congress permitting an appropriation for an airport of \$2,500,000 of District funds. It finally got to the other side of the Capitol, and there were objections, so far as the naming of a committee. We were in a hopeless deadlock. Finally the conferees met, and the purpose was to come to some sort of an agreement, because of conditions in respect to an airport here in the District. The matter of \$100,000 was due to a former Member of the Senate, former Senator Bingham. It was called to the attention of the conferees that Senator Bingham had made a private survey when he was investigating to report to the Senate on an airport for the District, in order to prevent real-estate manipulators from knowing what was doing and to keep the prices down. That accounts for the suggestion of \$100,000. You see now what will happen if the House does not accept the commission's report. As I understand it, it will permit the commission to obtain three or four or five different options on land, either one of them having a sufficient amount for an airport, and in that way this House and the Senate would naturally adopt one or the other if it came here, after we reported back to the President. The gentleman says if you do not adopt any, what then? Of course, if you are not going to consider any airport for the District, then I say get out altogether and do not consider any future legislation.

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

Mr. PALMISANO. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. From the information that has come to the committee so far, how much does the gentleman think is involved in preparing a proper airport here?

Mr. PALMISANO. The gentleman means purchasing the land?

Mr. SNELL. Yes; whatever it is intended to do under this bill. How much is involved?

Mr. PALMISANO. I am not familiar with the cost, except that I might say the House has considered two and a half million dollars by the bill that passed the House.

Mr. SNELL. If we are going to get into a two-and-a-half-million-dollar proposition or anything in that vicinity, I for one want to know something a little more definite before I vote for this authorization.

Mr. PALMISANO. I suppose the gentleman wants to know with reference to the Government money?

Mr. SNELL. I want to know about the whole proposition. Mr. PALMISANO. The \$50,000 that was placed here from the Government did not entirely meet with my approval. I more or less wanted it charged to the District. But a question arose in the conference whether or not it would be a District airport or a Government airport, and it means that the Government, if it happens to be a District airport, and I feel that it ought to be a District airport, would perhaps donate \$50,000 as against an expenditure on the part of the District of Columbia of two and a half million dollars. On the other hand, in the event the commission's report would come back here saying it should be a Government airport, then the District would lose \$50,000. We do not expect to come back here and ask this House to appropriate money on a 50-50 basis for an airport for the District of Columbia. We expect the commission to come back here and say it will be a District airport or it will be a Government airport, and ask for an appropriation from the appropriate fund.

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

Mr. PALMISANO. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I desire to say to the membership of the House that I believe the rank and file of the residents of the District do not use the airport for travel or for business, but hundreds of Government officials do use the airport here each week and thousands of them use it in the course of a year. Thousands of our constituents come here yearly by plane to do business with departments of the Federal Government. If this country were engaged in conflict with another nation, the municipal airport of the District of Columbia would be turned over to the Federal authorities in the emergency. Let us not quibble here at a question of motive for a real national municipal airport with possibilities not only for the District but for the Nation at large.

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I should like to ask the gentleman from Maryland, if this bill provides for the mere reporting back to Congress, without any power to take final action in the selection of a site, then why do you call for an authorization, with authority to actually purchase property?

Mr. PALMISANO. That was for the purpose of preventing real-estate manipulators raising the price on whatever site might be obtained for a District airport.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is all right as far as the options are concerned, but why does this commission want to purchase property for that airport until the Congress finally authorizes it?

Mr. NICHOLS. Will the gentleman yield to me to answer the gentleman?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I just want to get that information.

Mr. PALMISANO. The purpose of it is to obtain options.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; but you say "purchase."

Mr. PALMISANO. Well, they might purchase. In a sense, an option is more or less of a purchase.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; it is not a purchase. Does the gentleman think they ought to have authority to purchase land which Congress has never authorized you to purchase?

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I think we are all agreed that Washington ought to have an airport. The indisputable fact is that Washington does not have an airport. Back as far as 1929 agitation began for an airport for the Nation's Capital. Senator Bingham, of Connecticut, did a lot of work on the subject.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, let me finish.

Mr. McFARLANE. I wanted to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not even started yet.

