to designate Armistice Day as a holiday; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2756. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 24 of the Department of State of the State of California, relative to memorializing the President and Congress to enact legislation relative to the conscription of wealth and industry in wartime and the effective barring of war profits; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2757. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 6 of the Department of State of the State of California, relative to memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to enact legislation that would result in financial aid in the construction of a neuropsychopathic hospital for veterans of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2758. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 51 of the Department of State of the State of California, relative to memorializing the President and Congress to take such steps as may be necessary to cut a channel through the southerly end of the Coronado Silver Strand to allow seagoing vessels to enter the bay of San Diego at its southerly end; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2759. Also, petition of the California Federation of Women's Clubs, protesting against any change in the United States Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2760. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 52 of the Department of State of the State of California, relative to Federal aid to State or Territorial veterans' homes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2761. Also, petition of the California Veterans' Committee, protesting against any change in the United States Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2762. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 26 of the Department of State of the State of California, urging that Congress and the Federal Relief Administration direct their consideration to the wages of employees on work-relief projects; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2763. Also, petition of the California Federation of Women's Clubs, recommending that Congress change the naturalization law to the end that an alien be allowed to take out first papers once only if he does not pursue his case; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2764. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 14 of the Department of State of the State of California, relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact House bill 4009, which proposes to appropriate $50,000,000 to cooperate with the States of the United States in the eradication of noxious weeds, and urging the Secretary of Agriculture to expedite consideration favorable to said bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2765. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 26 of the Department of State of the State of California, relative to memorializing the President of the United States and the Members of Congress to extend the life of the Federal Public Works Administration for a period of 2 years after next June 30, and further memorializing Congress to earmark the sum of $350,000,000 of the pending farm relief appropriation for a continuance of loans and grants under Public Works Administration to local communities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2766. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 18 of the Department of State of the State of California, relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act so as to enable such States as may desire to do so to bring the employees of such State and the employees of its counties, cities, and other political subdivisions within the provisions of such act relating to old-age benefits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2767. By Mr. KENNEY: Petition of the New Jersey Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., urging the speedy repeal of section 213 of the National Economy Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2768. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Retail Tobacco Dealers of America, Inc., New York, concerning the Peterson bill (H. R. 6791), which proposes to amend paragraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2769. Also, petition of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Black-Connery wages-and-hours bill (S. 2475 and H. R. 7200); to the Committee on Labor.

2770. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, relative to memorializing the President and Congress to enact legislation relative to the conscription of wealth and industry in wartime and the effective barring of war profits; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2771. Also, resolution of the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, relative to memorializing the President and Congress to take such steps as may be necessary to cut a channel through the southerly end of the Coronado Silver Strand to allow seagoing vessels to enter the bay of San Diego at its southerly end; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2772. By Mr. LANZETTA: Resolution adopted by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment of the City of New York on June 18, 1937, approving and urging passage of House bill 6841, to extend the time for filing claims for refunds under section 15 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2773. By Mr. O'NEAL of Kentucky: Petition of citizens of Jefferson County, Ky., in behalf of House bill 2257; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2774. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Melrose Slipper Co., Inc., Little Falls, N. Y., concerning the proposed reciprocal trade agreement with Czechoslovakia; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2775. Also, petition of the Retail Tobacco Dealers of America, Inc., New York, concerning House bill 6791, to amend paragraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2776. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the third annual department encampment at Anniston, Ala.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 28, 1937

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 15, 1937)

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, June 24, 1937, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

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

On June 18, 1937:

S. 1112. An act awarding a Navy Cross to John W. Thomason and Robert Slover.

On June 19, 1937:

S. 665. An act for the relief of the estate of Everett P. Sheridan.

On June 24, 1937:

S. 102. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Antietam; and

S. 187. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. At the suggestion of the leader, I note the absence of a quorum and ask for a roll call.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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

Adams	Connally	Lee	Robinson
Andrews	Copeland	Lewis	Russell
Ashurst	Davis	Lodge	Schwartz
Austin	Dieterich	Logan	Schwellenbach
Bailey	Donahey	Lonergan	Sheppard
Bankhead	Ellender	Lundeen	Shipstead
Barkley	Frazier	McAdoo	Smathers
Berry	George	McCarran	Steiwer
Bilbo	Gerry	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Black	Glass	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Bone	Green	McNary	Townsend
Borah	Guffey	Minton	Truman
Bridges	Hale	Murray	Tydings
Bulkley	Harrison	Neely	Vandenberg
Bulow	Hatch	Nye	Van Nuys
Burke	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Byrd	Hitchcock	Overton	Walsh
Byrnes	Holt	Pepper	Wheeler
Capper	Hughes	Pittman	White
Caraway	Johnson, Colo.	Pope	
Chavez	King	Radcliffe	
Clark	La Follette	Reynolds	

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. DUFFY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are detained from the Senate on important public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING] is absent, having been called back to his State on important official matters.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

REPORT FILED BY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS DURING THE RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 24th instant, Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6958) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and for other purposes, reported it on the 26th instant with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 817) thereon.

AMENDMENT OF ADJUSTED COMPENSATION PAYMENT ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936, to provide for the escheat to the United States of certain amounts, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTION OF MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a resolution adopted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, Virgin Islands, for the purchase by E. Beresford Cancryn of a certain strip of land belonging to the municipality of St. Thomas and St. John, west of property no. 17, Murphy Gade, Queens Quarter, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

TRANSFER OF UNUSED LIGHTHOUSE SITES ON ISLAND OF MAUI, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to transfer two unused lighthouse sites in Kahului town site, island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, in exchange for two plots of land located in the same town site and now occupied for lighthouse purposes under permission from the respective owners, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

RELIEF OF VIRGIL D. ALDEN AND OTHERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Assistant Administrator of the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Virgil D. Alden and others in connection with their transfer of headquarters, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

Senate joint resolution relative to memoralizing the President and the Congress of the United States to protect the rights of the State of California to its tidelands and the coastal area lying seaward of the State of California

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress of the United States and in the Senate thereof by the Honorable Senator NYE, S. 2164, which bill declares land under the territorial waters of continental United States to be a part of the public domain, and for other purposes; and

Whereas said bill provides that all submerged lands are declared to be a portion of the public domain and are withdrawn from settlement, location, sale, entry, occupation, encroachment, or acquisition; and

Whereas the bill further provides that wherever the submerged lands shall be found to contain oil or petroleum deposits they shall be reserved to and included in a naval reserve; and

Whereas the State of California, since its admission to the Union in 1850, has had as its westerly boundary the Pacific Ocean and has, during all of those years succeeding 1850, exercised ownership, dominion, jurisdiction, and control over the seacoast lying on the westerly side of the State of California, including the tide and submerged lands; and

Whereas the State of California has at various times granted to cities and counties and to port boards of commissioners jurisdiction over certain tide and submerged lands of the State of California, and said cities and counties and port boards have spent many millions of dollars in the occupation, control, management, improvement, and preservation and defense of the seacoast and tide and submerged lands of the State of California; and

Whereas the State of California, as a body politic, has spent a great deal of money belonging to its citizens in the protection of the seacoast and the acquisition and purchase of many strips of land along the seacoast and has established thereon parks and playgrounds for the benefit not only of the people of the State but of the multitude of visitors and tourists who annually enter the borders of the State of California and frequent its seashore; and

Whereas by virtue of the development of said seacoast and the tide and submerged lands, many businesses, occupations, and trades are conducted and practiced and engaged in along said shore line, under lease, option, or agreement with the State of California, and great industrial plants depending upon products as produced from said tide and submerged lands of the State have become a portion and part of the business life of the seacoast of California; and

Whereas said businesses as conducted, both on shore as a result of the products produced from the tide and submerged lands and the product itself as produced from the same, do make up and form a large taxable portion of the tax-bearing burden of the respective counties facing on the tidal section of the State of California; and

Whereas there exists offshore and in the tide and submerged lands of the State of California various places where deposits of mineral and oil and gas are known to exist and other places where they may exist, and some of which are now being developed to the benefit of the State of California and to the citizens of this State, and are contributing largely to the support of various portions of the State and providing to the respective counties and cities in the immediate vicinity an asset for the purpose of local taxation and improvement of conditions in the respective localities; and

Whereas the adoption of S. 2164 would cast a cloud upon the right, title, and interest of the State of California in and to its tide and submerged lands and prevent private capital or public institutions or corporations from expending money or developing the tideland or submerged area of the State of California and discourage commerce and navigation and industry from investing money or expending effort in the development of the same; and

Whereas there have been developed many great harbors on the coast, one at San Francisco by the State of California, one at Los Angeles by the city of Los Angeles, one in Oakland by the board of port commissioners of Oakland, and many others up and down the coast line of the State, the title to which property would be clouded by the passage of said bill: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That this Legislature of the State of California in regular session assembled, urgently petitions and requests that S. 2164 be defeated; and be it further

Resolved, That the Governor be and is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Vice President thereof, to each Senator and Representative in Congress of the State of California, to Hon. Senator NYE, and to the respective members of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by members of the Farmers Union at Sheyenne, N. Dak., protesting against the enactment of the

bill (S. 25) to prevent profiteering in time of war and to equalize the burdens of war and thus provide for the national defense, and promote peace, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate the memorial of (Mrs.) Cecil Sloane, of Brooklyn, N. Y., remonstrating against the ratification of the "additional protocol between American Republics relative to nonintervention", negotiated at the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, held at Buenos Aires, December 1–23, 1936, particularly in regard to its application to Peru, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Washington County Unit Farmers Union of Oregon, assembled at Hillsboro, Oreg., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the submission of a proposed declaration of war to a referendum of the people, except in case of invasion, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from J. L. Smith, Jr., of Circleville, Ohio, praying for the construction and completion of flood-control projects on the Scioto and Sandusky Rivers, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the San Francisco (Calif.) Save W. P. A. Committee, favoring the carrying out of the W. P. A. program without cuts in the personnel, and also the making of additional appropriation for the W. P. A. when present appropriations are exhausted, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for the abolition of the Federal Reserve System as at present constituted, and also praying that Congress exercise its constitutional right to coin money and regulate the value thereof, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2482) to provide for the assignment of officers of the Navy for duty under the Department of Commerce and appointment to positions therein, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 819) thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 137) granting the consent of Congress to the minimum-wage compact ratified by the Legislatures of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 820) thereon.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to which was referred the bill (S. 2403) to prohibit the transportation of certain persons in interstate or foreign commerce during labor controversies, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 821) thereon.

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6496) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, or the counties of Roosevelt, Richland, and McCone, singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River, at or near Poplar, Mont., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 822) thereon.

Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 2381) to amend the Criminal Code by providing punishment for impersonation of officers and employees of Government-owned and Government-controlled corporations, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 823) thereon.

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 2387) to authorize certain officers and employees of Federal penal and correctional institutions to administer oaths, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 824) thereon.

Mr. GUFFEY, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6737) to amend the stamp provisions of the Bottling in Bond Act, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 825) thereon.

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 2386) to give precedence to certain proceedings to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 826) thereon.

Mr. NEELY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6208) to amend an act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia", approved June 22, 1936, by changing the times provided therein for holding the United States district court at various places now fixed by law in the State of West Virginia, reported it without amendment.

TAXES TO EFFECTUATE RAILROAD EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. CLARK. I ask unanimous consent to report favorably from the Committee on Finance, without amendment, House bill 7589, and to submit a report (No. 818) thereon. I propose to ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received.

Mr. CLARK. I may say, Mr. President, that this is a companion bill to the railroad employees' pension bill which passed the House and the Senate and was signed by the President last week. The bill for the consideration of which I now ask unanimous consent provides for the taxes to effectuate the act referred to. In view of the importance of the matter, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may the title of the bill be read? I did not hear the first remarks of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK. May I explain again to the Senator from Oregon that this is a companion bill to the railroad employees' pension bill passed by both Houses of Congress last week. This is the bill providing taxes to effectuate the purposes of that act, and, in view of the early approach of the 1st of July and the fact that a great many accounting matters will naturally take up the time to the 1st of July, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. I should not want to grant permission at this time. Let the bill go over until after the call of the calendar, and I will look into it in the meantime.

Mr. ROBINSON. May I ask if the bill has passed the House?

Mr. CLARK. It has passed the House and been reported to the Senate without amendment from the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. McNARY subsequently said: Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Missouri that I have discussed with several Republican members of the Finance Committee the proposal made by him, and have no objection to the immediate consideration of the bill which he desires to have considered.

Mr. CLARK. Then, Mr. President, I renew my request for unanimous consent that the Senate consider House bill 7589 at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 7589) to levy an excise tax upon carriers and certain other employers and an income tax upon their employees, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. That as used in this act—

(a) The term "employer" means any carrier (as defined in subsection (i) of this section), and any company which is directly or indirectly owned or controlled by one or more such carriers or under common control therewith, and which operates any equipment or facility or performs any service (except trucking service, casual service, and the casual operation of equipment or facilities) in connection with the transportation of passengers or property by railroad, or the receipt, delivery, elevation, transfer in transit, refrigeration or icing, storage, or handling of property transported

by railroad, and any receiver, trustee, or other individual or body, judicial or otherwise, when in the possession of the property or operating all or any part of the business of any such employer: *Provided, however,* That the term "employer" shall not include any street, interurban, or suburban electric railway, unless such railway is operating as a part of a general steam-railroad system of transportation, but shall not exclude any part of the general steam-railroad system of transportation now or hereafter operated by any other motive power. The Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby authorized and directed upon request of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, or upon complaint of any party interested, to determine after hearing whether any line operated by electric power falls within the terms of this proviso. The term "employer" shall also include railroad associations, traffic associations, tariff bureaus, demurrage bureaus, weighing and inspection bureaus, collection agencies and other associations, bureaus, agencies, or organizations controlled and maintained wholly or principally by two or more employers as hereinbefore defined and engaged in the performance of services in connection with or incidental to railroad transportation; and railway labor organizations, national in scope, which have been or may be organized in accordance with the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended, and their State and National legislative committees and their general committees and their insurance departments and their local lodges and divisions, established pursuant to the constitution and bylaws of such organizations.

(b) The term "employee" means any person in the service of one or more employers for compensation: *Provided, however,* That the term "employee" shall include an employee of a local lodge or division defined as an employer in subsection (a) only if he was in the service of or in the employment relation to a carrier on or after August 29, 1935. An individual is in the employment relation to a carrier if he is on furlough, subject to call for service within or outside the United States and ready and willing to serve, or on leave of absence, or absent on account of sickness or disability; all in accordance with the established rules and practices in effect on the carrier: *Provided further,* That an individual shall not be deemed to have been on August 29, 1935, in the employment relation to a carrier not conducting the principal part of its business in the United States unless during the last pay-roll period in which he rendered service to it prior to said date, he rendered service to it in the United States.

(c) The term "employee representative" means any officer or official representative of a railway labor organization other than a labor organization included in the term "employer" as defined in section 1 (a), who before or after the enactment hereof was in the service of an employer as defined in section 1 (a) and who is duly authorized and designated to represent employees in accordance with the Railway Labor Act, as amended, and any individual who is regularly assigned to or regularly employed by such officer or official representative in connection with the duties of his office.

(d) An individual is in the service of an employer whether his service is rendered within or without the United States if he is subject to the continuing authority of the employer to supervise and direct the manner of rendition of his service, which service he renders for compensation: *Provided, however,* That an individual shall be deemed to be in the service of an employer not conducting the principal part of its business in the United States only when he is rendering service to it in the United States.

(e) The term "compensation" means any form of money remuneration earned by an individual for services rendered as an employee to one or more employers, or as an employee representative, including remuneration paid for time lost as an employee, but remuneration paid for time lost shall be deemed earned in the month in which such time is lost. Such term does not include tips, or the voluntary payment by an employer, without deduction from the remuneration of the employee, of the tax imposed on such employee by section 2 of this act. Compensation which is earned during the period for which the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall require a return of taxes hereunder to be made and which is payable during the calendar month following such period shall be deemed to have been paid during such period only.

(f) The term "United States" when used in a geographical sense means the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(g) The term "company" includes corporations, associations, and joint-stock companies.

(h) The term "employee" includes an officer of an employer.

(i) The term "carrier" means an express company, sleeping-car company, or carrier by railroad, subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act.

(j) The term "person" means an individual, a partnership, an association, a joint-stock company, or a corporation.

INCOME TAX ON EMPLOYEES

SEC. 2. (a) In addition to other taxes, there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon the income of every employee a tax equal to the following percentages of so much of the compensation of such employee as is not in excess of $300 for any calendar month, earned by him after December 31, 1936—

1. With respect to compensation earned during the calendar years 1937, 1938, and 1939, the rate shall be 2¾ percent;

2. With respect to compensation earned during the calendar years 1940, 1941, and 1942, the rate shall be 3 percent;

3. With respect to compensation earned during the calendar years 1943, 1944, and 1945, the rate shall be 3¼ percent;

4. With respect to compensation earned during the calendar years 1946, 1947, and 1948, the rate shall be 3½ percent;

5. With respect to compensation earned after December 31, 1948, the rate shall be 3¾ percent;

(b) The tax imposed by this section shall be collected by the employer of the taxpayer by deducting the amount of the tax from the compensation of the employee as and when paid. If an employee is paid compensation by more than one employer with respect to any calendar month, then, under regulations made under this act, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may prescribe the proportion of the tax to be deducted by each employer from the compensation paid by him to the employee with respect to such month. Every employer required under this subsection to deduct the tax is hereby made liable for the payment of such tax and shall not be liable to any person for the amount of any such payment.

(c) If more or less than the correct amount of tax imposed by this section is paid with respect to any compensation payment, then, under regulations made under this act by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, proper adjustments, with respect both to the tax and the amount to be deducted, shall be made, without interest, in connection with subsequent compensation payments to the same employee by the same employer.

EXCISE TAX ON EMPLOYERS

SEC. 3. (a) In addition to other taxes, every employer shall pay an excise tax, with respect to having individuals in his employ, equal to the following percentages of so much of the compensation as is not in excess of $300 for any calendar month paid by him to any employee for services rendered to him after December 31, 1936: *Provided, however,* That if an employee is paid compensation by more than one employer with respect to any such calendar month, the tax imposed by this section shall apply to not more than $300 of the aggregate compensation paid to said employee by all said employers with respect to such calendar month, and each such employer shall be liable for that proportion of the tax with respect to such compensation which his payment to the employee with respect to such calendar month bears to the aggregate compensation paid to such employee by all employers with respect to such calendar month:

1. With respect to compensation paid to employees for services rendered during the calendar years 1937, 1938, and 1939, the rate shall be 2¾ percent;

2. With respect to compensation paid to employees for services rendered during the calendar years 1940, 1941, and 1942, the rate shall be 3 percent;

3. With respect to compensation paid to employees for services rendered during the calendar years 1943, 1944, and 1945, the rate shall be 3¼ percent;

4. With respect to compensation paid to employees for services rendered during the calendar years 1946, 1947, and 1948, the rate shall be 3½ percent;

5. With respect to compensation paid to employees for services rendered after December 31, 1948, the rate shall be 3¾ percent.

(b) If more or less than the correct amount of the tax imposed by this section is paid with respect to any compensation payment then, under regulations made by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, proper adjustments with respect to the tax shall be made, without interest, in connection with subsequent excise-tax payments made by the same employer.

REFUNDS AND DEFICIENCIES

SEC. 4. If more or less than the correct amount of the tax imposed by section 2 (a) or 3 (a) of this act is paid or deducted with respect to any compensation payment and the overpayment or underpayment of the tax cannot be adjusted under section 2 (c) or 3 (b), the amount of the overpayment shall be refunded, or the amount of the underpayment shall be collected in such manner and at such times (subject to the statute of limitations properly applicable thereto) as may be prescribed by regulations under this act as made by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

INCOME TAX ON EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 5. In addition to other taxes, there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon the income of each employee representative a tax equal to the following percentages of so much of the compensation of such employee representative as is not in excess of $300 for any calendar month, earned by him after December 31, 1936:

1. With respect to compensation earned during the calendar years 1937, 1938, and 1939, the rate shall be 5½ percent;

2. With respect to compensation earned during the calendar years 1940, 1941, and 1942, the rate shall be 6 percent;

3. With respect to compensation earned during the calendar years 1943, 1944, and 1945, the rate shall be 6½ percent;

4. With respect to compensation earned during the calendar years 1946, 1947, and 1948, the rate shall be 7 percent;

5. With respect to compensation earned after December 31, 1948, the rate shall be 7½ percent.

The compensation of an employee representative for the purpose of ascertaining the tax thereon shall be determined in the same manner and with the same effect as if the employee organization by which such employee representative is employed were an employer as defined in section 1 (a) of this act.

DEDUCTIBILITY FROM INCOME TAX

SEC. 6. For the purposes of the income tax imposed by title I of the Revenue Act of 1936 or by any act of Congress in substitution therefor, the taxes imposed by sections 2 and 5 of this act shall

not be allowed as a deduction to the taxpayer in computing his net income.

COLLECTION AND PAYMENT OF TAXES

SEC. 7. (a) The taxes imposed by this act shall be collected by the Bureau of Internal Revenue and shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as internal-revenue collections.

(b) The taxes imposed by this act shall be collected and paid quarterly or at such other times and in such manner and under such conditions not inconsistent with this act as may be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. If a tax imposed by this act is not paid when due, there shall be added as part of the tax (except in the case of adjustments made in accordance with the provisions of this act) interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date the tax became due until paid.

(c) All provisions of law, including penalties, applicable with respect to any tax imposed by section 600 or section 800 of the Revenue Act of 1926, and the provisions of section 607 of the Revenue Act of 1934, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, shall be applicable with respect to the taxes imposed by this act.

(d) In the payment of any tax under this act, a fractional part of a cent shall be disregarded unless it amounts to one-half cent or more, in which case it shall be increased to 1 cent.

(e) Any tax paid under this act by a taxpayer with respect to any period with respect to which he is not liable to tax under this act shall be credited against the tax, if any, imposed by title VIII of the Social Security Act upon such taxpayer, and the balance, if any, shall be refunded. Any tax paid under title VIII of the Social Security Act by a taxpayer with respect to any period with respect to which he is not liable to tax under such title VIII shall be credited against the tax, if any, imposed by this act upon such taxpayer, and the balance, if any, shall be refunded.