Senator Bingham went so far as to get options on available airport sites for as low as \$30 an acre. You could not beat that, as a matter of fact, but the whole business went into the discard, and today we are precisely where we were in 1929. They have a makeshift airport over on the other side of the Potomac. They say it is dangerous. They say it is foggy. I agree. It is a dangerous place. The Nation's Capital ought to have a proper kind of airport. We have heard a great deal about it. Shall we go ahead and develop the Washington-Hoover Airport? Shall we develop a new airport down at Gravelly Point? Those matters have all been presented at length before a subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia in the House, and they have been presented on the Senate side. We could not come to any definite conclusion because it seemed that a lot of people had their oar in the water. We could not get any results as to what kind of a commission ought to be established in order to inquire into this airport matter. We were afraid that some of the members of the Department of Commerce might have some bias. We were afraid that perhaps some members of air lines would be prejudiced. So, after sitting in a huddle for a while, the conferees came to the conclusion that the best kind of a commission would be one consisting of three Members of the House, three Members of the Senate, and three independent members to be appointed by the President. That is what this conference report provides. It provides \$100,000, equally divided between the District and the Federal Governments for this purpose, not to exceed \$10,000 of which may be used for expenses, including obtaining the services of experts, and not to exceed \$90,000 for the purpose of taking options.

Now, somebody might kick about that \$90,000. I believe it is a very vital and material element in this bill. If we went over on the other side of the river and tried to procure an airport, it would cost \$1,000 an acre. If this commission, in its dispassionate way, can quietly work out a proposition and take options on airports, we will get a site for perhaps \$30 or \$35 an acre. It is the only way to work. If the commission must disclose its hand, you know very well that all available space will go up in price overnight. That is the reason for the \$90,000 in this bill. It is the only feasible proposition I know of by which we can guarantee to the city of Washington a real airport at a price that will not be exorbitant and will involve no exorbitant profits to a lot of land speculators.

That is the sum and substance of this bill. The whole thing is predicated upon this House reposing some confidence in those who will be members of this commission. That is the very foundation of the bill. If they have no confidence in the Members of this House who are to represent this House on that commission, then, of course, there is nothing to be done about it. If, however, you feel that three Senators, three Members of the House of Representatives, and three members appointed by the President can go out and make a deal without having the thing plugged in the newspapers and headlined so that land speculators can take advantage of whatever findings and investigation the commission makes, then I say you ought to vote for this report, because it will give Washington an airport site at a rock-bottom price. That is the sum and substance of it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would be interested if the gentleman from Illinois would answer the question I asked the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PALMISANO], namely, if you are merely going to get options and report back to this House and let this House confirm what you do, why do you give yourself authority to do something irrevocable in the way of the purchase of an airport?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman cite the language?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The language of the bill is:

Ninety thousand dollars or so much thereof as may be necessary shall be used for the purchase of land and buildings or for the negotiation of options to purchase land or land and buildings.

Now will the gentleman answer my question?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The language of such a resolution has to be rather flexible. The gentleman must remember that we have our own constituencies to look after, that we will be back and forth; for the limited time which members of the commission can devote to this matter they should be permitted to consummate a deal if it can be done; and when we are working here trying to do something for Washington in the matter of an airport, there must be some flexibility. I submit that without this flexibility we will not have an airport even 5 years from now.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I will answer the gentleman's question. If it is possible to purchase an airport site of sufficient size and adequacy for the District of Columbia for \$90,000, it had better be done when the opportunity presents itself, for the chances are that otherwise you would not get started for \$90,000.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; they will not get started for less than \$5,000,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a brief statement with reference to this controversy. I think this is an exceedingly important matter. The question of an airport for the District of Columbia or in the District of Columbia has been discussed pro and con here in Congress for a number of years. It is a subject in which the people of this community are deeply interested.

This conference report is called up this afternoon rather unexpectedly. There seems to be considerable difference of opinion with reference to the proposals contained in the conference report, and differences as to the proper interpretation of the report.