COURT JURISDICTION

SEC. 8. The several district courts of the United States and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, respectively, shall have jurisdiction to entertain an application by the Attorney General on behalf of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to compel an employee or other person residing within the jurisdiction of the court or an employer subject to service of process within its jurisdiction to comply with any obligations imposed on such employee, employer, or other person under the provisions of this act. The jurisdiction herein specifically conferred upon such Federal courts shall not be held exclusive of any jurisdiction otherwise possessed by such courts to entertain actions at law or suits in equity in aid of the enforcement of rights or obligations arising under the provisions of this act.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

SEC. 9. (a) The term "employment", as defined in subsection (b) of section 811 of title VIII of the Social Security Act, shall not include service performed by an individual as an employee as defined in section 1 (b) or service performed as an employee representative as defined in section 1 (c).

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury at intervals of not longer than 3 years shall estimate the reduction in the amount of taxes collected under title VIII of the Social Security Act by reason of the operation of subsection (a) of this section and shall include such estimate in his annual report.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 10. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

REPEAL OF PRIOR TAX ACT

SEC. 11. The provisions of this act are in substitution for the provisions of the act of August 29, 1935, as amended, entitled "An act to levy an excise tax upon carriers and an income tax upon their employees, and for other purposes", which is hereby repealed. All moneys payable as and for taxes under such act of August 29, 1935, and not heretofore paid shall cease to be payable and all proceedings pending for the recovery of any such moneys shall be terminated. All sums paid into the Treasury of the United States as and for taxes under such act shall be refunded, except so much of the sums so paid as and for taxes with respect to compensation earned after December 31, 1936, as equals the taxes imposed by this act with respect to the same persons and the same period, and the sums not required to be so refunded shall be retained in the Treasury of the United States and credited on taxes due and payable under this act. All sums deducted by employers from the compensation of employees as and for taxes under such act of August 29, 1935, which have not been paid into the Treasury of the United States shall be repaid by such employers to such employees, except so much of the sums so deducted as and for taxes in respect of compensation earned after December 31, 1936, as equals the taxes imposed and required to be deducted by this act with respect to the same persons and the same period, and the sums not required to be so repaid shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States and thereupon shall be credited on taxes due and payable under this act. No interest shall be allowed or paid with respect to any sum refunded, credited, or repaid under the provisions of this section.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 12. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall make and publish such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the enforcement of this act.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 13. This act may be cited as the "Carriers' Taxing Act of 1937."

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. LONERGAN:

A bill (S. 2708) to declare Burr Creek, from Fairfield Avenue southward to Yacht Street, in the city of Bridgeport, Conn., a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GUFFEY:

A bill (S. 2709) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Konderish; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A bill (S. 2710) for the relief of Ernestine Huber Neuheller (nee Ernestine Huber); to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A bill (S. 2711) granting a pension to George Austin; to the Committee on Pensions.

(Mr. VANDENBERG also introduced Senate bill 2712, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

A bill (S. 2713) to provide funds for the initiation of a mapping program in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

A bill (S. 2714) to create a Division of Aviation Education in the Office of Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BULKLEY:

A bill (S. 2715) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 2716) for the relief of Christine Yerges Conaway; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 2717) for the relief of the Canvas Decoy Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2718) granting a pension to Eliza Lightle (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON:

A bill (S. 2719) granting a pension and hospitalization benefits to William T. Dugard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

A bill (S. 2720) to authorize the coinage of silver coins in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the admission of the State of Nevada to the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill proposing certain amendments to the so-called Wagner Labor Act. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. I ask also that it be printed in the RECORD, together with a statement in connection with it and concerning it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred as requested by the Senator from Michigan, and the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2712) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) so much of the first paragraph of section 1 of the National Labor Relations Act as reads "The denial by employers of the right of employees to organize and the refusal by employers to accept the procedure of collective bargaining lead to strikes and other forms of industrial unrest" is amended to read

as follows: "The denial of or interference with the right of employees to organize, the refusal to accept the procedure of collective bargaining, and the failure to perform the terms and conditions of collective bargaining agreements lead to strikes and other forms of industrial unrest."

(b) Section 1 of such act is further amended by inserting after the third paragraph thereof the following new paragraph:

"The protection of the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively requires (1) that the right to organize be exercised voluntarily and free from coercion, (2) that collective bargaining be conducted by employers and responsible representatives of the employees' own choosing, and (3) that employers and employees perform faithfully the terms and conditions of agreements reached through the practice and procedure of collective bargaining."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (1) of section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by inserting after the word "associations" a comma and the word "organizations."

SEC. 3. Section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by inserting after "SEC. 8.", at the beginning thereof, the letter "(a)" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) It shall be an unfair labor practice—

"(1) For any person to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7, or to induce or compel or attempt to induce or compel any employee to become a member of any labor organization by means of any threat, intimidation, or coercion or by the use of physical violence.

"(2) For any person, in connection with any labor dispute, to interfere with the free exercise or enjoyment by any person of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or to damage or destroy the property of any person, or to violate or interfere with the exercise of any person's rights in real or personal property.

"(3) For any labor organization to make any compulsory assessment or require any contribution for political purposes.

"(4) For persons other than citizens of the United States to act as officers, agents, or representatives of labor organizations.

"(5) For any person to engage in any strike unless such strike has been voted for by a majority of the employees in the appropriate unit for collective bargaining.

"(6) For any person to engage in any strike for the purpose of inducing or forcing any person to violate any contract or any law of a State or the United States.

"(7) For any person to refuse to sign a written contract or agreement embodying the terms and conditions of any agreement between an employer and employees, or their representatives, reached as the result of collective bargaining, or to violate the provisions of any such written contract or agreement."

SEC. 4. Subsection (c) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "Investigations may be undertaken and secret ballots taken under this section upon the request of any employees, employer, or labor organization directly interested in any such question or controversy; and a new investigation may be undertaken and a new ballot taken upon such request at any time after the expiration of any agreement or contract entered into by an employer and representatives of employees certified under this act or at any time when the Board finds that any provision of any such contract has been violated by any of the parties thereto. When a request has been properly made for an investigation under this section, no person shall be recognized as a representative of the employees affected until the name of such person shall have been certified as such representative by the Board."

SEC. 5. The third sentence of subsection (c) of section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act is amended to read as follows: "If upon all the testimony taken the Board shall be of the opinion that any person named in the complaint has engaged in or is engaging in any such unfair labor practice, then the Board shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring such person to cease and desist from such unfair labor practice; and if in the opinion of the Board it is necessary in order to effectuate the policies of this act, such order may also (1) require reinstatement of employees with or without back pay; (2) suspend any right or privilege conferred upon such person by this act; and (3) in the case of a labor organization, suspend or prohibit the collection or receipt of any dues, assessment, contribution, or other thing of value."

SEC. 6. Section 13 of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "except as specifically provided herein."

The statement presented by Mr. VANDENBERG in reference to the bill is as follows:

Senator VANDENBERG announced that early this week he will offer in the Senate a series of amendments to the Wagner Labor Act. "Their purpose", he declared, "is to broaden the act and to invite an immediate study of an expanded formula under which legalized collective bargaining may hope to produce more effective industrial peace and prosperity for labor and everyone else. I believe that it is only in some such fashion that legitimate labor organization can protect itself against excesses from within and reprisals from without. There are four parties to a collective-bargaining dispute under the Wagner Act—the majority employees, the minority employees, the employer, the public. The Wagner Act ably defends the first. It seems to me that it now must acknowledge the rights of the other three."

The first amendment to be proposed by Senator VANDENBERG will permit employers to share with employees the right to demand elections to determine majority rule for the purpose of establishing collective-bargaining representatives. It would also permit subsequent repeated elections at the option of either party upon the termination or the breach of a contract. It would further require that an election must precede the assertion of any right of representation, thus obviating contentious claims respecting authority to act.

The second amendment would require the agreement resulting voluntarily from collective bargaining to be set down in writing. But it would require that strikes may be called only by a majority vote of all employees; and it would provide that any breach of contract, if not corrected upon order of the National Labor Relations Board, shall suspend the right of representation and shall subject the offender to whatever penalty the National Labor Relations Board may direct in respect to the exercise of further rights under the Wagner Act—plus the right of the Board to stop the collection of union dues and assessments during the period of discipline.

The third amendment would parallel the existing "fair practice code" for employers with a "fair practice code" for labor, including the following: (a) Prohibit compulsory political assessments upon union members; (b) require that all officers, agents, and representatives of unions shall be citizens of the United States; (c) make it "unfair practice", subject to the regular penalties of the Wagner Act "to force any worker to join any labor organization by means of threats, intimidation, coercion, or physical violence" or "to injure, damage, or destroy the property of any person or to violate any person's rights in real or personal property" or "to strike for the purpose of coercing or forcing any person to violate any contract or the laws of any State or of the United States."

"I make no claim that this is a final answer to some of the difficulties that have arisen—difficulties which responsible labor leaders are eager to join in helping correct", said Senator VANDENBERG. "I may have gone too far in some directions and not far enough in others. But I am convinced that the best welfare of labor itself requires a conclusive study of this whole related problem. Moderate protections now may prevent radical restraints later. I believe that labor is entitled to a constantly broadening share in the fruits of its own production. But it will do labor no good to achieve these benefits if a profitable economy and an orderly society in which to enjoy them is jeopardized or destroyed. In the final analysis, the public interest is paramount. There can be but one sovereignty—the sovereignty of government—in this country."

AMENDMENT TO THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ROBINSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the third deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill to insert the following:

"PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

"Division of Venereal Diseases: For the maintenance and expenses of the Division of Venereal Diseases, established by sections 3 and 4, chapter 15, of the act approved July 9, 1918 (U. S. C., title 42, secs. 24 and 25), including additional facilities and services at the Hot Springs Transient Medical Center and Infirmary, $189,000, said funds to be disbursed by the United States Public Health Service upon invitation of the public agency owning the physical property. It is further provided that the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept title to this property as a part of the Hot Springs National Park."

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6523) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 33, 34, 36, 39, 41, 44, 49, 51, 58, 60, 68, 74, 77, 79, 80, 82, 83, 84, 87, 89, 93, 96, 97, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 110, 112, 114, 115, 118, 121, 122, 123, 128, 129, 135, and 136.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 15, 32, 35, 40, 42, 46, 47, 48, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 62, 65, 67, 70, 71, 72, 75, 76, 92, 94, 95, 107, 108, 109, 111, 113, 120, 127, 130, and 133, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$887,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the

sum proposed insert "$1,254,130"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,232,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,463,546"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,342,870"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,190,179"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,703,049"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$633,199"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$703,694"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "including not exceeding $80,000 for acquisition of additional land, notwithstanding the limitations of said act of March 4, 1927"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$122,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,833,048"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$638,403"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$14,116,596"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$18,892,182"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$196,243"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,425,431"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$460,860"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,711,398"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$171,149"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,127,840"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$48,785"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$423,169"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$460,769"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,162,698"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,212,698"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$190,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$22,175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$24,390,780"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 125: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 125, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *And provided further*, That the funds provided by section 32 of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes', approved August 24, 1935 (U. S. C., Supp. II, title 7, sec. 612c), shall be available during the fiscal year 1938 for administrative expenses in such sums as the President may direct in carrying out the provisions of said section, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to the employment of persons and means by Agricultural Adjustment Administration"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 131: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$12,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 132: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$7,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 88, 124, 126, and 134.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Jr.,
CARL HAYDEN,
ROYAL S. COPELAND,
E. D. SMITH,
GERALD P. NYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
M. C. TARVER,
WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD,
WILLIAM R. THOM,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
W. D. MCFARLANE,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. As this is a privileged matter, I ask for the present consideration of the report.

The report was considered and agreed to.

DEDICATION OF THE ROSCOE P. COPELAND AUDITORIUM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR COPELAND

[Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator Copeland at Dexter, Mich., June 13, 1937, on the occasion of the

dedication of the Roscoe P. Copeland Auditorium, which appears in the Appendix.]

NECESSARY FARM LEGISLATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR POPE

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator POPE on June 24, 1937, on the subject "Necessary Farm Legislation", which appears in the Appendix.]

REORGANIZATION OF FEDERAL JUDICIARY—ARTICLE BY SENATOR GREEN

[Mr. ASHURST asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Senator GREEN, relative to the reorganization of the Federal judiciary, published in the American Bar Association Journal for June 1937, which appears in the Appendix.]

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY COMMENCEMENT—ADDRESS BY JESSE H. JONES

[Mr. MCKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered on June 10, 1937, in Philadelphia, Pa., by Jesse H. Jones, Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, at the fifty-first annual commencement of Temple University, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF—CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR EDITORIAL

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial headed "Time for Facts About Relief", published in the Christian Science Monitor of June 17, 1937, which appears in the Appendix.]

ITALY AND SPAIN—WASHINGTON POST EDITORIAL

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial headed "Out in the Open", published in the Washington Post of June 28, 1937, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSIDERATION OF UNOBJECTED BILLS ON CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on Thursday last, the Senate will now proceed to consider unobjected bills on the calendar, which will be stated in their order.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 8) limiting debate on general appropriation bills, was announced as first in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let the resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

BOARD OF SHORTHAND REPORTING

The bill (S. 1435) to create a board of shorthand reporting, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 149, being Senate bill 1435. I do not think there is now any objection to that bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understood the Senator from Arkansas to object.

Mr. ROBINSON. I do not now object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas to return to Senate bill 1435 and consider it at this time?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1435) to create a board of shorthand reporting, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established a National Board of Shorthand Reporting (hereinafter referred to as the Board) to be composed of three members to be appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate. The members of the Board, with the exception of the members first to be appointed, shall be holders of certificates issued under the provisions of this act. The members first appointed shall be skilled in the art and practice of shorthand reporting and shall have been actively and continuously engaged as professional shorthand reporters within the United States for at least 5 years preceding their appointments. The members shall hold office for a term of 3 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of nomination, one at the end of 1 year, one at the end of 2 years, and one at the end of 3 years after such date. The Board shall elect one of its members as chairman and one as secretary-treasurer, who shall hold their respective offices for 1 year. The Board shall make all necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this act. Any two members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

SEC. 2. Any person who has received from the Board a certificate of his qualifications to practice as a shorthand reporter shall be known and styled as a "Federal certified shorthand reporter", and no other person, and no partnership, all of the members of which have not received such certificate, and no corporation shall assume such title or the abbreviation "F. C. S. R.", or any other words, letters, or abbreviations tending to indicate that the person, partnership, or corporation so using the same is a Federal certified shorthand reporter.

SEC. 3. The Board shall grant a certificate as a Federal certified shorthand reporter to any citizen of the United States (a) who is over the age of 21 years, is of good moral character, and is a graduate of a high school or has had an equivalent education; and (b) who has, except as provided in section 5 of this act, successfully passed an examination in shorthand reporting under such rules and regulations as the Board may prescribe.

SEC. 4. The Board shall hold regular meetings for the examination of applicants for certificates under this act beginning on the third Monday of June and December of each year, and additional meetings at such times and places as it shall determine but not to exceed once every 3 months. The time and place of holding such examinations shall be advertised in a periodical to be selected by the Board at least 30 days prior to the date of each examination. The Civil Service Commission is authorized to conduct such examinations for the Board.

SEC. 5. The Board may, in its discretion, waive the examination provided for in this act and issue a certificate as a Federal certified shorthand reporter to any person submitting an application within 1 year after the appointment of the members of the Board (a) who possesses the qualifications set out in section 3, (b) who has been actively engaged in the practice of shorthand reporting for more than 5 years next preceding the date of enactment of this act, and (c) who is competent, in the opinion of the Board, to perform the duties of a Federal certified shorthand reporter.

SEC. 6. The Board may revoke any certificate issued under this act for unprofessional conduct or other sufficient cause after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing. Said notice shall state the cause of such contemplated revocation and the time and place of such hearing and shall be mailed to the registered address of the holder of such certificate at least 30 days before such hearing. Each member of the Board shall be empowered to administer oaths and affirmations, subpena witnesses, compel their attendance, take evidence, and require the production of any books, papers, correspondence, memoranda, or other records concerning any matter within the jurisdiction of the Board.

SEC. 7. Upon the filing of an application for an examination or a certificate under this act, the Board shall charge a fee of $25. Should the applicant fail to pass the required examination he shall be entitled to take subsequent examinations after the expiration of 6 months and within 2 years without the payment of an additional fee.

SEC. 8. Each member of the Board shall receive $25 for each day actually employed in the discharge of his official duties and in addition thereto all necessary expenses incurred by him in executing his functions under this act. The compensation and expenses of the members of the Board and the expenses of the Board that are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act shall be paid from the fees collected under section 7. *Provided*, That such compensation and expenses shall not exceed the amount so collected as fees.

SEC. 9. On and after July 1, 1937, no person shall be employed for shorthand reporting in the judicial or executive branches or by any independent agency of the Government unless said person is the holder of a certificate provided for in this act: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to prohibit the temporary employment of a shorthand reporter not holding a certificate until a reporter holding a certificate shall be available: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to any person not employed for the shorthand reporting of such proceedings as are described and defined in section 10 hereof: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to persons regularly employed in any department under provisions of the civil-service laws.

SEC. 10. When used in this act the term "shorthand reporting" means the making, by use of symbols or abbreviations, of a verbatim record of any oral testimony, proceeding, hearing, or trial before a court, commission, independent agency of the Government, master, referee, convention, deliberative assembly, or proceedings of like character.

SEC. 11. If after July 1, 1937, any person shall represent himself as having received a certificate as provided for in this act or shall practice as a Federal certified shorthand reporter without having received such certificate, or after having his certificate revoked shall continue to practice as a Federal certified shorthand reporter, or shall use any title or abbreviation that indicates that the person

using the same is a Federal certified shorthand reporter, or shall violate any of the provisions of this act, said person shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1436) providing for the employment of skilled shorthand reporters in the executive branch of the Government was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 419) to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public education was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 847) to prevent the use of Federal official patronage in elections and to prohibit Federal officeholders from misuse of positions of public trust for private and partisan ends was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 100) to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies", approved July 2, 1890, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1261) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 69) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce", approved February 4, 1887, as amended and supplemented, by limiting freight or other trains to 70 cars, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4276) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", was announced as next in order.

Mr. COPELAND. I ask that that bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2106) for the allowances of certain claims not heretofore paid, for indemnity for spoliations by the French, prior to July 31, 1801, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

JOHN L. SUMMERS

The bill (H. R. 4679) for the relief of John L. Summers, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department; and Frank White, G. F. Allen, H. T. Tate, and W. O. Woods, former Treasurers of the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN LANDS OF PANAMA RAILROAD CO.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 41) authorizing the disposal of certain lands held by the Panama Railroad Co. on Manzanillo Island, Republic of Panama, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Panama Railroad Co. be, and is hereby, authorized to sell, and convey in whole or in part, at public or private sale, at not less than the appraised value to be fixed as hereinafter provided, all of its right, title, and interest in and to the lands situated within that portion of Manzanillo Island, Republic of Panama, lying within the area bounded by a line described as follows:

Beginning at the point where the Canal Zone-Republic of Panama (city of Colon) boundary line intersects the western shore line of the arm of Manzanillo Bay known as "Boca Chica" or "Folks River"; thence following the Canal Zone-city of Colon boundary line northerly to Eleventh Street and westerly on Eleventh Street to the center of Front Avenue; thence northerly along the center of Front Avenue and its prolongation to the center of Second Street; thence easterly along the center of Second Street to the center of Melendez Avenue ("G" Street); thence southerly along the center of Melendez Avenue to the center of Seventh Street; thence easterly along the center of Seventh Street to the center of Roosevelt Avenue; thence southerly along the center of Roosevelt Avenue to the center of Ninth Street; thence easterly along the center of Ninth Street to the shore line of Manzanillo Bay; thence southerly along the shore line of Manzanillo Bay to the intersection with the center of Eleventh Street prolonged; thence westerly along the center of Eleventh Street to the center of Melendez Avenue; thence southerly along the center of Melendez Avenue to the center of Sixteenth Street; thence easterly along the center of Sixteenth Street to the shore line of Folks River; thence southerly, westerly, northwesterly, and southerly along the shore line of Folks River to the point of beginning; excepting, however, lot 22, block 26, as shown on Panama Canal drawing 2021-6, and lot 1189, as shown on Panama Canal drawing 7/019, which lie within the said area.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War shall designate a board of three appraisers, who shall appraise the value of each tract or lot within the said area separately, and file the same with the president of the Panama Railroad Co. From time to time, at intervals of not less than 1 year, the Secretary of War, if deemed advisable by him, may, through a similar board, order a reappraisement of the unsold tracts. Such appraisement and any reappraisement shall be open to public inspection.

SEC. 3. The Panama Railroad Co. is also authorized, with the approval of the President of the United States, to convey in whole or in part all its right, title, and interest in and to the said lands, in exchange for a grant by the Republic of Panama to the United States of all the rights, power, and authority within various other areas situated on Manzanillo Island which the United States would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign of the territory included within the said areas, to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority.

SEC. 4. Any conveyance of any lot or tract by the Panama Railroad Co., as aforesaid, shall be deemed to release any and all reversionary rights of the United States in said property.

SEC. 5. The Panama Railroad Co. shall, on or before August 16, 1966, deposit the net proceeds from sales of the land in question in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of "Miscellaneous receipts."

The preamble was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF CANAL ZONE CODE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4597) to amend the Canal Zone Code, which had been reported from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals with an amendment, on page 5, after line 19, to insert a new section 10, as follows:

SEC. 10. That section 222 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"222. Carriage by Panama Railroad Co. of marine and fire insurance: The Panama Railroad Co. shall carry no insurance to cover marine or fire losses: *Provided*, That this section shall not prohibit the company from carrying insurance to cover shipments of its own funds and securities."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 62 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1122), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"62. Offenses in relation to entry or importation of articles or merchandise: Any person who shall—

"(a) Enter or import, or attempt to enter or import, any articles or merchandise into the Canal Zone before the entry or importation of such article or merchandise has been approved by the proper officers of the Canal Zone;

"(b) Pass, or attempt to pass, any false, forged, or fraudulent invoice, bill, or other paper, for the purpose of securing the entry or importation of any articles or merchandise into the Canal Zone in violation of the rules and regulations established under the authority of the next preceding section; or

"(c) Violate any of the rules and regulations established under the authority of the next preceding section;

"Shall be punished by a fine of not more than $100 or by imprisonment in jail for not more than 30 days, or by both."

SEC. 2. That section 323 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, relative to the violation of regulations governing roads, highways, and self-propelled vehicles, is amended to read as follows:

"323. Violation of regulations; punishment: Any person who violates any rule or regulation established under the authority of the two next preceding sections shall be punished by a fine of not more than $100 or by imprisonment in jail for not more than 30 days, or by both."

SEC. 3. That paragraph (a) of section 61 of title 3, Canal Zone Code, is amended to read as follows:

"61. Application for and issuance of license; fee: (a) No marriage shall be celebrated in the Canal Zone unless a license to marry has first been secured from the office of the clerk of the district court in either division. In cases where both parties to a proposed marriage are residents of the Republic of Panama and neither is an American citizen, no license shall issue in the Canal Zone unless the parties have previously obtained a license to marry from the proper authorities in the Republic of Panama. No marriage license shall be issued to a leper except upon a certificate of approval by the chief health officer of the Canal Zone. All licenses when issued shall be accompanied by a marriage certificate to be executed by the person celebrating the marriage."

SEC. 4. That article 3, chapter 39, title 3, Canal Zone Code, relative to loan of money, is amended by adding at the end of said article a new section no. 1270 and reading as follows:

"1270. Interest of judgments: Judgments shall bear interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date of entry thereof."

SEC. 5. That section 1312 of title 3 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by substituting the word "default" for the word "defraud" appearing in the proviso in said section.

SEC. 6. That paragraph (b) of section 182, title 4, Canal Zone Code, relative to process in proceedings for divorce, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Upon application of the plaintiff, accompanied by the affidavit required by subdivision (c), if the summons has not been served as provided in subdivision (a), the court, or the judge thereof, shall enter an order directing service of a summons by publication if it appears to the satisfaction of such court or judge—

"(1) That the defendant cannot be found in the Canal Zone; and

"(2) That a proper cause for divorce is alleged in favor of the plaintiff."

SEC. 7. That article 2, chapter 11, title 5, Canal Zone Code, relative to crimes in relation to motor and other vehicles, is amended by adding at the end of said article a new section no. 514 and reading as follows:

"514. Driving motor vehicle recklessly causing bodily injury: Any person who shall operate a motor vehicle recklessly, thereby causing great bodily injury to the person of another, shall be punishable by imprisonment in jail for not more than 1 year or by a fine of not more than $1,000, or by both."

SEC. 8. That section 571 of title 6 of the Canal Zone Code, relative to bail upon being held to answer before information, is amended to read as follows:

"571. Admission to bail in such case: When the defendant has been held to answer upon a preliminary hearing for a public offense, the admission to bail may be by the magistrate by whom he is so held, or by any judge who has power to issue the writ of habeas corpus. The power of the said magistrate to admit to bail in such case shall extend to the time of filing of an information, and the magistrate shall likewise have power either to increase or reduce the amount of such bail in the manner provided in section 582 of this title.

SEC. 9. That section 43 of title 7 of the Canal Zone Code is amended to read as follows:

"43. Public defender: The Governor of the Panama Canal shall appoint a duly qualified member of the bar of the Canal Zone as a public defender, whose duty it shall be to represent, in the district court, any person charged with the commission of a crime within the original jurisdiction of that court who is unable to employ counsel for his defense. The public defender shall receive such compensation, and such of the privileges of a Canal employee, as shall be fixed and granted by the President or by his authority."

SEC. 10. That section 222 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"222. Carriage by Panama Railroad Co. of marine and fire insurance: The Panama Railroad Co. shall carry no insurance to cover marine or fire losses: *Provided*, That this section shall not prohibit the company from carrying insurance to cover shipments of its own funds and securities."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] give us an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the code of laws in existence in the Canal Zone has been found defective in several particulars. There are several different provisions involved.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was there any objection from any source?

Mr. CLARK. The bill which is recommended by the Canal Zone authorities and approved by the War Department passed the House of Representatives unanimously and has been unanimously approved by the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AIR NAVIGATION IN CANAL ZONE

The bill (H. R. 6144) to amend the Canal Zone Code was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 1 of title 2, Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1122), is amended by adding at the end of said chapter a new section no. 14 and reading as follows:

"14. Air navigation: The Government of the United States is hereby declared to possess, to the exclusion of all foreign nations, sovereign rights, power, and authority over the air space above the lands and waters of the Canal Zone. Until Congress shall otherwise provide, the President is authorized to make rules and regulations, and to alter and amend the same from time to time, governing aircraft, air navigation, air-navigation facilities, and aeronautical activities within the Canal Zone. Any person who shall violate any of the rules or regulations issued in pursuance of the authority contained in this section shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment in jail for not more than 1 year, or by both."

SEC. 2. That chapter 3 of title 2, Canal Zone Code, relative to administering oaths and summoning witnesses, is amended by adding at the end of said chapter a new section no 44, and reading as follows:

"44. Administering oaths in inquests and in deportation proceedings: Officers of the Panama Canal designated by the Governor or by his authority to act as coroner and deputy coroners and authorized to hold inquests in the Canal Zone, and officers designated by such authority to conduct hearings in reference to the exclusion and deportation of persons from the Canal Zone, are hereby authorized to administer oaths in the conduct of such proceedings."

SEC. 3. That section 81 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code is amended so as to read as follows:

"81. Appointment, removal, and compensation of necessary persons: All persons, other than the Governor of the Panama Canal, necessary for the care, management, maintenance, sanitation, government, operation, and protection of the Canal and Canal Zone shall—

"(a) Be appointed by the President or by his authority;

"(b) Be removable at the pleasure of the President; and

"(c) Receive such compensation as shall be fixed by the President or by his authority until such time as Congress may by law regulate the same;

and such persons shall be employed and shall serve under such conditions of employment, including matters relating to transportation, medical care, quarters, leave and the commutation thereof, and office hours and hours of labor as have been or shall hereafter be prescribed by the President: *Provided, however*, That salaries or compensation fixed by the President hereunder shall in no instance exceed by more than 25 percent the salary or compensation paid for the same or similar services to persons employed by the Government in continental United States: *And provided further*, That nothing contained in this section shall affect the application to employees of the Panama Canal of the provisions of section 23 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1935 (48 Stat. 522)."

RELIEF OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF PANAMA CANAL

The bill (H. R. 6436) authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Panama Canal not coming within the provisions of the Canal Zone Retirement Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Governor of the Panama Canal, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the President of the United States, may pay cash relief to such employees of the Panama Canal not coming within the provisions of the Canal Zone Retirement Act as may become unfit for further useful service by reason of mental or physical disability resulting from age or disease, and also to such former employees of the Panama Canal not coming within the provisions of the Canal Zone Retirement Act as have within 3 years prior to the date of enactment of this act been separated from the service because of unfitness for further useful service by reason of such disability: *Provided*, That such cash relief shall not exceed $1 per month for each year of service of the employee so furnished relief, with a maximum of $25 per month, nor be granted to any employee having less than 10 years' service with the Panama Canal, including any service with the Panama Railroad Co. on the Isthmus of Panama.

SEC. 2. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

CITIZENSHIP OF CERTAIN PERSONS BORN IN CANAL ZONE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2416) relative to the citizenship of certain classes of persons born in the Canal Zone or the Republic of Panama, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person born in the Canal Zone on or after February 26, 1904, and whether before or after the effec-

tive date of this act, whose father or mother or both at the time of the birth of such person was or is a citizen of the United States, is declared to be a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 2. Any person born in the Republic of Panama on or after February 26, 1904, and whether before or after the effective date of this act, whose father or mother or both at the time of the birth of such person was or is a citizen of the United States employed by the Government of the United States or by the Panama Railroad Co., is declared to be a citizen of the United States.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, what change in existing law does the bill propose to make?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it merely provides that any person born in the Canal Zone after a certain date, whose father or mother or both at the time of the birth of such person was or is a citizen of the United States, shall be declared to be a citizen of the United States. The existing law is changed in that respect as to children born on or after February 26, 1904.

Mr. ROBINSON. How many persons would it add to our citizenship?

Mr. CLARK. I can best answer the Senator by reading from the letter of the Secretary of War set forth in the report, as follows:

The citizenship status of persons born in the Canal Zone has never been defined either by constitution, treaty, or congressional enactment. The resulting questions which have arisen are of considerable importance because there are in the Canal Zone some 3,000 citizens of the United States employed by the Government on the Panama Canal, and some 10,000 citizens of the United States constituting the personnel of the Army and Navy units stationed in the Canal Zone. These classes of persons, with their families, comprise the whole body of American citizens in the Canal Zone with the exception of a negligible number employed by steamship, oil, and cable companies which are fairly closely allied with the Panama Canal enterprise. The population of the Canal Zone, other than citizens of the United States, consists of some 21,000 inhabitants of diverse nationality, many of whom were born in the Canal Zone subsequent to February 26, 1904.

The questions involved are of greater concern to those affected because of the fact that, in a number of cases which is constantly increasing, children born in the Canal Zone of American fathers who are employees of the Government of the United States are themselves reaching maturity, entering the Government service, and becoming the parents of children, without ever having resided elsewhere than in the Canal Zone. One of the most important questions involved, therefore, concerns the citizenship status of children born in the Canal Zone of these second generation citizens of the United States in those cases where a parent capable of transmitting citizenship has not resided in the United States previous to the birth of such a child.

Problems similar to the above have arisen with respect to the status of children born in the hospitals maintained by the Government of the United States in Colon, Republic of Panama. In the latter class of cases the parent is employed in the Government service and works in the Canal Zone. In a number of these cases the parents of the child actually reside in the Canal Zone. The United States Government hospital in which the child is born is adjacent to the Canal Zone but actually within the political jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama.

The draft of bill attached was prepared under the direction of the Governor of the Panama Canal after extensive studies had been made of the subject matter, and it is recommended that this legislation be given favorable consideration.

In other words, as I understand, the hospital to which Government employees in the Canal Zone naturally go, and to which their wives go and in which their children are born, lies outside the jurisdiction of the Canal Zone but in the Republic of Panama. The bill is merely to take care of the citizenship of children so born.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1760) to promote the safety of scheduled air transportation was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, by providing for the regulation of the transportation of passengers and property by aircraft in interstate commerce and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 892) to repeal the act entitled "An act relating to Philippine currency reserves on deposit in the United States" was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

The bill (S. 2010) to authorize the appointment of an additional judge for the southern district of Ohio was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President hereby is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one district judge for the southern district of Ohio in addition to those now authorized by law. Said additional judge shall be entitled to receive the same salary payable in the same manner as is now provided for district judges in said district. This additional district judge shall reside within said district and shall be subject to the general provisions of law relating to district judges of the United States.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect immediately upon the approval thereof by the President of the United States.

WARTIME RANK OF RETIRED OFFICERS OF ARMY, NAVY, ETC.

The bill (S. 2279) to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to give wartime rank to retired officers and former officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and/or Coast Guard of the United States", approved June 21, 1930, so as to prohibit persons who have been subsequently separated from the service under other than honorable conditions from bearing the official title and upon occasions of ceremony wearing the uniform of the highest grade held by them during their war service, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to give wartime rank to retired officers and former officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and/or Coast Guard of the United States", approved June 21, 1930 (46 Stat. 793; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1028–b), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. All persons who have served honorably in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and/or Coast Guard of the United States during war shall, when not in the active military and/or naval service of the United States, be entitled to bear the official title and upon occasions of ceremony, to wear the uniform of the highest grade held by them during their war service: *Provided*, That their subsequent service and their separation from the service have been honorable and that they have not been sentenced by court martial or by civil authorities to confinement in a State or Federal penitentiary as a result of a conviction for a felony: *Provided further*, That persons other than regular members thereof shall not bear the official title of any of the above services except as authorized by this or other acts, and anyone who offends against the provisions of this section shall be punished in the same manner and to the same extent as is provided by law for persons who offend against prohibitions of law making it unlawful to wear duly prescribed uniforms of said services or parts thereof."

JAMES PHILIP COYLE

The bill (H. R. 2404) for the relief of James Philip Coyle, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TIMOTHY JOSEPH M'CARTHY

The bill (H. R. 3002) for the relief of Timothy Joseph McCarthy, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIMS OF FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1379) authorizing the Five Civilized Tribes, in suits heretofore filed under their original jurisdictional acts, to present claims to the United States Court of Claims, by amended petitions to conform to the evidence; and authorizing said court to adjudicate such claims upon their merits as though filed within the time limitation fixed in said original jurisdictional acts, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, before the word "suits", to insert "any"; on page 1, line 4, after the words "claims by", to strike out "the Five Civilized Tribes under

their respective jurisdictional acts (Cherokee Nation, act approved Mar. 19, 1924, 43 Stat. 27; Seminole Nation, act approved May 20, 1924, 43 Stat. 133; Creek Nation, act approved May 24, 1924, 43 Stat. 139; Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, act approved June 7, 1924, 43 Stat. 537, as amended by joint resolutions approved May 19, 1926, 44 Stat. 568, and Feb. 19, 1929, 45 Stat. 1229)" and to insert "any nation, tribe, or band of Indians"; and, on page 2, line 14, after the words "Indian nations", to insert "tribes, or bands", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in any suits heretofore filed in the United States Court of Claims by any nation, tribe, or band of Indians, plaintiffs therein, at any time before the final submission of said suits, shall have the right to amend their petitions to conform to any evidence filed in said suits, whether such amended petitions develop original claims or present new claims based upon said evidence; and jurisdiction be, and is hereby, conferred upon said Court of Claims, notwithstanding the lapse of time or statute of limitations, to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in any and all legal and equitable claims which may have been presented by said Indian nations, tribes, or bands in any amended petitions heretofore filed, or which may be filed under the terms of this act; and claims so presented shall be adjudicated by said court upon their merits as though presented by petitions filed within the time limited by said respective original jurisdictional acts, as amended; and any case presenting claims which may have been dismissed upon the ground that new claims were set up by amended petition, after the expiration of the time limitation fixed in said original jurisdictional acts, as amended, shall be reinstated and retried by said court on their merits, upon the same pleadings, findings of fact, and under the same law in force when originally tried.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing any nation, tribe, or band of Indians, in suits heretofore filed under their original jurisdictional acts, to present claims to the United States Court of Claims, by amended petitions at any time before final submission of said suits, to conform to the evidence; and authorizing the said court to adjudicate such claims upon their merits as though filed within the time limitation fixed in said original jurisdictional acts."

INDIANS OF QUINAIELT RESERVATION, WASH.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1517) authorizing the payment of necessary expenses incurred by certain Indians allotted on the Quinaielt Reservation, State of Washington, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment, on page 2, line 8, after the words "sale of", to strike out "timber on his or her allotment" and insert "his allotment or of timber thereon", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay the attorneys of record for those Quinaielt Indians who received their allotments on the Quinaielt Reservation, State of Washington, pursuant to an order of a United States district or appellate court in a case wherein they were named parties plaintiff, the reasonable and fair value of the services rendered and expenses incurred, as heretofore fixed and determined by said Secretary; and the sum of $55,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary; is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to make said payments, the amount so paid for the account of each such allottee to be reimbursed to the United States out of any funds now or hereafter accruing to the account of each such Indian allottee from the sale of his allotment or of timber thereon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the payment of attorney fees contracted to be paid by certain Indians allotted on the Quinaielt Reservation, State of Washington, and for other purposes."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1392) to reorganize the judicial branch of the Government was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

WABASH RIVER BRIDGE, INDIANA

The bill (H. R. 5848) to extend times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Wabash River at or near Merom, Sullivan County, Ind., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POTOMAC RIVER BRIDGE AT SHEPHERDSTOWN, MD.

The bill (H. R. 6285) authorizing the State Roads Commission of the State of Maryland and the State Road Commission of the State of West Virginia to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Potomac River in Washington County, Md., at or near a point opposite Shepherdstown, W. Va., and a point at or near Shepherdstown, Jefferson County, W. Va., to take the place of a bridge destroyed by flood, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POTOMAC RIVER BRIDGE AT HANCOCK, MD.

The bill (H. R. 6286) authorizing the State Roads Commission of the State of Maryland and the State Road Commission of the State of West Virginia to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Potomac River at or near a point in the vicinity of Hancock, in Washington County, Md., and a point near the north end of Morgan County, W. Va., to take the place of a bridge destroyed by flood, was considered, ordered tc a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE NEAR NIOBRARA, NEBR.

The bill (H. R. 6292) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Niobrara, Nebr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SNAKE RIVER BRIDGE, WASHINGTON-IDAHO

The bill (H. R. 6494) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Snake River between Clarkston, Wash., and Lewiston, Idaho, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISABILITY OR DEATH BENEFITS IN EVENT OF WAR

The bill (S. 2113) to provide benefits on account of disability or death due to service in the armed forces of the United States in the event of war, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, let us have an explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan desires an explanation of the bill.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, this is a bill which I was instructed to report from the Committee on Military Affairs. Its title discloses its purpose. I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate and particularly to the attention of the Senator from Michigan the fact that the bill was considered by a subcommitee of the Committee on Military Affairs and was later considered by the full committee and reported favorably to this body.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am simply asking the Senator to indicate what the bill provides.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It merely provides benefits for the widows of soldiers of future wars, and likewise compensation to soldiers for services rendered in war, not in excess of compensation being derived by veterans of the World War at the present time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is there any recommendation from the War Department or the Veterans' Bureau in connection with the bill?

Mr. REYNOLDS. As a matter of fact, my recollection is that the War Department recommended adversely. The War Department, in addressing the members of the Committee on Military Affairs under date of May 11, 1937, had the following to say to the chairman of the committee:

DEAR SENATOR SHEPPARD: Careful consideration has been given to the bill (S. 2113) to provide benefits on account of disability or death due to service in the armed forces of the United States in the event of war, and for other purposes, which you referred to the

War Department under date of April 10, 1937, with request for information and the views of the Department relative thereto.

This proposed legislation appears to have reference to laws which are administered primarily, if not entirely, by the Veterans' Administration. The records of the War Department do not include information regarding the subject matter of the bill. This Department therefore feels that, out of deference to the Veterans' Administration, it should refrain from expressing an opinion as to the merits of the measure.

This report was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, which advises that there would be no objection to the submission to Congress of the proposed report on S. 2113.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY H. WOODRING,
Secretary of War.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the attitude of the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. REYNOLDS. In view of the fact that the matter is one with which the Veterans' Administration would have to do, the War Department advised that they would not comment further upon the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Veterans' Administration themselves commented on the bill, did they not?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think they did.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What did they say?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as I understand, they did not recommend the bill, nor did the Navy Department.

Mr. REYNOLDS. General Hines commented upon the bill as follows:

This is with further reference to your request of April 10, 1937, for a report on S. 2113, Seventy-fifth Congress, a bill to provide benefits on account of disability or death due to service in the armed forces of the United States in the event of war, and for other purposes, which provides——

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I notice that in the report from the Secretary of the Navy it is stated:

However, in the opinion of the Navy Department it would be better to provide benefits based on conditions existing when the future war comes, or, if it is desired to enact such legislation now, to enumerate those it is desired to perpetuate.

I, myself, do not see the necessity at this time of legislating benefits for soldiers in future wars. It seems to me that if we are to take it for granted that a necessity for such legislation will arise, we may well consider the legislation when the necessity does arise; so I think the measure had better go over.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, at least we are not going to have a war before we have another call of the calendar; and I suggest that the bill go over until that time, in any event.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being made, the bill will be passed over.

FORT NIAGARA MILITARY RESERVATION, N. Y.

The bill (H. R. 3123) to authorize the Secretary of War to lease to Old Fort Niagara Association, Inc., portions of the Fort Niagara Military Reservation, N. Y., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to lease to Old Fort Niagara Association, Inc., a nonprofit membership corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of New York, that portion of the Fort Niagara Military Reservation, N. Y., known as Old Fort Niagara, including all grounds, buildings, and fortifications pertaining thereto which have been restored and rehabilitated by Old Fort Niagara Association, Inc., and the United States of America, together with such additional adjacent areas and/or buildings as, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, may be or become necessary for such term or terms and subject to such conditions as, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, shall be advisable: *Provided, however*, That the consideration for any lease executed pursuant to this act shall be the maintenance by said Old Fort Niagara Association, Inc., of said premises in accordance with the terms of such lease, and every such lease shall be revocable at will by the Secretary of War.

FORT DONELSON NATIONAL MILITARY PARK, TENN.

The bill (S. 2026) to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Fort Donelson National Military Park in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-described tracts or parcels of land, lying and being within the seventh civil district of Stewart County, Tenn., are hereby transferred from the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior as additions to the Fort Donelson National Military Park, and shall hereafter be subject to all laws and rules and regulations applicable to said park:

Tract no. 1, a right-of-way, 50 feet wide, lying 25 feet on each side of a center line, beginning at a point in the southerly boundary line of lock D reservation, 734.8 feet from the southwest corner of this reservation; thence south 31°5′ W. 77.1 feet; thence south 86°21′ W. 479.9 feet; thence south 63°53′ W. 262.3 feet; thence south 39°36′ W. 186.7 feet; thence south exactly 40′ E. exactly 194 feet; thence south 30°58′ E. 314.5 feet; thence south 28°15′ E. exactly 85 feet; thence south 28°37′ E. 250.5 feet; thence south 4°6′ E. 261.7 feet; thence south 36°27′ E. 282.3 feet; thence south 23°45′ E. 178.3 feet to center of line of county road, reserving, however, to the War Department the right to the continued use of the road over this tract as a means of access to lock D.

Tract no. 2, beginning at a point in the southern boundary line of lock D reservation 753.5 feet from the southwest corner of this reservation, thence north 74°28′ E. 191.98 feet, thence south 85°12′ E. 52.9 feet, thence south 51°36′ E. 32.9 feet, thence south 9°33′ E. 117.02 feet, thence south 31°3′ W. 69.82 feet, thence north 58°57′ W. 288.08 feet to beginning.