With the permission of the chairman of the House conferees, I am going to submit a unanimous-consent request, Mr. Speaker, and I hope there will be no objection to it on either side. I do not think this conference report ought, under the circumstances I have stated, to be subjected this afternoon to the possibility of being defeated, because it is a matter of very grave importance to the people of the community. I do not know how the House will vote on it. It might vote it up; it might vote it down.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to agree to the conference report may be withdrawn in order that the conferees, in view of the objections that have been raised this afternoon, in view of the differences of opinion and of interpretation, may have another opportunity to consider this matter and bring it back for further consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the motion to consider the conference report be withdrawn.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object if the majority leader insists upon it, but, in my opinion, this matter ought to be voted down right now, and I think it will be voted down right now.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know what the House will do about this matter; I am no clairvoyant. I hope the gentleman from Washington will not object.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois said we would have confidence in the members of this commission. Why expose them to temptation and tampering? [Laughter.]

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

There was no objection.

BOY SCOUT JAMBOREE, 1937

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following request from the Senate:

The Clerk read as follows:

FEBRUARY 24 (calendar day, MAR. 5), 1936.

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House to return to the Senate the bill (S. 3586) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Treasury to lend Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and other needed equipment for use at the National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America; and to authorize the use of property in the District of Columbia and its environs by the Boy Scouts of America at their national jamboree to be held during the summer of 1937."

Attest:

E. A. HALSEY, Secretary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN, Mr. LANHAM, and Mr. PIERCE asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the majority leader if he can give us the tentative program for the first part of next week?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the minority leader that, as far as it has been arranged and as far as we can now anticipate, we will take up District of Columbia business on Monday. I understand the Committee on the District of Columbia has a bill that may take some little time. On Tuesday we expect to take up the legislative appropriation bill. There has been no program worked out further than that.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state which appropriation bill will be taken up next?

Mr. BANKHEAD. We expect to bring up the legislative appropriation bill on Tuesday, as I stated.

Mr. RICH. I hope the majority leader will try to keep these appropriations down, so we can meet these enormous expenses of government.

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

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the majority leader if there is in contemplation any arrangement to take up the omnibus bills before the third Tuesday of this month?

Mr. BANKHEAD. If we can find an opportunity to do so, I hope we can, but no arrangement has been made as yet. I want to say to the gentleman that, as far as I am concerned, our policy with reference to the program has been to try to get these appropriation bills passed as soon as possible and get them out of the way. This will give us an opportunity, I think, to devote some extra time to the consideration of the private and omnibus bills.

Mr. BIERMANN. I want to remind the majority leader that we have not had up for consideration at this session the omnibus bills, and if the matter is delayed until toward the end of the session we may pass these bills and the Senate not have time to act.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I may say to the gentleman that when their turn comes I shall insist that they be considered at that time.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, why should the omnibus bills come up when the President of the United States vetoes every one that is sent down to him?

Mr. BIERMANN. Take that question up with the President.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. He has been vetoing them right along. I think the gentleman is an optimist.