Tract no. 3, beginning at a point in the southern boundary line of lock D reservation, 590 feet from the southwest corner of this reservation, this point being marked by an iron fence post, thence north 58°57′ W. 590 feet along the southern boundary line of lock D reservation, thence north 31°3′ E. 488 feet along the western boundary line of the lock D reservation to low-water mark on bank of Cumberland River, thence along low-water line of Cumberland River in a southeasterly direction 335 feet, thence south 35°5′ W. 123 feet to an iron pin, thence south 55°55′ E. 307.5 feet to an iron pin, thence south 40°5′ W. 310.5 feet to beginning.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to accept donations of land, interests in land, buildings, structures, and other property within a distance of 1 mile from the boundaries of said Fort Donelson National Military Park, as hereby extended, and donations of funds for the purchase or maintenance thereof, the title and evidence of title to lands acquired to be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That he may acquire on behalf of the United States out of any donated funds, by purchase at prices deemed by him reasonable or by condemnation, such tracts of land within a distance of 1 mile from the boundaries of the said national military park as may be necessary for the completion thereof. Upon the acquisition of such land the same shall become a part of the Fort Donelson National Military Park and shall be subject to the laws and rules and regulations applicable to said park.

SEC. 3. The administration, protection, and development of the lands hereby authorized to be added to the Fort Donelson National Military Park shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", as amended.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE IN PRODUCTS OF CHILD LABOR

The bill (S. 2226) to regulate interstate commerce in the products of child labor, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, that is an important bill. I do not wish to object to its consideration, but I think the bill should receive more attention than it is possible to give it at this time. Let the bill be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

COMPENSATION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF CORPORATIONS

The bill (H. R. 6215) to repeal provisions of the income tax requiring lists of compensation paid to officers and employees of corporations was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. President, has objection been made to the consideration of this bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection has been made.

Mr. LONERGAN. By whom, may I ask?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I made the objection. The bill seems to be very important; and I should like to

have it go over until the next time the Calendar is called, in any event.

Mr. LONERGAN. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that the bill passed the House of Representatives on the 27th of April, and was considered by the Finance Committee and favorably reported.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no doubt of that, or the bill would not be on the Calendar; but I should like to have the Senator let it go over this time, until I can examine into it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

JACKSON CASKET & MANUFACTURING CO.

The bill (H. R. 5258) for the relief of the Jackson Casket & Manufacturing Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) notwithstanding the declaration of adjusted declared value in its capital-stock-tax return for the year ending June 30, 1936, the original declared value of the Jackson Casket & Manufacturing Co., of Jackson, Miss., in determining its capital-stock tax under section 105 of the Revenue Act of 1935, as amended, for the year ending June 30, 1937, and subsequent years, shall be a value computed on the basis of $125 per share of its capital stock.

(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall apply only if the taxpayer within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this act files with the collector of internal revenue for its district a statement under oath, recomputing its original declared value in accordance with the provisions of this act.

ELIMINATION OF OATH ON INCOME-TAX RETURNS

The bill (S. 2473) to provide that individual income-tax returns may be made without the formality of an oath, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] if the intention and purpose of this bill is to permit the filing of unverified income-tax returns.

Mr. WALSH. No. The purpose of the bill is to eliminate the requirement that individual tax returns shall be made under oath. The bill provides that the individual taxpayer will be guilty of perjury, and may be prosecuted for perjury, in case he knowingly makes false statements in the return.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is a well-established principle of law that there can be no perjury where an oath is not administered and violated. To provide that a man shall be guilty of perjury for merely making a statement as to which he is not required to take an oath seems to me, to say the least, a very unusual provision of law. What is the object of it?

Mr. WALSH. I will state to the Senator that such a provision of law has existed for years in the State of Massachusetts in the requirements of taxpayers making out individual tax returns, and prosecutions have been made under it; and this bill follows the provisions of that law. I will also say to the Senator that the Treasury Department report that in several cases they have been unable to prosecute where oaths have been administered, because the oaths were improperly administered, or there was the appearance of authority to administer the oaths where there was not such authority.

I will read a few lines from the Secretary of the Treasury on that point:

The Department has, on several occasions in recent years, considered suggestions that the statutory requirement for making income returns under oath be eliminated and that a statement similar to that now proposed in S. 4257 be substituted therefor. After a careful review of the relevant considerations, I am convinced that the arguments raised against eliminating the oath on income returns are not of sufficient weight to warrant objection on the part of the Department to the purpose of the proposed legislation. The experience of the Department is that there has been a frequent disregard of the prescribed formalities incident to the administering of oaths by notaries public and other persons authorized to administer oaths. As a result much of the solemnity and psychological effect usually attached to the proper administering of an oath is lost. Because of some formal defect in the administering of the oath, the Government, in numerous instances, has been unable to prosecute taxpayers for perjury for false statements made in their income returns.

It will suffice to state, without entering into a detailed discussion of the relative significance, merits, and effect of an oath as compared with a statement made under the penalties of perjury as proposed, that I am of the opinion that such a statesment as is proposed in S. 4257 would discourage the making of dishonest returns at least as effectively as the present requirement of an oath.

Mr. President, this bill, if enacted into law, will remove some delays and inconveniences to income-tax payers and also will aid somewhat the Government in prosecuting taxpayers for false statements in their income-tax returns.

Let me add, further, that the Treasury Department are now contemplating the presentation of a similar bill to apply to statements made by employers and employees under the social security law, because of the numerous complaints which have been made of the inconvenience, expense, and trouble to which employers and employees are put in making out the large number of reports that now have to be made under oath.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the bill go over today, in order that I may look into it.

Mr. WALSH. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 106) to establish the Farmers' Home Corporation, to encourage and promote the ownership of farm homes and to make the possession of such homes more secure, to provide for the general welfare of the United States, to provide additional credit facilities for agricultural development, to create a fiscal agent for the United States, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

AGREEMENTS UNDER AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

The bill (S. 2229) to permit Members of Congress to enter into agreements under agricultural programs was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, what is the purpose of this bill?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I introduced the bill at the request of a number of Members of Congress.

Some Members of Congress are engaged in the business of farming. They are unable to enter into the conservation contracts which are expected to be made by farmers generally, because of a provision of the statutes which passed some time ago. Some of them have been embarrassed by being asked by farmers if they had signed the contract and having to reply that they could not do so because the law did not allow them to do so; and they thought no possible harm could come from permitting Members of the Congress to enter into conservation contracts.

It is a matter which I understand is favored by representatives of the Department, although I introduced the bill at the instance of a number of Members of Congress who themselves did not wish to introduce it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let the bill go over for this call of the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

MAURICE D. PRYOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1626) to amend the military record of Maurice D. Pryor, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers Maurice D. Pryor (Army serial no. 2384655) shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged as a private, Company A, One Hundred and Forty-fourth Machine Gun Battalion, United States Army, on February 13, 1919: *Provided*, That no pension, bounty, compensation, benefit, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this Act, with the exception of that provided in the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended and supplemented: *Provided*, That the said Maurice D. Pryor makes application for the benefits of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act within 1 year from the date of the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Maurice D. Pryor."

PUGET SOUND BRIDGE, WASHINGTON

The bill (H. R. 4711) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Puget Sound at or near a point commonly known as The Narrows, in the State of Washington, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS IN THE PHILIPPINES

The bill (S. 2349) to authorize the administration of oaths by the chief clerk and the assistant chief clerk of the office of United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby conferred upon the chief clerk and the assistant chief clerk, respectively, of the office of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands the authority whenever either of them is required or deems it necessary or proper so to do at any place within the territorial limits of the Commonwealth of the Philippines to administer to or take from any person an oath, affirmation, affidavit, or deposition, and to perform any notarial act which any notary public is required or authorized by law to do within the United States or any of its possessions. Every such oath, affirmation, affidavit, deposition, and notarial act administered, sworn, affirmed, taken, had, or done, by or before such chief clerk or assistant chief clerk when certified under their respective hands and accompanied by a certificate attesting the official position of the person certifying as such chief clerk or assistant chief clerk, under the hand and the seal of office of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands or of the Acting United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, shall be as valid, and of like force and effect within the United States and its possessions, to all intents and purposes, as if administered, sworn, affirmed, taken, had, or done by or before any other person within the United States or its possessions duly authorized and competent thereto.

SEC. 2. Any person who shall willfully and corruptly misstate, or by any means procure any person to misstate, any material fact or matter in any such oath, affirmation, affidavit, or deposition, or shall forge any of the signatures of the seal hereinbefore mentioned or shall tender in evidence any of the documents heretofore mentioned with a false or counterfeit seal or signature thereto, knowing the same to be false or counterfeit, may be charged and tried in any court of the United States or of its possessions, including the Commonwealth of the Philippines, within whose territorial jurisdiction he may be found, and upon conviction of any offense herein described shall be imprisoned for not less than 1 nor more than 3 years and fined in a sum not to exceed $3,000.

SEC. 3. Any document mentioned herein purporting to have subscribed thereto or thereon the signature of the official administering or taking the same in testimony thereof, when accompanied by the above-mentioned certificate of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands or of the Acting United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, shall be admitted in evidence without proof of the genuineness of the signature or seal of any official herein mentioned or of the official position of such official.

ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF SENIOR CIRCUIT JUDGES

The bill (H. R. 2703) to provide for the representation of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia on the Annual Conference of Senior Circuit Judges was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL SAFETY STANDARDS COMMISSION

T. bill (S. 18) to establish a National Safety Standards Commission to reduce the danger of accidents at highway grade crossings, and drawbridges, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Let this bill go over.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. President, will not the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I had no objection to this bill in its original form, but it seems to me it has been amended in important respects, and I have had no opportunity to read or to study the amendments. I think other Members on the minority side of the committee have had no opportunity to know what the effect of the amendments would be. I should like to have the bill go over for the time being.

Mr. LONERGAN. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

INSURANCE AGAINST LOSS OR DAMAGE IN SHIPMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6635) to dispense with the necessity for insurance by the Government against loss or damage to valuables in shipment, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That as soon as practicable after the approval of this act the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General shall, jointly, with the approval of the President, prescribe regulations governing the shipment of valuables by the executive departments, independent establishments, agencies, wholly owned corporations, officers, and employees of the United States, with a view to minimizing risks of loss and destruction of, and damage to, such valuables in shipment. After the effective date of such regulations, which shall be not more than 30 days after their issuance, it shall be the duty of every such executive department, independent establishment, agency, wholly owned corporation, officer, and employee, and of every person acting for him or it, or at his or its direction, to comply with such regulations in making any shipment of valuables.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500,000 to be used, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, for the replacement of valuables, or the value thereof, lost, destroyed, or damaged in the course of shipment effected pursuant to the regulations prescribed under section 1. There is hereby further authorized to be appropriated annually, beginning with the fiscal year 1939 and ending with the fiscal year 1948, inclusive, the sum of $200,000 for the said purposes, and from time to time such additional sums as may be necessary for the said purposes. There shall be in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund, to be known as "the fund for the payment of Government losses in shipment" (hereinafter referred to as "the fund"), to be constituted of the said sum of $500,000 and the sums hereafter appropriated for the said purposes, together with all recoveries and repayments credited to the fund as hereinafter provided. There is hereby further authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000, for expenditure under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, to be used for the payment of administrative expenses, including personal services, necessary to carry out the provisions of this act for the fiscal year 1938.

SEC. 3. In the event of loss or destruction of, or damage to, valuables of which shipment shall have been made pursuant to the regulations prescribed under section 1, a claim in writing for replacement shall be made upon the Secretary of the Treasury who, if he shall be satisfied that such loss, destruction, or damage has occurred and that shipment was made substantially in accordance with such regulations, shall cause replacement to be made out of the fund through such officers as he may designate. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the decision of the Secretary of the Treasury that such loss, destruction, or damage has occurred or that such shipment was made substantially in accordance with such regulations shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review by any other officer of the United States: *Provided, however*, That where the Secretary of the Treasury determines that such replacement can be effected, in whole or in part, without actual or ultimate injury to the United States, by a credit in the accounts of the executive department, independent establishment, agency, officer, employee, or other accountable person making the claim he shall not resort to the fund, except to the extent that such replacement cannot be so effected by such credit, but shall certify such determination to the Comptroller General and, upon receipt of such certification, the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to make such credit in the settlement of accounts in the General Accounting Office: *Provided further*, That the fund shall not be available with respect to any loss, destruction, or damage affecting valuables of which shipment shall have been made by or on behalf of the Public Debt Service of the Treasury Department, insofar as such loss, destruction, or damage is chargeable against the indefinite appropriation "Expenses of loans, act of September 24, 1917, as amended and extended" (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 31, secs. 760, 761): *And provided further*, That the fund shall not be available with respect to any loss, destruction, or damage affecting valuables, insofar as such loss, destruction, or damage may be adjusted by the Postmaster General under the provisions of the act of March 17, 1882, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 39, sec. 49); nor shall it be available with respect to any loss, destruction, or damage affecting valuables of which shipment shall have been made at the risk of persons other than the United States, its executive departments, independent establishments, agencies, wholly owned corporations, officers, and employees. All recoveries and repayments on account of loss, destruction, or damage to valuables of which replacement shall have been made out of the fund shall be credited to it and shall be available for the purposes thereof.

SEC. 4. On and after the effective date of the regulations prescribed under section 1, no executive department, independent establishment, agency, wholly owned corporation, officer, or employee shall expend any money, or incur any obligation, for insurance, or for the payment of premiums on insurance, against loss, destruction, or damage in the shipment of valuables except

as specifically authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury may give such authorization if he shall find that the risk of loss, destruction, or damage in such shipment cannot be adequately guarded against by the facilities of the United States or that the circumstances are such that adequate replacement cannot be provided under this act.

SEC. 5. Every officer and employee of the United States and every person acting on behalf of a wholly owned corporation who makes a shipment of valuables in good faith pursuant to and substantially in accordance with the regulations prescribed under section 1 shall be deemed, insofar as there may be concerned the propriety with respect to such shipment of any act or omission governed by such regulations, to be acting in faithful execution of his duties of office and in full performance of the conditions of his bond and oath of office, if any.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Treasury shall have power, with the approval of the President, to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the execution of the functions vested in him by this act, and may for such purpose require persons making shipment of valuables or making claims for replacement to make such declarations or to furnish him with such other information as he may deem necessary.

SEC. 7. For the purposes of this act—

(a) The term "valuables" means any article or thing or representative of value in which the United States has any interest, or in connection with which it has any obligation or responsibility, direct or indirect, and which is of, or is similar to, a class or kind of article or thing or representative of value which it has been the practice heretofore of the United States to insure, as the insured party, against loss, destruction, or damage in shipment, and includes, but is not limited to, coin, specie, bullion, currency, bonds, coupons, debentures, bills, notes, certificates of indebtedness, certificates of deposit, mortgages, assignments, certificates of stock, warehouse receipts, checks, trust receipts, warrants, stamps, and any other securities, papers, or materials of value, whether complete, incomplete, mutilated, in definitive form, or represented by interim documents; the term "United States" as used in this subsection means the United States or any of its executive departments, independent establishments, agencies, wholly owned corporations, officers, or employees;

(b) The term "shipment" means the transportation, or the effecting of transportation, of valuables, without limitation as to the means or facilities used or by which the transportation, is effected or the person to whom it is made, and includes, but is not limited to, shipments made to any executive department, independent establishment, agency, wholly or partly owned corporation, officer, or employee of the United States, or any person acting on his or its behalf or at his or its direction;

(c) The term "wholly owned corporation" means any corporation, regardless of the law or laws under which it is incorporated, the capital of which is entirely owned, directly or indirectly, by the United States, and includes the duly authorized officers, employees, and agents thereof;

(d) The term "replacement" means payment, reimbursement, replacement, or duplication or the expenses incident thereto.

SEC. 8. (a) Whenever it is clearly proved to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury—

(1) That any interest-bearing security of the United States, identified by number and description, payable to bearer or so assigned as to become, in effect, payable to bearer, has been wholly or partly destroyed, or so mutiliated or defaced as to impair its value to the owner, or has been lost or stolen under such circumstances, and such a period of time having elapsed after it has matured or has become redeemable pursuant to a call for redemption, as in the judgment of the Secretary would indicate that it has been destroyed or irretrievably lost, is not held by any person as his own property and will never become the basis of a valid claim against the United States; or

(2) That any interest-bearing security of the United States, identified by number and description, which is not payable to bearer and which has not been so assigned as to become, in effect, payable to bearer, has been lost or stolen, so that it is not held by any person as his own property, or has been wholly or partly destroyed, or so mutilated or defaced as to impair its value to the owner;

the Secretary, upon receipt and approval by him of a bond of indemnity, if and as required by subsection (b) hereof, shall, in the case of a security which has not matured or become redeemable pursuant to a call for redemption, issue a substitute marked "duplicate" and showing the serial number of the original security; or shall, in the case of a security which has matured or become redeemable pursuant to a call for redemption, make payment thereof to the owner, with such interest only as would have been paid had the security been presented when it became due and payable: *Provided*, That in the case of an interim certificate relief may be given by the issue of a definitive security, whether before or after maturity, rather than by the issue of a substitute or by payment: *And provided further*, That no payment shall be made on account of interest coupons claimed to have been attached to such original security unless the Secretary is satisfied that such coupons have not been paid, and are in fact destroyed or can never become the basis of a valid claim against the United States.

(b) Except as hereinafter provided, the owner of such lost, stolen, destroyed, mutiliated, or defaced security shall file with the Secretary of the Treasury a bond, to indemnify the United States, in such form and amount and with such surety, sureties, or security as the Secretary of the Treasury shall require: *Provided*, That in case of securities payable to bearer or so assigned as to become, in effect, payable to bearer, the destruction of which has not been proved, a corporate surety, qualified under the provisions of the act of August 13, 1894, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 6, secs. 6–13), shall be required on such bond of indemnity: *And provided further*, That a bond of indemnity shall not be required in any of the following classes of cases, except as hereinafter provided:

(1) If the Secretary of the Treasury is satisfied that the loss, theft, destruction, mutilation, or defacement, as the case may be, occurred without fault of the owner and while the security was in the custody or the control of the United States (not including the Postal Service when acting solely in its capacity as the public carrier of the mails), or of a person thereunto duly authorized as lawful agent of the United States, or while it was in the course of shipment effected pursuant to and in accordance with the regulations issued under the provisions of this act.

(2) If substantially the entire security is presented and surrendered by the owner and the Secretary of the Treasury is satisfied as to the identity of the security presented and that any missing portions are not sufficient to form the basis of a valid claim against the United States.

(3) If the lost, stolen, destroyed, mutilated, or defaced security is one which by the provisions of law or by the terms of its issue is transferable only by operation of law.

(4) If the owner is a State or political subdivision thereof, a corporation the whole of whose capital is owned by the United States, a foreign government or a Federal Reserve bank:

Provided, however, That in any of the foregoing classes of cases the Secretary of the Treasury may require a bond of indemnity if he deems it essential to the public interest.

(c) The term "interest-bearing security of the United States" or "security", wherever used in this section, means any direct obligation of the United States issued pursuant to law for valuable consideration and which by its terms bears interest, or is issued on a discount basis, and includes (but is not limited to) bonds, notes, certificates of indebtedness, and Treasury bills, and interim certificates issued for any such security.

(d) The Secretary of the Treasury shall have the power to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the administration of this section.

(e) Sections 3702, as amended, 3703, 3704, and 3705 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 31, secs. 735, 736, 737, and 738) are hereby repealed.

SEC. 9. Section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 31, sec. 528), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as hereinafter provided, whenever it is clearly proved to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that any original check of the United States is lost, stolen, or wholly or partly destroyed, or is so mutilated or defaced as to impair its value to its owner or holder, persons authorized to issue such checks on behalf of the United States are authorized, before the close of the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the original check was issued, to issue to the owner or holder thereof a substitute, marked 'duplicate' and showing the number, date, and payee of the original check, upon the receipt and approval by the Secretary of the Treasury of a bond, to indemnify the United States, in such form and amount and with such surety, sureties, or security as the Secretary of the Treasury shall require; but no such substitute shall be payable if the original check shall first have been paid: *Provided, however*, That the authority herein conferred to issue substitute checks may, in the case of checks issued on account of public-debt obligations and transactions regarding the administration of banking and currency laws, be issued without limitation of time.

"(b) A bond of indemnity shall not be required under subsection (a) of this section in any of the following classes of cases except as hereinafter provided: (1) If the Secretary of the Treasury is satisfied that the loss, theft, destruction, mutilation, or defacement, as the case may be, occurred without fault of the owner or holder and while the check was in the custody or control of the United States (not including the Postal Service when acting solely in its capacity as the public carrier of the mails), or of a person thereunto duly authorized as lawful agent of the United States, or while it was in the course of shipment effected pursuant to and in accordance with the regulations issued under the provisions of the Government Losses in Shipment Act; (2) if substantially the entire check is presented and surrendered by the owner or holder and the Secretary of the Treasury is satisfied as to the identity of the check presented and that any missing portions are not sufficient to form the basis of a valid claim against the United States; (3) if the Secretary of the Treasury is satisfied that the original check is not negotiable and cannot be made the basis of a valid claim against the United States; (4) if the amount of the check is less than $50 and the Secretary of the Treasury is satisfied that the giving of a bond of indemnity would be an undue hardship to the owner or holder; (5) if the owner or holder is a State or political subdivision thereof, a corporation the whole of whose capital is owned by the United States, a foreign government, or a Federal Reserve bank: *Provided, however*, That in any of the foregoing classes of cases the Secretary of the Treasury may require a bond of indemnity if he deems it essential to the public interest.

"(c) The Secretary of the Treasury shall have the power to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the administration of the provisions of this section.

"(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, whenever any original check of the Post Office Department has been lost, stolen, or destroyed, the Postmaster General may authorize the issuance of a substitute, marked 'duplicate' and showing the number, date, and payee of the original check, before the close of the fiscal year following

the fiscal year in which the original check was issued, upon the execution by the owner thereof of such bond of indemnity as the Postmaster General may prescribe: *Provided*, That when such original check does not exceed in amount the sum of $50 and the payee or owner is, at the date of the application, an officer or employee in the service of the Post Office Department, whether by contract, designation, or appointment, the Postmaster General may, in lieu of an indemnity bond, authorize the issuance of a substitute check or warrant upon such an affidavit as he may prescribe, to be made before any postmaster by the payee or owner of an original check.

"(e) Substitutes, marked as hereinabove provided, drawn on the Treasurer of the United States, shall, after the lapse of the period fixed by section 21 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934 (48 Stat. 1235; U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 31, sec. 725 (t)), for the payment of the original checks, be payable only as the original checks would be payable thereunder.