Mr. BIERMANN. I thank the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BEITER (at the request of Mr. MEAD), for 1 week, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, March 9, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. MASSINGALE: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 7806. A bill to extend the public-land laws of the United States to certain lands, consisting of islands, situated in the Red River in Oklahoma; without amendment (Rept. No. 2141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALMISANO: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2953. An act to provide for the inspection, control, and regulation of steam boilers and unfired pressure vessels in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. 2142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 5336. A bill for the relief of George D. Johnson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DARDEN: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 2682. An act for the relief of Chief Carpenter William F. Twitchell, United States Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 2140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11519) for the relief of Joseph Noel Roberts, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAAS: A bill (H. R. 11657) to abolish the office of certain postmasters and create the office of post-office administrator, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PIERCE: A bill (H. R. 11658) to authorize completion, maintenance, and operation of certain facilities for navigation on the Columbia River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DITTER: A bill (H. R. 11659) authorizing the improvement of the Schuylkill River in Pennsylvania for flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 11660) declaring Bayou St. John at and above the Esplanade Avenue Bridge, New Orleans, La., a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 11661) providing for Federal service medals of honor to Government employees for distinguished service; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 11662) to regulate the transportation and sale of natural gas in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11663) to require reports of receipts and disbursements of certain contributions, to require the registration of persons engaged in attempting to influence legislation, to prescribe punishments for violation of this act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 11664) to increase the processing tax on certain oils, to impose a tax upon imported soybean oil, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEAD (by request): A bill (H. R. 11665) to give the consent of the United States to the taxation by the State of New York and its subdivisions of certain lands and structures in the city of Buffalo, State of New York, purchased and under construction by the United States as and for a housing development; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. THOMASON. A bill (H. R. 11666) authorizing an exchange of Federal property for property situated in and owned by the city of El Paso, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MEAD (by request): A bill (H. R. 11667) to give the consent of the United States to the taxation by the several States and their subdivisions of property situated therein and used for other than a usual, necessary, and continuing function of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McLEOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 513) requesting the President of the United States to reinstate Maj. Gen. Johnson Hagood to active duty and assignment to the command of the Eighth Corps Area; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 514) authorizing the completion of certain records and operations resulting from the administration of the Kerr Tobacco Act, the Bankhead Act of 1934, and the Potato Act of 1935 (repealed), and making funds available for those and other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 45) authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the completion of the Norris Dam; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BLANTON: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 45) authorizing the Committee on Appropriations of the House to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held during the current session on the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1937; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASEY: A bill (H. R. 11668) to credit the account of Everett P. Sheridan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COCHRAN: A bill (H. R. 11669) granting a pension to Annie Callahan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOCKWEILER: A bill (H. R. 11670) for the relief of Max Natenson; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11671) for the relief of Edward Martin Howard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GEHRMANN: A bill (H. R. 11672) granting a pension to Charlie J. Dupree; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11673) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Gibbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LARRABEE: A bill (H. R. 11674) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Jarrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 11675) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Chester A. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11676) for the relief of Herbert McCosh DeWitt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 11677) granting an increase of pension to Frances Margaret Small; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'NEAL: A bill (H. R. 11678) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John W. Hubbard; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11679) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of William E. Steen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WITHROW: A bill (H. R. 11680) granting an increase of pension to Nettie S. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10396. By Mr. BIERMANN: Memorial of Charles W. Greenley, of radio station KGCA, of Decorah, Iowa, referring to copyright legislation now before Congress; to the Committee on Patents.

10397. By Mr. KENNEY: Petition of the Parent-Teacher Association of Bank Street School, Bridgeton, N. J., endorsing bill 3012 and petitioning it to be brought before the House of Representatives for a hearing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10398. Also, petition of the Parent-Teacher Association of School No. 8 endorsing the Pettengill bill (H. R. 6472) and petitioning it to be brought before the House of Representatives for a hearing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10399. Also, petition of the Parent-Teacher Association of Bank Street School, Bridgeton, N. J., endorsing the Pettengill bill (H. R. 6472) and petitioning it to be brought before the House of Representatives for a hearing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10400. Also, petition of the Parent-Teacher Association of School No. 8 endorsing the Federal food and drug bill (S. 5) and petitioning it to be brought before the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10401. Also, petition of the High School Parent-Teacher Association of Hillside, N. J., endorsing the Federal food and drug bill (COPELAND, S. 5) and petitioning it to be brought before the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10402. Also, petition of the High School Parent-Teacher Association of Hillside, N. J., endorsing the Pettengill bill (H. R. 6472) and petitioning it to be brought before the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10403. By Mr. MERRITT of New York: Resolution of the Lehigh Valley Railroad Veterans' Association, endorsing the Pettengill bill (H. R. 3263) and calling upon not only its members but also officials of railways, members of chambers of commerce, stockholders, insurance companies, bank depositors, etc., to combine in an effort to secure the passage of this bill in order to provide equality treatment for the transportation systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10404. Also, protest signed by 237 residents of the city of Ithaca, N. Y., against the program for building the Navy up to treaty strength, since that program is far in excess of our needs for the defense of American territory, and it is believed that the only principle of our naval policy should be the defense of American territory from attack; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