"(f) The term 'original check' wherever used in this section means any check, warrant, or other order for the payment of money, payable upon demand and not bearing interest, drawn by a duly authorized officer or agent of the United States on its behalf against an account or funds of the United States, whether upon a bank or upon the Treasurer or other paying officer of the United States, but does not include money, coins, or currency of the United States nor instruments issued by any corporation or other entity owned or controlled by the United States, whether in whole or in part, against such corporation's or entity's own funds; as used in subsection (d) of this section it means such an instrument drawn by a duly authorized officer or employee of the Post Office Department."

SEC. 10. This act may be cited as the "Government Losses in Shipment Act."

SEC. 11. This act shall become effective on July 1, 1937.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RELIEF OF THE FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD NATIONAL STEAMSHIP COMPANIES

The resolution (S. Res. 147) referring the bill (S. 2609) for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos. to the Court of Claims for findings of fact, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 2609) entitled "A bill for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos.", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary", approved March 3, 1911; and the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

E. P. LEWIS

The bill (H. R. 3075) for the relief of E. P. Lewis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DOMINGA PARDO

The bill (H. R. 1689) for the relief of Dominga Pardo, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. J. C. PORTER

The bill (H. R. 2983) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Porter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANK S. WALKER

The bill (H. R. 1406) for the relief of Frank S. Walker was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FLORIDA O. M'LAIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2229) for the relief of Florida O. McLain, widow of Calvin E. McLain, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "Treasury", to strike out "not otherwise appropriated" and to insert "allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps", and on line 8, to strike out "$5,000" and to insert "$2,500", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, and in full settlement of all claims against the United States, the sum of $2,500 to Florida O. McLain, widow of Calvin E. McLain, who died as a result of injuries by reason of being struck by a truck which was being recklessly driven by an employee of the Government Civilian Conservation Corps in the city of Knoxville, Tenn., on August 23, 1934: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

LAURA E. ALEXANDER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3259) for the relief of Laura E. Alexander, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$6,349" and insert "$5,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Laura E. Alexander, of Asheville, N. C., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, expenses incident thereto, and the subsequent death of her husband, Samuel H. Alexander, who was shot and permanently disabled February 8, 1901, while acting as assistant postmaster at Emma, N. C., in defending the post office against attempted robbery by armed bandits, and who died January 5, 1920, as a result of said disability: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CLAIM OF THE CITY OF PERTH AMBOY, N. J.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2146) to amend the act entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the city of Perth Amboy, N. J., approved July 23, 1935, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the city of Perth Amboy, N. J.", approved July 23, 1935, be amended to read as follows: "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment for just and fair compensation upon the claim of the city of Perth Amboy, N. J., against the United States upon its merits and according to the equities of the case with a view of reimbursing the claimant for money expended in 1918, 1919, and 1920 by the city of Perth Amboy, N. J., growing out of an agreement, formal or informal, or otherwise, with the United States to extend the city's water system for the purpose of supplying water to the Raritan Arsenal and Colonia Base Hospital, No. 2, less the present estimated value of the equipment installed under such agreement.

"SEC. 2. That the suit heretofore instituted under the act of which this is amendatory, by the city of Perth Amboy, N. J., against the United States in the Court of Claims, no. 43325, shall proceed under this act, notwithstanding any lapse of time, laches, or any statute of limitations or any defense, except that said city shall be required to give sufficient assurance to the United States that it will preserve the facilities for furnishing water on account of which this claim is made and will not destroy or render them unfit for use except with the consent of the Secretary of War. Official letters, papers, documents, and public records or certified copies thereof from the files and records of the United States relating to the subject matter in controversy in said suit may be used in evidence by either party and the departments of the United States Government shall give the attorneys for both parties access to such papers, correspondence, and documents as are in the files. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended."

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama, who I see reported the bill, what changes are proposed by this measure in the act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to determine this claim.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, the changes are very simple. About 2 years ago the Committee on Claims reported favorably a bill, and it was passed, which authorized the city of Perth Amboy, N. J., to file suit against the Government and have the case decided on the equities between the city and the Government with reference to the construction of a water system at Perth Amboy.

The controversy arose on account of the establishment of a military camp. It became necessary, because of the establishment of the camp, to have additional water. The city went through its part of the contract, seemingly, and erected the plant. In the meantime the camp was moved, and the city claims that it is entitled to damages. The committee took that viewpoint of the matter originally and passed a bill which it believed would have enabled all the equities to be decided in the court. Government counsel appeared in the court and set up the fact that under the bill as it was passed the city was limited to damages which occurred in 1 year. As a matter of fact, it took 3 years to construct the plant. Therefore there were 3 years' damages instead of 2, if it could be considered from a collective standpoint. The pending bill simply gives the city the right to recover damages which were incurred during any one of the years instead of 1 year only.

Mr. ROBINSON. What measure of damages is set up by the bill?

Mr. BLACK. The bill does not attempt to set up the measure of damages, but we attempted by very strong language, as the Senator will see if he will read it, absolutely to give the court the right to allow only the damages to which the city was equitably entitled, irrespective of what the city spent. We did not seek to set up the measure of damages.

Mr. ROBINSON. What are the damages for? Are they for moving the camp?

Mr. BLACK. The damage was occasioned by the fact that the Government agreed to use the water from this camp, as I recall. It has been some time since I went over the matter. The Government did not use the water. It was to contribute in that way to the construction of the water project.

Mr. ROBINSON. The city was induced to build the water plant by the promise of the Government to use a certain amount of water, and thus compensate the city for a portion of the construction costs?

Mr. BLACK. That is correct.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Government moved the camp away and did not carry out its contract?

Mr. BLACK. The Government did not carry out its contract with reference to the use of all the water it would have utilized.

Mr. ROBINSON. How long was it bound to use the water?

Mr. BLACK. I do not know.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator sees the pertinence of the question. Is the Government to pay damages forever to the city of Perth Amboy for the failure of the Government to keep a camp there?

Mr. BLACK. No; as I recall—although I cannot remember definitely—the original damages were limited at the outset to the amount of the cost of the additional water equipment. I reported on the bill about 2 years ago, and when the matter was brought up a short time ago I did not attempt to look into the measure of damages, but I saw that the court had precluded the city from having the equity of its case tried.

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. As I understand, the purpose of the bill is merely to give jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to determine whether or not there was any damage; and if so, how much. Is not that correct?

Mr. BLACK. And whether or not the Government should pay it.

Mr. SMATHERS. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. I will not object to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RICHARD T. EDWARDS

The bill (H. R. 5438) for the relief of Richard T. Edwards was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADELE FOWLKES

The bill (H. R. 3967) for the relief of Adele Fowlkes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLARD WEBSTER

The bill (H. R. 5496) for the relief of Willard Webster was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANK A. SMITH

The bill (H. R. 5652) for the relief of Frank A. Smith was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLIFFORD R. GEORGE AND MABLE D. GEORGE

The bill (H. R. 1310) for the relief of Clifford R. George and Mable D. George was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALLIE RANKIN

The bill (H. R. 3339) for the relief of Allie Rankin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

A. L. MALLERY

The bill (H. R. 4942) for the relief of A. L. Mallery was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. CLIFF SNIDER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1865) for the relief of Mrs. Cliff Snider, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "Treasury", to strike out "not otherwise appropriated" and to insert "allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps"; on line 10, after the words "passenger was", to strike out the words "struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck driven by an enrollee, Joe Holder" and insert "struck by a Government truck operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps"; and to insert a proviso at the end of the bill, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, to Mrs. Cliff Snider, of Smithville, Ga., the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction of all her claims against the United States for damages sustained when the automobile in which she was a passenger was struck by a Government truck operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps, on the Americus-Andersonville Highway, about 8 miles north of Americus, Ga., on October 25, 1936, resulting in the death of her husband and her own serious personal injury: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION OF MILITARY POSTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2649) to authorize appropriations for construction and rehabilitation at military posts, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, this bill was favorably reported after hearings held by the Senate Military Affairs Committee, at which the Army officers connected with the construction activities of the War Department testified. The War Department presented a construction plan involving about $162,000,000. The items in this bill were selected from the construction program of the Department and represent what the committee considered the most urgent housing needs of the Army.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the bill authorizes an appropriation of $22,993,088.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So it does; and this amount covers the most urgent housing needs of the Army, in the view of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it a part of the Army construction plan?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is a part of the Army construction plan that embraces a total authorization of approximately $162,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will there be a request for an additional appropriation this year if this measure shall be passed?

Mr. SHEPPARD. There will be no request for an appropriation this year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none. The amendments reported by the committee will be stated.

The amendments were, in section 1, page 1, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$21,460,688" and insert "$22,993,088"; at the bottom of page 3, to strike out "Total, United States, $15,090,588"; at the top of page 4, to insert:

Station	Description of construction	Amount
Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.	Barracks (250 men)	$275,000
	Barracks, quartermaster and detachments.	275,000
	Telephone construction	5,000
Total		555,000
Fort Bliss, Tex.	Barracks (250 men)	275,000
	Telephone construction	1,000
Total		276,000
Fort Devens, Mass.	Quarters, officers	107,400
	Quarters, noncommissioned officers	42,500
	Telephone, telegraph, and radio station	45,000
	Telephone construction	6,000
Total		200,900
Fort Huachuca, Ariz.	Hospital (50 beds, 32 medical detachment).	225,000
	Barracks (250 men)	275,000
	Telephone construction	500
Total		500,500
Total, United States		16,622,988

And at the end of table on page 5 to strike out "Grand total, $21,460,688" and insert "Grand total, $22,993,088", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $22,993,088, to be expended for the construction, rehabilitation, and installation at military posts of such buildings and utilities and appurtenances thereto as may be necessary, as follows:

Station	Description of construction	Amount
Army and Navy General Hospital, Hot Springs, Ark.	Quarters	$34,000
	Telephone	1,000
Total		35,000
Air Corps Technical School, Denver, Colo.	Barracks	935,000
	Hospital headquarters and administration building.	200,000
	School building	540,000
	Runways	300,000
	Grading and improving landing field	300,000
Total		2,275,000
Fort Bragg, N. C.	Barracks	412,500
	Telephone construction	1,000
Total		413,500
Carlisle Barracks, Pa.	Quarters	$238,000
	Telephone construction	3,000
	Quarters	348,000
	Sterilizing plant, etc.	35,000
	Barracks (125 men)	137,500
Total		761,500
Chanute Field, Ill.	Barracks, including mess facilities	1,035,000
	Quarters, noncommissioned officers	505,000
	Hospital	300,000
	Central heating plant, beginning	500,000
	School building	540,000
Total		2,880,000
Fort Crook, Nebr.	Barracks (addition to)	55,000
	Barracks	137,500
	Telephone construction	500
Total		193,000
Fort Du Pont, Del.	Barracks	412,500
	Telephone construction	1,000
Total		413,500
Fort Ethan Allen, Vt.	Quarters (30 noncommissioned officers)	255,000
	Telephone	2,500
Total		257,500
Fitzsimons General Hospital, Colo.	Hospital	1,750,000
	Telephone construction	20,000
Total		1,770,000
Fort Sam Houston, Tex.	Hospital (addition)	235,000
	Basement in transmitter building	4,000
	Barracks	550,000
	Telephone construction	4,000
Total		793,000
Fort Leavenworth, Kans.	Auditorium and production plant	600,000
Madison Barracks, N. Y.	Barracks	137,500
	Quarters, noncommissioned officers	136,000
	Telephone construction	1,000
	Water supply	85,000
Total		359,500
Fort McPherson, Ga.	Radio station	23,000
	Dental clinic	85,000
Total		108,000
Fort Monmouth, N. J.	Barracks	137,500
	Signal Corps laboratory	220,000
	Telephone construction	20,000
Total		377,500
Fort Monroe, Va.	Barracks, quartermaster detachment	110,000
	Barracks (addition to)	225,000
	Enlisted Specialists' School	69,500
	Telephone construction	12,000
Total		416,500
Fort Myer, Va.	Hospital addition	9,000
	Barracks Building No. 104	55,000
	Barracks (addition to)	220,000
	Telephone construction	500
Total		284,500
Fort Riley, Kans.	Academic building	400,000
	Telephone construction	5,000
Total		405,000
Fort Sill, Okla.	Barracks	330,000
	Telephone construction	1,000
Total		331,000
Fort Thomas, Ky.	Barracks	412,500
	Telephone construction	2,500
Total		415,000
Fort Washington, Md.	Quarters (officers' double)	30,000
Fort Humphreys, D. C.	Reproduction plant	74,880
	Telephone construction	3,500
Total		78,380
Headquarters Provisional Brigade and Washington Quartermaster Depot, D. C.	Barracks	1,320,000
	Land, purchase of	573,188
Total		1,893,188
Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.	Barracks (250 men)	275,000
	Barracks, quartermaster and detachments.	275,000
	Telephone construction	5,000
Total		555,000

Station	Description of construction	Amount
Fort Bliss, Tex	Barracks (250 men)	$275,000
	Telephone construction	1,000
Total		276,000
Fort Devens, Mass	Quarters, officers	107,400
	Quarters, noncommissioned officers	42,500
	Telephone, telegraph, and radio station.	45,000
	Telephone construction	6,000
Total		200,900
Fort Huachuca, Ariz	Hospital (50 beds, 32 medical detachment).	225,000
	Barracks (250 men)	275,000
	Telephone construction	500
Total		500,500
Total, United States		16,622,988
HAWAII		
Schofield Barracks	Barracks, Eleventh Field Artillery	1,256,200
	Barracks, detachments	498,300
	Telephone construction	11,000
	Barracks, detachments	283,800
Total		2,049,300
Fort Shafter	Barracks	825,000
	Telephone construction	2,500
Total		827,500
Department headquarters, Fort Shafter.	Quarters	246,500
Tripler General Hospital	Barracks, medical detachment	176,000
	Telephone construction	3,000
Total		179,000
Total, Hawaii		3,302,300
PANAMA		
Fort Clayton	Barracks	825,000
	Telephone	3,000
	Barracks	687,500
	Telephone construction	2,000
Total		1,517,500
Corozal General Depot	Barracks	454,300
	Telephone construction	5,000
Total		459,300
Fort Davis	Barracks	550,000
	Telephone construction	3,000
Total		553,000
Fort de Lesseps	Barracks	120,000
Fort Kobbe	do	55,000
	Warehouse and shops	20,000
	Special project	7,000
	Water tank	8,000
Total		90,000
Panama Canal Zone	Rehabilitation	328,000
Total, Panama		3,067,800
Grand total		22,993,088

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to establish in or near Denver, Colo., an extension to the Air Corps Technical School and to accept on behalf of the United States, free from encumbrance or conditions and without cost to the United States, for use as a site for the extension to such school, the title in fee simple to 960 acres of land, more or less, within and without the city limits of the city of Denver, Colo., including the property known as the "Agnes (Phipps) Memorial Sanitarium", together with existing buildings and equipment located thereon; and, also, a tract of land, within the State of Colorado, suitable for use as an aerial gunnery and bombing range by the Army Air Corps: *Provided*, That in the event a donor is unable to perfect title to any land tendered as a donation, condemnation of such land is authorized in the name of the United States, and payment of any and all awards for title to such land as is condemned, together with the cost of suit, shall be made by the donor.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SELECTION OF MIDSHIPMAN FROM CANAL ZONE AND REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2276) to provide for an additional midshipman at the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be at the United States Naval Academy one midshipman to be selected from among the sons of civilians residing in the Canal Zone and the sons of civilian employees of the United States Government and the Panama Railroad Co. residing in the Republic of Panama, whose appointment shall be made by the Secretary of the Navy on the recommendation of the Governor of the Panama Canal.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, this bill merely provides for the selection and appointment of a midshipman from the Canal Zone. It is similar to a bill pending before the Military Affairs Committee for the appointment of a cadet to the Military Academy at West Point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

W. G. ADAMS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2241) for the relief of W. G. Adams, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the word "Treasury", to strike out "not otherwise appropriated" and insert "allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, to W. G. Adams the sum of $500 in full satisfaction for his claim against the United States for damages arising out of personal injuries suffered when he was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck, near Flagstaff, Ariz., on September 8, 1936: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LAWSON N. DICK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 821) for the relief of Lawson N. Dick, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, page 1, line 9, after the word "to", to strike out "the date of enactment of this act" and insert "August 28, 1934", and at the end of the section to insert a proviso, so as to make the section read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lawson N. Dick, an employee in the office of the Mississippi River Commission at Vicksburg, Miss., a sum equal to $60 per annum from July 1, 1928, to July 2, 1930, plus $120 per annum from July 3, 1930, to August 28, 1934, less 3½-percent retirement deductions which shall be credited to his account in the civil-service retirement and disability fund, such sum representing additional compensation to which he is entitled under the provisions of the act of May 28, 1928, known as the Welch Act, and the act of July 3, 1930, known as the Brookhart Act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out section 2 in the following words:

SEC. 2. The annual rate of compensation of said Lawson N. Dick is hereby increased by $120 as of the date of enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS AT SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

The bill (S. 2629) to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to transfer to the city of San Diego, Calif., free from all encumbrances and without cost to said city of San Diego, all right, title, and interest to the land contained within that part of the Naval Supply Depot described as follows:

All that portion of the former military reservation heretofore known as the San Diego Barracks, situated in the city of San Diego, State of California, comprising block 31 of New San Diego according to the map of New San Diego made by A. B. Gray and J. D. Johns, and on file in the office of the county recorder of San Diego County, said lot being also shown on P. W. drawing no. NT4–4/31–13(2), bearing the legend "Naval Operating Base, San Diego, California, Supply Depot, Block 31—New San Diego, Transferred from War Department to Navy Department by Executive Order 7451 dated September 17, 1936",

in consideration of the transfer to the United States by said city of San Diego, free from all encumbrances and without cost to the United States of all right, title, and interest to the lands contained within the following-described areas:

Parcel no. 1: Beginning at the northeast corner of block 18, according to map of municipal tidelands subdivision tract no. 1, filed in the office of the city clerk of the city of San Diego and numbered Document No. 100007; thence north 89°58'20" W. along the northerly boundary of said block 18, 200 feet to its northwesterly corner; thence south 0°1'40" W. on a line parallel to and distant 200 feet easterly from the existing United States bulkhead line for the bay of San Diego, a distance of 300.15 feet to a point; thence south 89°58'20" E. at right angles to last-described course a distance of 200 feet to a point; thence north 0°1'40" E. at right angles to the last-described course, a distance of 300.15 feet to the point or place of beginning, containing 60,030 square feet, or 1.3781 acres of land, more or less.

Parcel no. 2: Beginning at the northwesterly corner of block 19, according to map of municipal tidelands subdivision tract no. 1, filed in the office of the city clerk of the city of San Diego, and numbered Document No. 100007; thence south 0°1'40" W. on a line parallel to and distant 500 feet easterly from the existing United States bulkhead line for the bay of San Diego a distance of 300.15 feet to a point; thence south 89°58'20" E. at right angles to the last-described course a distance of 180.16 feet to a point; thence north 0°1'40" E. on a line parallel to and distant 680.16 feet easterly from the said United States bulkhead line a distance of 300.15 feet to a point; thence north 89°58'20" W. at right angles to the last-described course a distance of 180.16 feet to the point or place of beginning, containing 54,075 square feet or 1.2414 acres of land, more or less.

JOHN PROSSER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2418) for the relief of John Prosser, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,000'" and insert "$400", and at the end of the bill to insert a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Prosser, of Turtle Lake, Wis., the sum of $400 in full satisfaction of all his claims against the United States for injuries received by him while participating in the arrest of two known post-office burglars: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOIS H. ANTHONY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2301) for the relief of Lois H. Anthony, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to cancel the charges, in the amount of $8,819.36, entered on the accounts of Lois H. Anthony, as clerk in charge of the post office at the Navy Yard, Boston, Mass., by reason of the disallowance by the General Accounting Office of payments made to the said Lois H. Anthony by the Post Office Department for her services in conducting such post office during the period from December 6, 1926, to June 1, 1936.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill was introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, this bill is recommended by the Post Office Department, by the Commandant of the United States Navy Yard at Boston, and by the Comptroller General. The purpose of the bill is to authorize and direct the Comptroller General to cancel the charges, in the amount of $8,819.36, entered on the accounts of Lois H. Anthony, as clerk in charge of the post office at the navy yard at Boston, Mass., by reason of the disallowance by the General Accounting Office of payments made to Lois H. Anthony by the Post Office Department for her services in conducting such post office during the period from December 6, 1926, to June 1, 1936.

The bill has the approval of the Postmaster General.

According to the records of the Post Office Department the facts are as follows: Miss Anthony, an employee of the Navy Department, was designated several years ago to serve as clerk in charge of the yard post office and, as such clerk in charge, she received compensation from the Post Office Department each month, the greater portion of which was turned over to assistants employed by her in the station. Eventually the Comptroller General reached the conclusion that no legal authority existed for compensating a person who was already a regular civil-service employee for conducting a contract station on Federal premises. The General Accounting Office disallowed a total amount of $8,819.36, covering payments made to Miss Anthony over a 10-year period. The Post Office Department requested a reconsideration of the Comptroller General's decision, pointing out that practically all of the compensation received by Miss Anthony was disbursed to assistants and represented services actually rendered, from which the Government benefited. However, the Comptroller General reaffirmed his original decision and declined to approve Miss Anthony's accounts.

Mr. McKELLAR. Those under Miss Anthony performed the work, and she has been paid for it; and, as I understand, the General Acounting Office disapproved the bill on the ground that there was no authority of law for the payments?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. And this bill is to validate the payments?

Mr. WALSH. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HEINRICH SCHMIDT, OF FLENSBURG, GERMANY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 676) for the relief of Heinrich Schmidt, G. m. b. H., of Flensburg, Germany, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment at the end of the bill to add a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Heinrich Schmidt, G. m. b. H., of Flensburg, Germany, owner of the steamship *Pollux*, of German registry, the sum of $1,151 in full satisfaction of all claims of such Heinrich Schmidt, G. m. b. H., against the United States resulting from the levy and collection by the United States of certain taxes, pursuant to sections 4219 and 4225 of the Revised Statutes, on the tonnage of such steamship *Pollux*, at the port of Baltimore, Md., on March 9, 1920, similar taxes having subsequently been held in the cases of *The Sophie Rickmers* (45 F. (2d) 413) and *Flensburger Dampfercampagnie* (73 Ct. Cls. 646) to be invalid as to ships of such registry: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR LOSSES BY NAVY MEN IN OHIO VALLEY FLOOD, 1937

The bill (S. 2647) to provide for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men and former enlisted men of the Navy for the value of personal effects lost while engaged in emergency relief expeditions during the Ohio Valley flood in January and February 1937 was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $545.75, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, enlisted men and former enlisted men of the Navy for the value of personal effects lost while engaged in emergency relief expeditions during the Ohio Valley flood in January and February 1937: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claims. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claims, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ISSUANCE OF BONDS, ETC., BY TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The bill (S. 2653) to amend an act entitled "An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the issuance of certain bonds, and for other purposes", approved August 3, 1935, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, Calendar Nos. 782, 783, 784, and 785 are bills which deal with the issuance of bonds in connection with the Territory of Hawaii. I think we should have an explanation of the bills. I do not know that I shall object to them, but I think we should have an explanation in the Senate before the bills are passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills were reported by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who is not in the Chamber at the moment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the bills go over until another day, when they may be explained. The bills may be entirely correct, and I do not know that I shall object to them, but I should like to have an explanation before action is taken upon them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills referred to by the Senator from Tennessee, being Senate bills 2653, 2621, 2622, and 2652, will be passed over.

Mr. TYDINGS subsequently said: Mr. President, while I was out of the Chamber four or five bills dealing with matters affecting the Territory of Hawaii came up, and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] said he would like to have a brief explanation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will be glad to have the Senator ask to recur to the bills, so that he may make the explanation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to recur to the four bills remaining with Order No. 782 on the calendar, being Senate bills 2653, 2621, 2622, and 2652.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, these bills were unanimously reported by the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs. They propose to grant authority so that Hawaii may receive funds from the Government for certain purposes such as P. W. A. and W. P. A. They involve no extra money from the Federal Government, but simply put Hawaii in a position to accept and carry on certain projects there.

Mr. McKELLAR. In other words, they give Hawaii the power to match funds to such extent as may be required by the P. W. A. and the W. P. A.?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct. In the original passing of one of the acts it was not broad enough to allow Hawaii to do what the body governing the Hawaiian people want to do.

Mr. McKELLAR. It does not take any appropriation out of the Federal Treasury?

Mr. TYDINGS. Not a cent.

There is another bill, being Order of Business 796, which I should like also to have considered. This bill simply amends the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act so as to give them an additional power, with no expenditure on the part of the Federal Government. I mention it now because I am forced to be absent and I hope it will not be objected to when it comes up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bills referred to by the Senator from Maryland?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2653) to amend an act entitled "An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the issuance of certain bonds, and for other purposes", approved August 3, 1935, which was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the issuance of certain bonds, and for other purposes", approved August 3, 1935, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That the Territory of Hawaii, any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act or of any act of this Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, is authorized and empowered to issue bonds in the sum of not to exceed $4,803,000 of the character and in the manner provided in that certain act of the legislature of said Territory, enacted at its regular session of 1935, entitled 'An act to provide for public improvements and for the securing of Federal funds for expenditure in connection with funds hereby appropriated for such improvements', as amended by act 23, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1937."

The bill (S. 2621) to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue sewer bonds was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act or of any act of this Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, may authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, to issue general obligation bonds in the sum of $1,750,000 for the purpose of enabling it to construct main interceptors and trunk lines and to meet its share of expenses for the construction and extension of laterals under improvement district assessments for a sanitary sewer system in the city and county of Honolulu.

SEC. 2. The bonds issued under authority of this act may be either term or serial bonds, maturing, in the case of term bonds, not later than 30 years from the date of issue thereof, and, in the case of serial bonds, payable in substantially equal annual installments, the first installment to mature not later than 5 years and the last installment to mature not later than 30 years from the date of such issue. Such bonds may be issued without the approval of the President of the United States.

SEC. 3. Any legislation enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in its 1937 session pertaining to the issuance of sewer bonds, as authorized by this act, is hereby ratified and confirmed subject to the provisions of this act: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to prohibit the amendment of such Territorial legislation by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii from time to time to provide for changes in the improvements authorized by such legislation and for the disposition of unexpended moneys realized from the sale of said bonds.

The bill (S. 2622) to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to create a public corporate authority authorized to engage in slum clearance and housing undertakings and to issue bonds of the authority, to authorize said legislature to provide for financial assistance to said authority by the Territory and its political subdivisions, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii may create a public corporate authority to engage in slum clearance or housing undertakings, or both, within such Territory. The Legislature of said Territory may provide for the appointment and terms of the members of such authority and for the powers of such authority, except that such authority shall be given no power of taxation. The legislature may authorize the

Territory or any political or municipal corporation or subdivision thereof to make loans, donations, and conveyances and make available their facilities and services to such authority, and to take other action in aid of slum clearance or housing undertakings, and may, without regard to any Federal acts restricting the disposition of public lands of the Territory, authorize the commissioner of public lands, the Hawaiian Homes Commissioners, and any other officers of the Territory having power to manage and dispose of its public lands, to grant, convey, or lease to such authority parts of the public domain, and may provide that any of the public domain or other property acquired by such authority may be mortgaged by it as security for its bonds. The Legislature of said Territory may authorize such authority to issue bonds or other obligations of such character and maturity and in such manner as the legislature may provide. Such bonds shall not be a debt of the Territory or any political or municipal corporation or subdivision thereof, shall not constitute public indebtedness within the meaning of section 55 of the act approved April 30, 1900, entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii", as amended, and shall not constitute bonds of the Territory of Hawaii within the meaning of the act approved August 3, 1935, entitled "An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the issuance of certain bonds, and for other purposes." All legislation heretofore enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii dealing with the subject matter of this act and not inconsistent herewith is hereby ratified and confirmed.

The bill (S. 2652) to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the issuance of certain bonds, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Territory of Hawaii, any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act or of any act of this Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, is authorized and empowered to issue bonds in the sum of not to exceed $4,029,000 of the character and in the manner provided in that certain act of the legislature of said Territory, enacted at its regular session of 1937, entitled "An act to provide for public improvements."

Such bonds may be either term or serial bonds, maturing, in the case of the term bonds, not later than 30 years from the date of issue thereof, and, in the case of the serial bonds, payable in substantially equal annual installments, the first installment to mature not later than 5 years and the last installment to mature not later than 30 years, from the date of such issue. And said act of said legislature is hereby ratified and confirmed, subject to the provisions of this act: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to prohibit the amendment of said act of said Territory by the legislature thereof from time to time to provide for changes in the improvements authorized by said act or for the disposition of unexpended moneys appropriated by said act, and that said bonds may be issued without the approval of the President of the United States.

HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION

The bill (S. 2620) to amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McNARY subsequently said: Mr. President, I inquire what became of Order of Business 796, being Senate bill 2620, to amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920. Evidently that bill has not been called.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] included the consideration of Order of Business 796 in an omnibus request for the consideration of a number of bills relating to Hawaii, and the bill was passed a few moments ago. I heard him specifically refer to the Hawaiian Homes Commission.

Mr. McNARY. I wish to look into that bill and I want it to go over for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent that Order of Business 796, being Senate bill 2620, be passed over for the day. In order to keep the record straight, the Chair suggests that the Senator from Oregon ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. McNARY. I make that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, the vote is reconsidered, and the bill will be returned to the calendar.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ON BILL TO REORGANIZE FEDERAL JUDICIARY

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report No. 711, Seventy-fifth Congress, on the bill (S. 1392) to reorganize the judicial branch of the Government, which had been reported from the Committee on Printing with an amendment, on page 1, line 2, after the word "printed", to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty"; in line 5, after the word "which", to strike out "ten" and insert "seven"; and in line 7, before the word "thousand", to strike out "forty" and insert "twenty-three", so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That there shall be printed 30,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 711, current session, on the bill (S. 1392) to reorganize the judicial branch of the Government, of which 7,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room and 23,000 copies for the use of the House document room.

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED AIRCRAFT CORPORATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1882) for the relief of the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$113,085.85. Such sum represents" and insert "$92,993.40 in full settlement of all claims against the United States", and at the end of the bill to insert a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation the sum of $92,993.40 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for additional costs incurred by such corporation in the performance of a contract with the Department of War dated February 27, 1933 (contract no. W 535 AC–5732 (1790)): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INDIANS OF FORT BERTHOLD RESERVATION, N. DAK.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 642) for the relief of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $400,000 in full and final settlement of all claims and demands of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota, composed of the Arickarees, Gros Ventres, and Mandans, which claims are based upon stipulations of an unratified treaty dated July 27, 1866 (Kappler's Laws and Treaties, vol. 2, p. 1052): *Provided*, That the amount when appropriated shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation and shall draw interest in accordance with existing laws: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 10 percent of the amount herein authorized may be used by the Secretary of the Interior for payment of fees and expenses of attorneys employed under contract approved in accordance with existing law.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have a statement concerning that bill?

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, in 1920 a bill was passed by the Congress allowing the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota to come into the Court of Claims to establish claims against the Government. A claim was allowed of a little over $4,000,000; and in the gratuity offsets, amounting to $2,700,000, was included an item of $400,000 which dated back to a treaty of 1866, in which the Government of the United States agreed to pay the Indians $20,000 a year for certain concessions and for uses of land for a period of 20 years.

The treaty was never ratified by the Congress, but the Government carried out this provision by paying the Indians $20,000 a year for 20 years, amounting to $400,000. The Government got the use of the land that was agreed to during that time.

When the bill came up before the Court of Claims, this $400,000, which represented the payment of $20,000 a year for 20 years, was allowed by the court as a gratuity offset. The Indians and their attorneys felt that that particular offset

should not have been included, because it was money paid by the Government to the Indians for value received under their treaty. The Secretary of the Interior last year, in his report, stated:

> The claim * * * has no legal standing.

That, of course, is because the treaty was not ratified.

> There is nevertheless a moral obligation on the part of the Government which has not been fulfilled, and in my opinion the legislation will do justice to this group of Indians.

Of course, in the report this year it is stated that the bill is not in accordance with the President's financial program. However, a moral obligation exists. The Indians are entitled to what they claim. The Committee on Indian Affairs, unanimously reported the bill favorably, and I believe the claim is justified.

Mr. McKELLAR. How many Indians are involved?

Mr. FRAZIER. About 1,700 or 1,800, as I remember.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARCH HURLEY CONSERVANCY DISTRICT, N. MEX.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2086) to authorize appropriations for the construction of the Arch Hurley conservancy district in New Mexico, which had been reported from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, to strike out "That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $6,000,000 for the construction of the Arch Hurley Conservancy District in New Mexico" and in lieu thereof to insert "That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to construct a Federal reclamation project for the irrigation of the lands of the Arch Hurley Conservancy District in New Mexico", so as to make the bill read:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to construct a Federal reclamation project for the irrigation of the lands of the Arch Hurley Conservancy District in New Mexico under the Federal reclamation laws: *Provided*, That construction work is not to be initiated on said irrigation project until (a) the project shall have been found to be feasible under subsection B of section 4 of the act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 702), and (b) a contract shall have been executed with an irrigation or conservation district embracing the land to be irrigated under said project, which contract shall obligate the contracting district to repay the cost of construction of said project in 40 equal annual installments, without interest: (c) contracts shall have been made with each owner of more than 160 irrigable acres under said project, by which he, his successors, and assigns shall be obligated to sell all of his land in excess of 160 irrigable acres at or below prices fixed by the Secretary of the Interior and within the time to be fixed by said Secretary, no water to be furnished to the land of any such large landowner refusing or failing to execute such contract; and (d) contracts shall have been made with all owners of lands to be irrigated under the project by which they will agree that if their land is sold at prices above the appraised value thereof, approved by said Secretary, one-half of such excess shall be paid to the United States to be applied in the inverse order of the due dates upon the construction charge installments coming due thereafter from the owners of said land.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the construction of a Federal reclamation project to furnish a water supply for the lands of the Arch Hurley conservancy district in New Mexico."

CULTIVATION REQUIREMENTS IN HOMESTEAD ENTRIES

The bill (S. 1759) to amend an act entitled "An act to eliminate the requirements of cultivation in connection with certain homestead entries", approved August 19, 1935, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in 1935 Congress passed a law relieving homestead settlers from the duty each year of breaking out a certain number of acres of land, as was required under the old homestead law. That was in line with the soil-conservation program which was recommended by the Department and has proved very wise and salutary. Under that law we found that the omission of the word "application" prevented a few homesteaders, probably 50 or 100 in number, from getting the benefits of the act. This bill proposes to amend the act by inserting the words "or application made" in order to correct the defect. That is all there is to the measure.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

> *Be it enacted etc.*, That the act entitled "An act to eliminate the requirements of cultivation in connection with certain homestead entries", approved August 19, 1935, is amended by inserting after the word "settlement" the words "or application made."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 714) relating to the eligibility of certain persons for admission to the civil service, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. I ask that that bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

TRANSFER OF CRAWFORD COUNTY, IOWA, TO NORTHERN JUDICIAL DISTRICT

The bill (H. R. 3284) to transfer Crawford County, Iowa, from the southern judicial district of Iowa to the northern judicial district of Iowa, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE H. STAHL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2093) for the relief of George H. Stahl, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments on page 1, line 9, after the word "the" to strike out the figures "13th" and insert "10th", and at the top of page 2, insert a new section as follows:

> SEC. 2. That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, Henry A. Behrens, who was a member of Company F, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and who was mustered into the service on July 11, 1898, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a member of that organization on February 28, 1899: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers George H. Stahl, who was a member of Company B, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, enlisted July 14, 1898, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a member of that organization on the 10th day of December 1898: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.
>
> SEC. 2. That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers Henry A. Behrens, who was a member of Company F, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and who was mustered into the service on July 11, 1898, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a member of that organization on February 28, 1899: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of George H. Stahl and Henry A. Behrens."

AMENDMENT TO JUDICIAL CODE

The bill (S. 2410) to amend the Judicial Code, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the author of this bill whether any hearings were held on it?

Mr. MINTON. There were no hearings on it. The interested parties made inquiry about the bill, and were told that there would be no hearings on it, but that they could submit a brief if they wished to do so. No brief was filed and so the bill was reported.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should like to ask the author of the bill if he does not think that it should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. MINTON. No; not at all. It has to do with matters affecting Federal agencies that deal with interstate commerce. Therefore, the Interstate Commerce Committee is quite as competent to handle it as is the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. AUSTIN. Under the circumstances, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ANGELO AND AURO CATTANEO

The bill (H. R. 1731) for the relief of Angelo and Auro Cattaneo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TERM OF COURT AT LIVINGSTON, MONT.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4795) to provide for a term of court at Livingston, Mont.

Mr. MURRAY. I offer an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 9, after the word "Havre", it is proposed to insert "Miles City."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 92 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 28, sec. 172), is amended to read as follows:

"The State of Montana shall constitute one judicial district, to be known as the district of Montana. Terms of the district court shall be held at Helena, Butte, Great Falls, Lewistown, Billings, Missoula, Glasgow, Havre, Miles City, and Livingston at such times as may be fixed by rule of such court: *Provided*, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Glasgow, Lewistown, Livingston, and Havre are furnished free of all expense to the United States. Causes, civil and criminal, may be transferred by the court or a judge thereof from any sitting place designated above to any other sitting place thus designated, when the convenience of the parties or the ends of justice would be promoted by the transfer; and any interlocutory order may be made by the court or judge thereof in either place."

ACCEPTANCE OF DECORATION BY JOHN MONROE JOHNSON

The bill (S. 2497) authorizing John Monroe Johnson, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, to accept the decoration tendered him by the Belgian Government was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That John Monroe Johnson, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, is authorized to accept the decoration which has been tendered him by the Belgian Government.

AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE DECORATIONS, ETC.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 349) authorizing certain retired officers or employees of the United States to accept such decorations, orders, medals, or presents as have been tendered them by foreign governments was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following-named retired officers or employees of the United States are hereby authorized to accept such decorations, orders, medals, or presents as have been tendered them by foreign governments:

Department of State: Edwin Cunningham, Carl F. Deichman, Stillman W. Eells, P. S. Heintzlemen, David B. Macgowan, Robert P. Skinner, and Merritt Swift.

Department of War: Preston Brown, William H. Brown, Marion L. Elliott, Milton A. Elliott, Richard T. Ellis, LaVergne L. Gregg, Francis J. Heraty, Jefferson Kean, James F. McKinley, Alexander J. McNab, Jr., A. Kenny C. Palmer, Frederick D. Sharp, and Louis J. Van Schaick.

Department of the Navy: William H. Standley and Rufus F. Zogbaum.

Department of Agriculture: James H. Kimball and Charles F. Marvin.

Department of Commerce: George R. Putnam.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

The bill (H. R. 6049) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 22 (1) of Part I of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by inserting after the word "guide" the words "or seeing-eye dog or other guide dog specially trained and educated for that purpose."

AUTHORIZATION OF DECORATION TO ACORS RATHBUN THOMPSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1918) to authorize the award of a decoration for distinguished service, namely, the Congressional Medal of Honor to Acors Rathbun Thompson, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments, on page 1 line 4, after the word "decoration", to strike out "for distinguished service, namely, the Congressional Medal of Honor"; and in line 10, after the word "comrade", to strike out "one Glen B. Ranney, Sixty-sixth Company", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to cause the recommendation for the award of a decoration to Acors Rathbun Thompson, formerly private, Sixty-sixth Company, First Battalion, Fifth Marines, Second Division, American Expeditionary Forces, who, on September 14, 1918, at Jaulny, in the St. Mihiel, sector, France, rescued and carried a wounded comrade through heavy enemy fire to a first-aid station, and who further distinguished himself as a member of a small group, October 4 and 5, 1918, at Blanc Mont Ridge, France, though wounded and constantly exposed to constant enemy machine-gun fire from three sides, was cut off from his main body, repulsed five counter attacks by the enemy, which resulted in the capture of four German officers, 268 men, together with 85 machine guns in position, some mortars, and a heavy fieldpiece, to be considered by the proper boards or authorities, and such award made to said Thompson as his said conduct merits.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the award of a decoration for distinguished service to Acors Rathbun Thompson."

ROGUE RIVER NATIONAL FOREST, OREG.

The bill (S. 1762) to add certain lands to the Rogue River National Forest in the State of Oregon was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of forest management, watershed protection, and recreational use the north half northwest quarter section 3, the south half northwest quarter section 23, and the west half northeast quarter northeast quarter and the east half northwest quarter northeast quarter section 27, township 37, south, range 3 east, Willamette meridian, of revested Oregon & California land-grant lands are hereby added to and made a part of the Rogue River National Forest in the State of Oregon, subject to all laws and regulations governing national forests: *Provided*, That the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture shall jointly appraise and agree on the value of the said Oregon & California land-grant lands and shall certify the same to the Secretary of the Treasury. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized, upon notice of the appraisal by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, to transfer an equal amount of money from the national-forest receipts and credit the same to the Oregon & California land-grant funds, subject to all laws and regulations governing the disposal of money received from the Oregon & California land-grant lands.

CONTROL OF SOIL EROSION, ETC.—CACHE NATIONAL FOREST, UTAH

The bill (S. 2221) to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating upon lands within the exterior boundaries of the Cache National Forest in the State of Utah was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture, with the approval of the National Forest Reservation Commission established by section 4 of the act of March 1, 1911 (U. S. C., title 16, sec. 513) is hereby authorized to acquire by purchase any lands within the boundaries of the Cache National Forest in the State of Utah which, in his judgment, should become the property of the United States in order that they may be so managed with other lands of the United States as to minimize soil erosion and flood damage; and to pay for said lands that proportion of the entire receipts from the sale of natural resources, and the occupancy of publicly owned lands within said national forest which is equal to that proportion of the gross area of said national forest situated

in the State of Utah hereby is authorized to be appropriated for expenditure for that purpose by the Secretary of Agriculture until said lands have been acquired. So far as the State of Utah may be concerned, the provisions of the acts of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260); section 500, title 16, United States Code, of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 843); and section 501, title 16, United States Code, shall be inoperative in relation to the receipts so appropriated, but nothing herein contained shall diminish payments to or expenditures within the State of Idaho under the provisions of said acts.

COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF PEANUT STATISTICS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1998) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts by the Department of Agriculture", approved June 24, 1936, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, page 1, line 10, after the name "United States", to insert "received, shipped, and"; on page 2, line 8, after the word "than" to strike out two hundred and fifty thousand" and insert "thirty thousand", so as to make the section read:

That the first sentence of the first section of the act entitled "An act to provide for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts by the Department of Agriculture", approved June 24, 1936, is amended to read as follows: "That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to collect and publish statistics of raw peanuts, shelled, unshelled, and crushed, and peanut oil, in the United States, received, shipped, and in the possession of warehousemen, brokers, cleaners, shellers, dealers, growers' cooperative associations, crushers, salters, manufacturers of peanut products, and owners other than the original producers of peanuts: *Provided*, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, omit for any period of time to collect such statistics from any or all salters of peanuts or manufacturers of peanut products who used, during the calendar year preceding that for which statistics are being collected, less than 30,000 pounds of shelled and unshelled peanuts."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 10, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. That section 2 of such act of June 24, 1936, is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to collect and publish statistics of the quantity of peanuts picked or threshed by any person owning or operating peanut picking or threshing machines."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 16, to renumber the section from "2" to "3", and in section 3, page 2, line 24, after the word "peanut", to insert "and peanut oil received, shipped, and", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. That the first sentence of section 3 of such act of June 24, 1936, is amended to read as follows: "It shall be the duty of every warehouseman, broker, cleaner, sheller, dealer, growers' cooperative association, crusher, salter, manufacturer of peanut products, and owner or operator of peanut picking or threshing machines to furnish promptly upon request of the Secretary, within the time prescribed by him, completely and correctly to the best of his knowledge, a report of the quantity of peanuts and peanut oil received, shipped, and on hand and in the case of an operator of peanut picking and threshing machines the quantity picked or threshed, segregating in accordance with forms furnished for the purpose by the Secretary."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROPOSED CHILD-LABOR AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 144) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting child labor was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the joint resolution proposes to amend the Constitution of the United States and I think we ought not to undertake to dispose of it under the 5-minute rule at least today. So I ask that the measure go over at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

VALIDATION OF CERTAIN MINERAL PATENTS, MONTANA

The bill (H. R. 7021) validating and confirming certain mineral patents issued for lands situated in township 5 south, range 15 east, Montana principal meridian, in the State of Montana, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2512) to authorize an appropriation for the construction of small reservoirs under the Federal reclamation laws was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill. I note that it was reported by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. As he is not present at the moment, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ETHEL SMITH M'DANIEL

The bill (S. 972) for the relief of Ethel Smith McDaniel was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Ethel Smith McDaniel, widow of Travis McDaniel, who died on April 16, 1934, and whose death is alleged to have resulted from disability incurred on January 8, 1929, while an employee of the United States Railway Mail Service, and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider her claim under the remaining provisions of said Act: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be made within 1 year from the date of the approval of this Act: *And provided further*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1507) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws and to punish the crime of lynching was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

W. D. DAVIS

The bill (H. R. 1851) for the relief of W. D. Davis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DOROTHY M'COURT

The bill (H. R. 607) for the relief of Dorothy McCourt was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN BRENNAN

The bill (H. R. 1235) for the relief of John Brennan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAUL J. FRANCIS

The bill (H. R. 1761) for the relief of Paul J. Francis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NORTHWESTERN OHIO MUTUAL RODDED FIRE INSURANCE CO.