10405. Also, resolution adopted by the Lehigh Valley Railroad Veterans' Association urging the passage of the Wheeler bill (S. 1632), providing for regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission of carriers by water for hire in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10406. Also, resolution of the Astoria Democratic Club, Inc., Astoria, N. Y., advocating (1) that there be 100 percent American crews on ships flying the American flag and who enjoy an indirect or direct subsidy; (2) that the steamship *Leviathan* be used as a school ship and remain at its present mooring to train and certify citizens for service aboard passenger ships, the purpose of this being to eliminate the plausible excuse which shipowners and agents employ, and give men and women certificates of proof that they are qualified as barbers, mess boys, stewards, waiters, pursers, water tenders, wipers, firemen, wireless operators, receiving clerks, delivery clerks, dock boss, supervisors, or any branch of the service—compliance with this ordinance would mean the elimination of alien crews; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

10407. Also, resolution adopted by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, that the President and Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to enact House Joint Resolution No. 143, awarding the Distinguished Service Medals to Tony Siminoff, Oliver F. Rominger, and Robert E. Beck, veterans of the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

10408. By Mr. RISK: Joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, requesting the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Rhode Island to oppose the enactment of any legislation by Congress designed to prevent veterans of the World War from remaining on Federal or State relief rolls if and when they shall receive a bonus under the provisions of House bill 9870, entitled "An act to provide for the immediate payment of World War adjusted-service certificates, for the cancellation of unpaid interest accrued on loans secured by such certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10409. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the National Peace Conference; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10410. Also, petition of the Wake County (N. C.) Bar Association; to the Committee on the Library.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1936

(Legislative day of Monday, Feb. 24, 1936)

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, March 5, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that the House had impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors Halsted L. Ritter, United States district judge for the southern district of Florida, and that the House had adopted articles of impeachment against said Halsted L. Ritter, judge as aforesaid, which the managers on the part of the House have been directed to carry to the Senate, and that HATTON W. SUMNERS, RANDOLPH PERKINS, and SAM HOBBS, Members of the House, have been appointed such managers.

The message also returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 3586) to authorize the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Treasury to lend Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and other needed equipment for use at the National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America; and to authorize the use of property in the District of Columbia and its environs by the Boy Scouts of America at their National Jamboree to be held during the summer of 1937.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8886) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration

of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the founding of the capital of South Carolina at Columbia, S. C.

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

H. R. 11323. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the first settlement on Long Island, N. Y.; and

H. R. 11581. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 2219. An act for the relief of D. A. Neuman;

S. 2875. An act for the relief of J. A. Jones;

H. R. 8886. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the founding of the capital of South Carolina at Columbia, S. C.; and

H. R. 10265. An act to authorize the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Treasury to lend Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and other needed equipment for use at the National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America; and to authorize the use of property in the District of Columbia and its environs by the Boy Scouts of America at their National Jamboree to be held during the summer of 1937.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. I note the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Connally	Johnson	Pope
Ashurst	Coolidge	Keyes	Radcliffe
Austin	Copeland	King	Reynolds
Bachman	Costigan	La Follette	Robinson
Bailey	Couzens	Lewis	Russell
Barbour	Davis	Logan	Schwollenbach
Barkley	Dickinson	Loneragan	Sheppard
Benson	Dieterich	McAdoo	Shipstead
Bilbo	Donahay	McGill	Smith
Black	Duffy	McKellar	Steiwer
Bone	Fletcher	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Frazier	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Bulkley	George	Minton	Townsend
Bulow	Gibson	Murphy	Trammell
Burke	Glass	Murray	Truman
Byrnes	Gore	Neely	Tydings
Capper	Guffey	Norbeck	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hale	Norris	Van Nuys
Carey	Harrison	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Chavez	Hatch	Overton	Wheeler
Clark	Hayden	Pittman	White

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is absent because of illness, and that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mrs. LONG], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] is unavoidably detained. I ask to have this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF] is necessarily absent.

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

NON-FEDERAL PROJECTS IN PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION (S. DOC. NO. 183)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 234 (submitted by Mr. HAYDEN, and agreed to Feb. 12, 1936), a list of