The bill (H. R. 3565) for the relief of the Northwestern Ohio Mutual Rodded Fire Insurance Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

H. E. WINGARD

The bill (H. R. 3809) for the relief of H. E. Wingard was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

C. O. EASTMAN

The bill (H. R. 4623) for the relief of C. O. Eastman was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. President, the bill is for the relief of a postmaster who was charged with some postal money orders which had been destroyed in a fire. The postal money orders had been properly paid, and this does not cost the Government anything it ought not to pay. It is recommended by the Post Office Department. The report shows it is recommended by the Department.

Mr. McKELLAR. The letter of the Acting Postmaster General says:

While there was undoubtedly negligence on the part of the clerk in failing to make up the account promptly and to safeguard the paid money orders by placing them in the safe, it nevertheless appears that as the money orders were actually paid there will be no loss to the Government in allowing the former postmaster at Wauseon, Ohio, credit for the disbursement in his accounts.

I have no objection.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to credit the money-order account of C. O. Eastman, former postmaster at Wauseon, Ohio, with $4,272.07, or so much thereof as is necessary, to relieve him for the alleged loss of paid money orders in a fire in the post office at Wauseon, Ohio, on June 11, 1934, disallowed in the audit of his accounts due to his failure to record the particulars of the said money orders.

E. W. GARRISON

The bill (H. R. 563) for the relief of E. W. Garrison was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LONNIE O. LEDFORD

The bill (H. R. 2482) for the relief of Lonnie O. Ledford was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN H. WYKLE

The bill (H. R. 3262) for the relief of John W. Wykle was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RAYMOND E. PAYNE AND ANNA R. PAYNE

The bill (H. R. 2934) for the relief of Raymond E. Payne and Anna R. Payne, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. FRANK MUZIO

The bill (H. R. 5102) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Muzio was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF EMPLOYEES OF DIVISION OF INVESTIGATION, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2774) for the relief of certain employees of the Division of Investigation, Department of the Interior, and certain disbursing officers of the Department of the Interior, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow payment or credit, as the case may be, and upon approval thereof by the Secretary of the Interior, in connection with the following claims or paid vouchers for traveling expenses on change of station or for mileage of personally owned automobiles in the same manner and to the same extent as though the required authorization had been issued prior to the date the expense was incurred:

(1) To allow payment to the following-named persons in the amounts stated, from appropriations chargeable therefor: John L. Buckey, $5.15; Agnes L. Burke, $17.82; Cedia E. Davis, $5.15; Cecil J. Dowd, $28.33; Dan W. Herring, $5.15; John W. Jackson, $141.37; Alexander F. Kelly, $75.40; William H. Selvey, $45.06; Maurice P. Shaner, $47.90; Owen B. Sherwood, $47.96; and Miller L. West, $114.40;

(2) To allow credit in the account of Frank A. Lewis, special disbursing agent, accounts for September and October 1933, as follows: Voucher 2794 (James W. Smith), $63.25; voucher 2795 (C. L. Anderson), $8.65; voucher 2981 (Joseph L. Quinn), $57.95; voucher 2983 (Avary H. Alcorn), $131.40; voucher 3011 (J. M. Flanigan, Jr.), $141.85; voucher 3013 (Howard E. Tyson), $113.70; voucher 3014 (Kent B. Knox), $165.15; voucher 3015 (W. H. Pontius), $114.60; voucher 3016 (Tilden E. Guillory), $28.05; voucher 3018 (F. H. Martin), $112.70; voucher 3024 (A. P. Thornton), $64.85; voucher 3025 (R. L. Knight), $109.65; voucher 3036 (Joe DeuPree), $49.80; voucher 3047 (Walter S. Behrens), $82.40; voucher 3041 (J. N. Inglish), $103.35; voucher 3042 (M. C. Parrish, Jr.), $92.45; voucher 3043 (G. H. Flagg), $110.30; voucher 3044 (J. G. Floyd), $75.70; voucher 3045 (Wilson Keyes), $137.55; voucher 3069 (Halvor P. McGrath), $21; voucher 3070 (Joe C. Hemphill), $33.30; voucher 3077 (Glenn O. Briscoe), $35.10; voucher 3081 (J. H. Lawrence), $84.45; and voucher 3378 (J. H. Lawrence), $14.05;

(3) To allow credit in the account of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, account for November 1934, as follows: Voucher 459021 (W. A. Whittlesey), $58.80.

(4) No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, the bill is recommended by the Bureau of Investigation, Department of the Interior. It grows out of traveling expenses. As I recall, a superior officer gave directions assigning someone to duty and he had a right to take his automobile provided the order specifically authorized it. Through some kind of error in a few cases the order by the superior officer did not specifically mention that the party being sent might take his automobile. Therefore when the matter came before the Comptroller General he very promptly stated the order was not broad enough to cover the item for automobile use. Those who were responsible for the order originally recommend that the claim be allowed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Department recommend it?

Mr. LOGAN. Yes. It was sent over by the Department.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill be read a third time?

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MORSE DRY DOCK & REPAIR CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2757) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of the Morse Dry Dock & Repair Co., which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the Morse Dry Dock & Repair Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $331,879.25, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for repairing and reconditioning the steamships *Princess Matoika, Pocahontas, Susquehanna, Potomac, America,* and *George Washington*, as found by the Court of Claims and reported in Senate Document No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, second session: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, is the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN] entirely satisfied that the bill is entirely proper?

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, the Committee on Claims has gone into the matter and reexamined it frequently, both carefully and critically, and as we have secured additional facts from the War Department the committee reached the conclusion that the bill ought to be reported favorably. I agree fully with the report of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was there any difference of opinion in the committee?

Mr. LOGAN. Not upon the part of those who were present. One member of the committee had said he would like to be present, and was present a time or two, but we could not wait any longer and he was not present when the committee finally passed on the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator was for a very long time a member of the Supreme Court of Kentucky.

Mr. LOGAN. I was.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is the Senator convinced the claim ought to be paid?

Mr. LOGAN. Yes; the claim ought to be paid.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill be read a third time?

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read a third time, and passed.

FORMER DISBURSING OFFICERS OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, ETC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6230) for the relief of certain former disbursing officers of the Veterans' Administration and of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, Federal Board for Vocational Education, and the United States Veterans' Bureau (now Veterans' Administration), which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed in the settlement of accounts of the following-named former disbursing officers of the Veterans' Administration and of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, Federal Board for Vocational Education, and the United States Veterans' Bureau (now Veterans' Administration), to allow credit in the sums herein stated now standing as disallowances in said accounts on the books of the General Accounting Office: *Provided*, That this act shall not be interpreted to waive collections by the United States Government of loans on adjusted-service certificates and interest thereon:

First. Miles E. Bailey, former disbursing officer, Bureau of War Risk Insurance (now Veterans' Administration), Washington, D. C., in the sums of $61.75 and $2,733.50, which amounts he expended during the period from December 1917 to January 1919 (symbols 11003 and 11234).

Second. Chester C. Vargas, former disbursing officer, Bureau of War Risk Insurance (now Veterans' Administration), Washington, D. C., in the sums of $63.05 and $330.70, which amounts he expended during the period from February 1919 to August 1919 (symbols 11005 and 11555).

Third. Richard W. Lamb, former distributing officer, United States Veterans' Bureau (now Veterans' Administration), Atlanta, Ga., in the sum of $16.32, which amount he expended during the period from February 1923 to January 1925 (symbol 11255).

Fourth. J. B. Schommer, former disbursing officer, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sums of $57.64, $58.45, $3,472.69, and $250.48, which amounts he expended during the periods from May 1, 1931, to August 31, 1931; July 1, 1932, to October 31, 1933; January 1, 1932, to October 31, 1933; and July 1, 1933, to April 30, 1934 (symbols 99220, 11500, 11501, and 11666).

Fifth. C. A. Wood, former disbursing officer at Veterans' Administration regional office, Atlanta, Ga., in the sum of $88.50 (symbol 99102), which amount he expended during the period from September 1, 1932, to September 30, 1932.

Sixth. W. A. Birmingham, former disbursing officer at Veterans' Administration regional office, Buffalo, N. Y., in the sum of $303.43 (symbol 99107), which amount he expended during the period from April 1, 1931, to April 30, 1931.

Seventh. Nina B. Harrison, former disbursing officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Los Angeles, Calif., in the sum of $403 (symbol 99129), which amount she expended during the period from June 1, 1933, to June 30, 1933.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William H. Holmes, former disbursing officer, United States Veterans' Bureau (now Veterans' Administration), District of Columbia, the sum of $222.10, of which amount $172.10 was paid by him on September 22, 1932, and $50 in November 1932 by personal checks delivered to the Department of Justice (symbol 11006).

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ursula H. Miller, former disbursing officer, United States Veterans' Bureau (now Veterans' Administration), Pittsburgh, Pa., the sum of $72.50, which amount was deducted from her salary as a Federal employee because of the disallowance by the General Accounting Office of that amount expended by her in June 1925 (symbol 11410).

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry M. Moeller, former disbursing officer, United States Veterans' Bureau (now Veterans' Administration), Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of $149.68, which amount was deducted from his salary as a Federal employee because of the disallowance by the General Accounting Office of that amount expended by him in May 1925 (symbol 11398).

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Henry F. Dolan, former disbursing officer, Federal Board for Vocational Education (now Veterans' Administration), Washington, D. C., the sum of $45.38, which amount was deducted from his salary as a Federal employee because of the disallowance by the General Accounting Office of that amount expended by him during the period from April 1919 to December 1920 (symbol 92065).

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Peter J. Carney, former disbursing officer, United States Veterans' Bureau (now Veterans' Administration), Philadelphia, Pa., the sum of $72.50, which amount he refunded to the United States because of the disallowance by the General Accounting Office of that amount expended by him in September 1923 (symbol 11253).

SEC. 7. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert L. Putman, former disbursing officer, United States Veterans' Bureau (now Veterans' Administration), Cincinnati, Ohio, the sum of $7.35, which amount was deducted from his salary as a Federal employee because of the disallowance by the General Accounting Office of that amount expended by him in February 1924 (11309).

SEC. 8. No part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, it would be difficult to explain the bill in very great detail. When the Congress some years ago authorized the making of loans on certificates which had been issued to veterans, the Veterans' Administration had the amended act before it. It had certificates amounting to some $2,000,000. Some disbursing officers made slight errors. There was one who distributed $53,000,000 with an error of only two or three dollars. The Veterans' Administration has sent the bill to us and asked us to consider it favorably. I should say it is entirely just.

Mr. McKELLAR. Are the amounts $61.75, $63.05, $88.50, and so forth, typical of the claims?

Mr. LOGAN. The claims are small in their individual amounts.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would that be about the average amount of the claims?

Mr. LOGAN. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill be read a third time?

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

W. R. FUCHS

The bill (H. R. 4682) for the relief of W. R. Fuchs was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES B. MURPHY

The bill (H. R. 5337) for the relief of Charles B. Murphy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TERM OF JUDGES IN CANAL ZONE, ETC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1986) to amend section 42 of title 7 of the Canal Zone Code, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to add a new section 2, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph a of section 42 of title 7 of the Canal Zone Code (June 19, 1934) is amended to read as follows:

"a. Be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the judge for a term of 10 years and the district attorney and marshal for terms of 4 years each."

SEC. 2. That title 7, section 29, United States Code, title 48, section 101, Alaska, be amended so that the term of the Federal district judge in Alaska will be 10 years; that section 863, Puerto Rico, be amended so that the term of the Federal district judge shall be 10 years; that section 1405y, Virgin Islands, be so amended that the term of the Federal district judge shall be 10 years; that section 643, Hawaii, be so amended that the term of the Federal district judge shall be 10 years.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, I shall explain the bill as best I can. It simply provided as originally introduced that the term of the Federal judge in the Canal Zone should be extended from 4 years to 10 years. That was submitted to the Department of Justice and the Department said that three other territorial judges, in the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Alaska, should have their terms extended likewise.

No one suggested this, but I spoke to an old friend of mine who was the Federal judge in the Canal Zone. He was a former law partner of mine. He served 4 years and declined to accept a further appointment, so I have no interest in his case. He said to me that in sending judges outside of the United States to serve only 4 years when it was probable the administration would change or for some reason he might be displaced at the end of the term, it was not fair that he be asked to give up all his practice and lose touch entirely with the people in his own community and his own State, and that it seemed to him the term should be 10 years. This bill was prepared by myself, and was my own idea. I thought it was only fair that the term should be extended to 10 years. I took it up with the Committee on the Judiciary and after some discussion there was no disagreement in the Judiciary Committee, and I was authorized to prepare the amendment and favorably report the bill, which I have done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DELEGATES TO FIFTH WORLD CONGRESS OF THE DEAF

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 150) to provide for the appointment of a delegate to the Fifth World Congress of the Deaf was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is authorized to appoint a member of the National Association of the Deaf as a delegate to represent the United States at the Fifth World Congress of the Deaf, to be held at Paris, France, from July 31 to August 6, 1937. The delegate so appointed shall make a report to the President.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay the expenses of such delegate and to be expended in such manner as the President may prescribe.

PUBLIC PARK AND RECREATIONAL SITE, MONTANA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1216) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the State of Montana to be used for the purpose of a public park and recreational site, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with amendments, on page 2, line 4, after the word "quarter", to strike out "north half" and insert "lot 3 or"; and on page 2, to strike out lines 8 to 21, inclusive, as follows:

Township 1 north, range 3 west, section 12, southeast quarter northeast quarter and all that part of southeast quarter lying north and east of the right-of-way of United States Highway No. 10S; section 13, all that part of northeast quarter lying north and east of the right-of-way of United States Highway No. 10S.

In the event the State shall fail to devote such land to the purposes of a State public park and recreational site within 5 years after the date of enactment of this act, or fail to maintain such land as a public park and recreational site for any period of 5 consecutive years subsequent to its devotion to such use, or devote such land or any part thereof to another use, such land and all improvements thereon shall revert to the United States.

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

Township 1 north, range 3 west, section 12, southeast quarter northeast quarter and east half southeast quarter (lots 7 and 12); section 13, east half northeast quarter (lots 1 and 4), and northwest quarter northeast quarter (lot 2).

In the event the State shall fail to devote such lands to the purposes of a State public park and recreational site within 5 years after the date of enactment of this act, or fail to maintain such land as a public park and recreational site for any period of 5 consecutive years subsequent to its devotion to such use, or devote such lands or any part thereof to another use, such land and all improvements thereon shall revert to the United States; and in such event the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered to declare such a forfeiture of the grant, and to assume jurisdiction of lot 12, section 17, township 1 north, range 2 west, for national-monument purposes under the act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225). Any patent issued hereunder shall contain a reservation to the United States of all mineral deposits in the land patented: *Provided*, That such minerals so reserved shall be prospected for, mined, and removed only in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the State of Montana, upon the conditions and limitations hereinafter expressed, the following-described land of the United States in the State of Montana, to be held and used by such State for the purposes of a State public park and recreational site:

MONTANA PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

Township 1 north, range 2 west, section 7, west half; section 8, south half southwest quarter and southwest quarter southeast quarter; section 17, lots 1, 2, 10, 11, and 12, and north half northwest quarter; section 18, northeast quarter northeast quarter, northwest quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter, lot 3 or northwest quarter southwest quarter, and north half southeast quarter; section 20, northwest quarter northeast quarter northeast quarter and northwest quarter northeast quarter.

Township 1 north, range 3 west, section 12, southeast quarter northeast quarter and east half southeast quarter (lots 7 and 12); section 13, east half northeast quarter (lots 1 and 4), and northwest quarter northeast quarter (lot 2).

In the event the State shall fail to devote such lands to the purposes of a State public park and recreational site within 5 years after the date of enactment of this act, or fail to maintain such land as a public park and recreational site for any period of 5 consecutive years subsequent to its devotion to such use, or devote such lands or any part thereof to another use, such land and all improvements thereon shall revert to the United States; and in such event the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered to declare such a forfeiture of the grant, and to assume jurisdiction of lot 12, section 17, township 1 north, range 2 west, for national-monument purposes under the act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225). Any patent issued hereunder shall contain a reservation to the United States of all mineral deposits in the land patented: *Provided*, That such minerals so reserved shall be prospected for, mined, and removed only in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, when order of business 796, being Senate bill 2620, was reached on the calendar, I asked that it might go over until I had time to acquaint myself with its provisions. I have had an opportunity since to discuss the matter with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and I have no further objection to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to recurring to Calendar 796?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2620) to amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, which had been reported from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 1, line 11, after the word "and", to strike out "Puuahi" and insert "Pauahi (750 acres, more or less), in the district of south"; on page 18, line 4, after the word "one", to insert "nor more than five", and in the same line to strike out "year's" to insert 'years' ", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 203 (1), 203 (4), 204 (2), 207 (1), 208, 208 (1), 208 (5), 208 (6), 208 (7), 209 (1), 209 (2), 209 (3), 209 (4), 215 (1), 215 (2), 215 (3), 216, and 220 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 203. (1) On the island of Hawaii: Kamaoa-Puueo (eleven thousand acres, more or less), in the district of Kau; Puukapu (twelve thousand acres, more or less), Kawaihae 1 (ten thousand acres, more or less), and Pauahi (seven hundred and fifty acres, more or less), in the district of South Kohala; Kamoku-Kaupalena (five thousand acres, more or less), Waimanu (two hundred acres, more or less), and Nienie (seven thousand three hundred and fifty acres, more or less), in the district of Hamakua; fifty-three thousand acres to be selected by the Commission from the lands of Humuula Mauka, in the district of North Hilo; Panaewa, Waiakea (two thousand acres, more or less), Waiakea-kai, or Keaukaha (two thousand acres, more or less), and two thousand acres of agricultural lands to be selected by the Commission from the lands of Piihonua, in the district of South Hilo; and two thousand acres to be selected by the Commission from the lands of Kaohe-Makuu, in the district of Puna; land at Keaukaha, Hawaii, more particularly described as follows:

"Parcel I

Now set aside as Keaukaha Beach Park by Executive Order No. 421, and being a portion of the Government land of Waiakea, South Hilo, Hawaii.

"Beginning at the southeast corner of this parcel of land, on the north side of Kalanianaole Road, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government survey triangulation station 'Halai' being five thousand six hundred and eighty-one and twelve one-hundredths feet north and seventeen thousand nine hundred and thirty-three and fifteen one-hundredths

feet east, as shown on Government Survey Registered Map No. 2704, and running by true azimuths.

"1. Sixty-one degrees fifty-eight minutes one thousand three hundred and fifty-one and seventy-three one-hundredths feet along the north side of Kalanianaole Road (50 feet wide);

"2. One hundred and fifty-one degrees fifty-eight minutes eight hundred and forty feet along United States military reservation for river and harbor improvements (Executive Order No. 176);

"Thence along the seashore at high-water mark, the direct azimuths and distances between points at seashore being:

"3. Two hundred and eighty-two degrees no minutes four hundred and sixty-eight and fifty one-hundredths feet;

"4. Three hundred and thirteen degrees twenty minutes four hundred and forty-one feet;

"5. Two hundred and sixty degrees twenty minutes one hundred and forty feet;

"6. Two hundred and forty-two degrees twenty minutes two hundred and fifty feet;

"7. One hundred and eighty-eight degrees forty minutes sixty feet;

"8. Two hundred and seventy-two degrees twenty minutes one hundred and seventy feet;

"9. Two hundred and five degrees no minutes sixty feet;

"10. One hundred and ten degrees twenty minutes two hundred and twenty feet;

"11. Ninety degrees fifty minutes eighty feet;

"12. One hundred and sixty-two degrees no minutes one hundred and seventy feet;

"13. Two hundred and fifty degrees thirty minutes four hundred and thirty feet;

"14. Three hundred and thirty-one degrees fifty-eight minutes three hundred and eighty feet along parcel II of Government land to the point of beginning and containing an area of eleven and twenty one-hundredths acres, more or less.

"Parcel II

"Being a portion of the Government land of Waiakea, South Hilo, Hawaii, and located on the north side of Kalanianaole Road and adjoining parcel I, hereinbefore described.

"Beginning at the south corner of this parcel of land, on the north side of Kalanianaole Road, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government survey triangulation station 'Halai', being five thousand six hundred and eighty-one and twelve one-hundredths feet north and seventeen thousand nine hundred and thirty-three and fifteen one-hundredths feet east and running by true azimuths:

"1. One hundred and fifty-one degrees fifty-six minutes three hundred and eighty feet along the east boundary of parcel I;

"2. Two hundred and twenty-nine degrees forty-five minutes thirty seconds one hundred and ninety-one and one one-hundredth feet;

"3. One hundred and ninety-eight degrees no minutes two hundred and thirty feet to a 1½-inch pipe set in concrete;

"4. Three hundred and seven degrees thirty-eight minutes five hundred and sixty-two and twenty-one one-hundredths feet to a 1½-inch pipe set in concrete;

"5. Twenty-eight degrees no minutes one hundred and twenty-one and thirty-seven one-hundredths feet to the north side of Kalanianaole Road;

"6. Sixty-one degrees fifty-eight minutes four hundred and eighty-three and twenty-two one-hundredths feet along the north side of Kalanianaole Road to the point of beginning and containing an area of 5.26 acres, more or less.

"SEC. 203. (4) On the island of Oahu: Nanakuli (3,000 acres, more or less), and Lualualei (2,000 acres, more or less), in the district of Waianae; and Waimanalo (4,000 acres, more or less), in the district of Koolaupoko, excepting therefrom the military reservation and the beach lands; and those certain portions of the lands of Auwaiolimu, Kewalo, and Kalawahine described by metes and bounds as follows, to wit:

"(I) Portion of the Government land at Auwaiolimu, Punchbowl Hill, Honolulu, Oahu, described as follows:

"Beginning at a pipe at the southeast corner of this tract of land, on the boundary between the lands of Kewalo and Auwaiolimu, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government survey triangulation station 'Punchbowl', being 1,135.9 feet north and 2,557.8 feet east as shown on Government Survey Registered Map No. 2692, and running by true azimuths:

"1. One hundred and sixty-three degrees thirty-one minutes two hundred and fifty-seven and eight-tenths feet along the east side of Punchbowl-Makiki Road;

"2. Ninety-four degrees eight minutes one hundred and twenty-four and nine-tenths feet across Tantalus Drive and along the east side of Puuowaina Drive;

"3. One hundred and thirty-one degrees thirteen minutes two hundred and thirty-two and five tenths feet along a 25-foot roadway;

"4. One hundred and thirty-nine degrees fifty-five minutes twenty and five-tenths feet along same;

"5. One hundred and sixty-eight degrees seventeen minutes two hundred and fifty-seven and eight-tenths feet along Government land (old quarry lot);

"6. One hundred and fifty-six degrees thirty minutes three hundred and thirty-three feet along same to a pipe;

"7. Thence following the old Auwaiolimu stone wall along L. C. award 3145 to Laenui, grant 5147 (lot 8 to C. W. Booth), L. C. award 1375 to Kapule, and L. C. award 1355 to Kekuanoni, the direct azimuth and distance being two hundred and forty-nine degrees forty-one minutes one thousand three hundred and three and five-tenths feet;

"8. Three hundred and twenty-one degrees, twelve minutes, six hundred and ninety-three feet along the remainder of the land of Auwaiolimu;

"9. Fifty-one degrees, twelve minutes, one thousand and four hundred feet along the land of Kewalo to the point of beginning; containing an area of twenty-seven acres; excepting and reserving therefrom Tantalus Drive and Auwaiolimu Street crossing this land;

"(II) Portion of the land of Kewalo, Punchbowl Hill, Honolulu, Oahu, being part of the lands set aside for the use of the Hawaii Experiment Station of the United States Department of Agriculture by proclamation of the Acting Governor of Hawaii, dated June 10, 1901, and described as follows:

"Beginning at the northeast corner of this lot, at a place called 'Puu Ea' on the boundary between the lands of Kewalo and Auwaiolimu, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government survey triangulation station 'Punchbowl', being three thousand two hundred and fifty-five and six-tenths feet north and five thousand two hundred and forty-four and seven-tenths feet east, as shown on Government Survey Registered Map No. 2692 of the Territory of Hawaii, and running by true azimuths:

"1. Three hundred and fifty-four degrees thirty minutes nine hundred and thirty feet along the remainder of the land of Kewalo, to the middle of the stream which divides the lands of Kewalo and Kalawahine;

"2. Thence down the middle of said stream along the land of Kalawahine, the direct azimuth and distance being forty-nine degrees sixteen minutes one thousand five hundred and twelve and five-tenths feet;

"3. One hundred and forty-one degrees twelve minutes eight hundred and sixty feet along the remainder of the land of Kewalo;

"4. Two hundred and thirty-one degrees twelve minutes five hundred and fifty-two and six-tenths feet along the land of Auwaiolimu to 'Puu Iole';

"5. Thence still along the said land of Auwaiolimu following the top of the ridge to the point of beginning, the direct azimuth and distance being two hundred and thirty-two degrees twenty-six minutes one thousand four hundred and seventy feet and containing an area of 30 acres; excepting and reserving therefrom Tantalus Drive crossing this land;

"(III) Portion of the land of Kalawahine situate mauka or northeast of Roosevelt High School, Honolulu, Oahu.

"Being portion of L. C. award 11215, Apana 2, to Keliiahonui conveyed by W. M. Giffard to the Territory of Hawaii by deed dated February 1, 1907, and recorded in Liber 291, page 1.

"(Being portion of the lands set aside for the Hawaiian Homes Commission by the Seventy-third Congress by Act No. 227, approved May 16, 1934.)

"Beginning at the south corner of this parcel of land and near the east corner of Roosevelt High School lot, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government survey triangulation station 'Punchbowl', being twenty-five and two one-hundredths feet south and four thousand one hundred and seventeen and thirty-nine one-hundredths feet east as shown on Government survey registered map numbered 2985 and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

"1. One hundred and twenty-eight degrees fifty-four minutes seven hundred and six and thirteen one-hundredths feet along Roosevelt High School lot, and passing over a pipe at six hundred and eighty-four and thirteen one-hundredths feet;

"2. Thence up along the middle of stream in all its turns and windings along the land of Kewalo-uka to the south corner of Hawaiian Home land (Presidential Executive Order No. 5561), the direct azimuth and distance being two hundred and thirteen degrees forty-eight minutes forty seconds one thousand one hundred and twelve any twenty one-hundredths feet;

"3. Thence continuing up along the middle of stream in all its turns and windings along the land of Kewalo-uka (Presidential Executive Order No. 5561), to the south side of Tantalus Drive realinement, the direct azimuth and distance being two hundred and twenty-eight degrees twenty-nine minutes ten seconds one thousand three hundred and ninety-one feet;

"4. Thence on a curve to the right with a radius of one hundred and twenty and seventy-eight one-hundredths feet along the southerly side of Tantalus Drive realinement (sixty feet wide), the direct azimuth and distance being three hundred and fifty-eight degrees twenty-one minutes one hundred and ninety-three and eighty one-hundredths feet;

"5. Fifty-one degrees forty-two minutes one hundred and ninety-three and thirty-five one-hundredths feet along the southerly side of Tantalus Drive realinement;

"6. Thence on a curve to the left with a radius of three hundred and thirty feet, along same, the direct azimuth and distance being twenty-five degrees twenty-three minutes ten seconds two hundred and ninety-two and fifty-eight one-hundredths feet;

"7. Twenty-two degrees fifty-three minutes two hundred and ninety-one and ninety-three one-hundredths feet along the southerly side of Tantalus Drive realinement and along the west side of Kalawahine Slope lots;

"8. Thence on a curve to the left with a radius of three hundred and five and sixty one-hundredths feet along the west side of the Kalawahine Slope lots, the direct azimuth and distance being six degrees twenty-one minutes thirty seconds one hundred and seventy-three and eighty-five one-hundredths feet;

"9. Three hundred and forty-nine degrees fifty minutes forty-seven feet along the west side of the Kalawahine Slope lots;

"10. Thence on a curve to the right with a radius of five hundred and twenty feet along same and along Territorial land, the direct azimuth and distance being seventeen degrees thirty-one minutes four hundred and eighty-three and eighteen one-hundredths feet;

"11. Three hundred and fifteen degrees twelve minutes seventy-five feet along Territorial land;

"12. Forty-five degrees twelve minutes six hundred and eleven and two one-hundredths feet along the northwest side of a twenty-foot road reserve;

"13. Thirty-four degrees four minutes thirty seconds three hundred and thirty-six and ninety-six one-hundredths feet along same to the point of beginning and containing an area of thirty-one and sixty one-hundredths acres.

"(IV) Portion of the Hawaiian Experiment Station under the control of the United States Department of Agriculture, situate on the northeast side of Auwaiolimu Street.

"KEWALO-UKA, HONOLULU, OAHU

"Being a portion of the land of Kewalo-uka conveyed by the Territory of Hawaii to the United States of America by proclamations of the Acting Governor of Hawaii, Henry E. Cooper, dated June 10, 1901, and August 16, 1901, and a portion of the United States Navy hospital reservation described in Presidential Executive Order No. 1181, dated March 25, 1910.

"Beginning at the west corner of this parcel of land, on the Auwaiolimu-Kewalo-uka boundary and on the northeast side of Auwaiolimu Street, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government survey triangulation station 'Punchbowl', being one thousand two hundred and thirty and fifty-eight one-hundredths feet north and two thousand six hundred and seventy-five and six one-hundredths feet east as shown on Government Survey Registered Map no. 2985 and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

"1. Two hundred and thirty-one degrees twelve minutes one thousand two hundred and forty-eight and twenty-six one-hundredths feet along the land of Auwaiolimu;

"2. Three hundred and twenty-one degrees twelve minutes eight hundred and sixty feet along Hawaiian Home Land as described in Presidential Executive Order No. 5561;

"3. Thence down along the middle of stream in all its turns and windings along the land of Kalawahine to the north corner of Roosevelt High School lot, the direct azimuth and distance being thirty-three degrees forty-eight minutes forty seconds one thousand one hundred and twelve and twenty one-hundredths feet;

"Thence still down along the middle of stream for the next seven courses along the Roosevelt High School premises, the direct azimuths and distances between points in middle of said stream being:

"4. Twenty-three degrees forty minutes twenty-eight and ninety one-hundredths feet;

"5. Eight degrees no minutes one hundred and fifteen feet;

"6. Three hundred and thirty-seven degrees fifty minutes forty-eight feet;

"7. Two degrees thirty minutes sixty feet;

"8. Forty-nine degrees forty minutes fifty-two feet;

"9. Forty-six degrees six minutes ninety and seventy one-hundredths feet;

"10. Ninety-two degrees forty-three minutes ninety-five and sixty one-hundredths feet; thence

"11. Eighty-three degrees thirty-eight minutes seventy-one and sixty-three one-hundredths feet along Territorial land to the northeast side of Auwaiolimu Street;

"12. Thence on a curve to the left with a radius of one thousand one hundred and seventy-six and twenty-eight one-hundredths feet along the northeast side of Auwaiolimu Street along land described in Presidential Executive Order No. 1181, dated March 25, 1910, the direct azimuth and distance being one hundred and seventy-two degrees twenty-nine minutes thirty-five seconds one hundred and sixty-four and thirty-nine one-hundredths feet;

"13. Thence continuing on a curve to the left with a radius of one thousand one hundred and seventy-six and twenty-eight one-hundredths feet along the northeast side of Auwaiolimu Street, the direct azimuth and distance being one hundred and sixty degrees fifty minutes forty-eight seconds three hundred and twelve and seventy-five one-hundredths feet;

"14. Two hundred and twenty-four degrees fifty-three minutes six hundred and seventy and sixty-five one-hundredths feet along the Quarry Reservation (Territory of Hawaii, owner);

"15. One hundred and ten degrees six minutes two hundred and thirty-nine and twenty one-hundredths feet along same;

"16. Ninety-two degrees five minutes two hundred and two and twenty one-hundredths feet along same;

"17. Fifty-three degrees twenty minutes three hundred and forty and thirty-four one-hundredths feet along same;

"18. One hundred and forty-two degrees thirty minutes four hundred and twenty-four and sixty-eight one-hundredths feet along the northeast side of Auwaiolimu Street to the point of beginning and containing an area of twenty-seven and ninety one-hundredths acres; excepting and reserving therefrom that certain area included in Tantalus Drive, crossing this land.

"(V) Portion of Kewalo-uka Quarry Reservation. Situate on the northeast side of Auwaiolimu Street.

"Kewalo-uka, Honolulu, Oahu

"Being land reserved by the Territory of Hawaii within the Hawaii Experiment Station under the control of the United States Department of Agriculture, as described in proclamations of the Acting Governor of Hawaii, Henry E. Cooper, dated June 10, 1901.

"Beginning at the northwest corner of this parcel of land and on the northeast side of Auwaiolimu Street, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government survey triangulation station 'Punchbowl', being eight hundred and ninety-three and sixty-six one-hundredths feet north and two thousand nine hundred and thirty-three and fifty-nine one-hundredths feet east as shown on Government Survey Registered Map Numbered 2985 and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

"1. Two hundred and thirty-three degrees twenty minutes three hundred and forty and thirty-four one-hundredths feet along the Hawaii Experiment Station under the control of the United States Department of Agriculture;

"2. Two hundred and seventy-two degrees five minutes two hundred and two and twenty one-hundredths feet along same;

"3. Two hundred and ninety degrees six minutes two hundred and thirty-nine and twenty one-hundredths feet along same;

"4. Forty-four degrees, fifty-three minutes six hundred and seventy and sixty-five one-hundredths feet along same to the northeast side of Auwaiolimu Street;

"5. Thence on a curve to the left with a radius of one thousand one hundred and seventy-six and twenty-eight one-hundredths feet along the northeast side of Auwaiolimu Street, the direct azimuth and distance being one hundred and forty-seven degrees fifty-one minutes thirteen seconds two hundred and nineteen and fifty one-hundredths feet;

"6. One hundred and forty-two degrees thirty minutes one hundred and thirty-four and fifty-five one-hundredths feet along the northeast side of Auwaiolimu Street;

"7. Two hundred and thirty-two degrees thirty minutes twenty feet along same;

"8. One hundred and forty-two degrees thirty minutes seventy-one and fifty-seven one-hundredths feet along same to the point of beginning and containing an area of four and six hundred and forty-six one-thousandths acres.

"SEC. 204 (2). Any available land, including land selected by the Commission out of a larger area, as provided by this act, as may not be immediately needed for the purposes of this act, may be returned to the Commissioner of Public Lands and may be leased by him as provided in subdivision (d) of section 73 of the Organic Act; any lease of Hawaiian homelands hereafter entered into shall contain a withdrawal clause, and the lands so leased shall be withdrawn by the Commissioner of Public Lands, for the purposes of this act, upon the Commission giving at its option not less than 1 nor more than 5 years' notice of such withdrawal: *Provided*, That the minimum withdrawal-notice period shall be specifically stated in such lease.

"SEC. 207 (1). (a) The Commission is authorized to lease to native Hawaiians the right to the use and occupancy of a tract of Hawaiian homelands within the following acreage limits per each lessee: (1) Not less than 1 nor more than 40 acres of agricultural lands; or (2) not less than 100 nor more than 500 acres of first-class pastoral lands; or (3) not less than 250 nor more than 1,000 acres of second-class pastoral lands: *Provided, however*, That lots of not more than 1 acre of any class of land may be leased as residence lots. The Commission is also authorized to grant licenses for terms of not to exceed 21 years in each case to public-utility companies or corporations as easements for railroad, telephone lines, electric power and light lines, gas mains, and the like.

"SEC. 208 (1). The original lessee shall be a native Hawaiian, not less than 21 years of age. In case two lessees either original or in succession marry, they shall choose the lease to be retained, and the remaining lease shall be transferred or canceled in accordance with the provisions of succeeding sections.

"SEC. 208 (5). The lessee shall not in any manner transfer to, or mortgage, pledge, or otherwise hold for the benefit of, any other person or group of persons or organizations of any kind, except a native Hawaiian or Hawaiians, and then only upon the approval of the Commission, or agree so to transfer, mortgage, pledge, or otherwise hold, his interest in the tract. Such interest shall not, except in pursuance of such a transfer, mortgage, or pledge to or holding for or agreement with a native Hawaiian or Hawaiians approved of by the Commission, or for any indebtedness due the Commission or for taxes, or for any other indebtedness the payment of which has been assured by the Commission, be subject to attachment, levy, or sale upon court process. The lessee shall not sublet his interest in the tract or improvements thereon.

"SEC. 208 (6). The lessee shall pay all taxes assessed upon the tract and improvements thereon. The Commission may in its discretion pay such taxes and have a lien therefor as provided by section 216 of this Act.

"SEC. 208 (7). The lessee shall perform such other conditions, not in conflict with any provision of this title, as the Commission may stipulate in the lease: *Provided, however*, That an original lessee shall be exempt from all taxes for the first 5 years from date of lease.

"SEC. 209 (1). Upon the death of the lessee his interest in the tract and the improvements thereon, including growing crops, either on the tract or in any collective contract or program, shall vest and be determined in the following manner. A lessee shall furnish the Commission, in writing, the name or names of such person or persons being a qualified native Hawaiian or Hawaiians, within the limits prescribed in the following sequence of succession, to whom he wishes his interest in the lease to be transferred after his death, this designation to be subject to the approval of the Commission: (1) In the widow or widower; (2) if

there is no widow or widower, then in the children; (3) if there are no children, then in the widows or widowers of the children; (4) if there are no such widows or widowers, then in the grandchildren; (5) if there are no grandchildren, then in the brothers and sisters; (6) if there are no brothers or sisters, then in the widows or widowers of the brothers and sisters; (7) if there are no such widows or widowers of the brothers or sisters, then in the nephews and nieces.

"In the absence of such designation the Commission shall choose a qualified native Hawaiian or Hawaiians in accordance with the foregoing sequence, either individually or collectively, except that such successor or successors need not be 21 years of age.

"Upon the death of a lessee, or the cancelation of a lease by the Commission, or the surrender of a lease by the lessee, the Commission shall appraise the value of all such improvements and said growing crops and shall pay to the legal representative of the deceased lessee, or to the previous lessee, as the case may be, the value thereof, less any indebtedness due the Commission, or for taxes, or for any other indebtedness the payment of which has been assured by the Commission, from the previous lessee. Such appraisal shall be made by three appraisers, one of which shall be named by the Commission, one by the previous lessee or the legal representative of his estate, and the third shall be selected by the two appraisers hereinbefore mentioned.

"SEC. 209 (2). After the cancelation of a lease by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of sections 210 and 216 of this title, or the surrender of a lease by a lessee, the Commission is authorized to transfer the lease or to issue a new lease to any qualified Hawaiian regardless of whether or not he is related in any way by blood or marriage to the previous lessee.

"SEC. 209 (3). After the death of a lessee, a successor or successors as defined in section 208 of this title shall not during a period of not less than 6 months nor more than 2 years, the exact length of such period to be fixed by the Commission, be deemed to have violated any of the conditions enumerated in section 208 of this title, even though he is not a native Hawaiian and does not during this period, on his own behalf, occupy or use or cultivate the tract as a home or farm in accordance with the provisions of this title and the stipulations and provisions contained in the lease.

"SEC. 209 (4). Should any successor or successors to a tract be a minor or minors, the Commission may appoint a guardian therefor, subject to the approval of the court of proper jurisdiction. Such guardian shall be authorized to represent the successor or successors in all matters pertaining to the leasehold: *Provided*, That said guardian shall, in so representing such successor or successors, comply with the provisions of this title and the stipulations and provisions contained in the lease, except that said guardian may not be a native Hawaiian as defined in section 201 of this title.

"SEC. 215 (1). Each contract of loan with the lessee or any successor or successors to his interest in the tract shall be held subject to the following conditions, whether or not stipulated in the contract of loan: The amount of loans at any one time to any lessee of a tract of agricultural or pastoral land shall not exceed $3,000, and to any lessee of a residence lot shall not exceed $1,000: *Provided*, That where, upon the death of a lessee or the cancelation of a lease by the Commission or the surrender of a lease by the lessee, the Commission shall make the appraisal and payment provided by section 209 (1), the amount of such payment shall be considered as part or all, as the case may be, of any such loan without limitation as to the maximum amounts herein specified in this section.

"SEC. 215 (2). The loans shall be repaid upon an amortization plan by means of a fixed number of annual installments sufficient to cover (a) interest on the unpaid principal at the rate of 3 percent per annum, and (b) such amount of the principal as will extinguish the debt within an agreed period not exceeding 30 years. The moneys received by the Commission from any installment paid upon such loans shall be covered into the fund. The payment of any installment due shall, with the concurrence therein of at least three of the five members of the Commission, be postponed in whole or in part by the Commission for such reasons as it deems good and sufficient and until such later date as it deems advisable. Such postponed payments shall continue to bear interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum on the unpaid principal and interest.

"SEC. 215 (3) In case of the borrower's death the Commission shall permit the successor or successors to the tract to assume the contract of loan subject to the provisions of paragraph (1) of this section. In case of the cancelation of a lease by the Commission or the surrender of a lease by a lessee, the Commission may, at its option, declare all annual installments upon the loan immediately due and payable or permit the successor or successors to the tract to assume the contract of loan subject to the provisions of paragraph (1) of this section.

"SEC. 216. The Commission may require the borrower to insure, in each amount as the Commission may by regulation prescribe, all livestock and dwellings and other permanent improvements upon his tract, purchased or constructed out of any moneys loaned from the fund; or in lieu thereof the Commission may directly take out such insurance and add the cost thereof to the amount of annual installments payable under the amortization plan. Whenever the Commission has reason to believe that the borrower has violated any condition enumerated in paragraphs (2), (4), (5), or (6) of section 215 of this title, the Commission shall give due notice and afford opportunity for a hearing to the borrower or the successor or successors to his interest in the tract as the case demands. If upon such hearing the Commission finds that the borrower has violated the condition the Commission may declare all annual installments immediately due and payable, notwithstanding any provision in the contract of loan to the contrary. The Commission shall have a first lien upon the borrower's or lessee's interest in his tract, growing crops, either on the tract or in any collective contract or program, dwellings, or other permanent improvements thereon, and his livestock, to the amount of all annual installments due and unpaid and of all taxes upon such tract and improvements paid by the Commission, and of all indebtedness of the lessee, the payment of which has been assured by the Commission. Such lien shall have priority over any other obligation for which the tract, said growing crops, dwellings, other improvements, or livestock may be security.

The Commission may, at such times as it deems advisable, enforce any such lien by declaring the borrower's interest in his tract, or his successor's interest therein, as the case may be, together with the said growing crops, dwellings, and other permanent improvements thereon, and the livestock, to be forfeited, the lease in respect to such tract canceled, and shall thereupon order the tract to be vacated and the livestock surrendered within a reasonable time. The right to the use and occupancy of the Hawaiian homelands contained in such tract shall thereupon revest in the Commission, and the Commission may take possession of the tract and the improvements and growing crops thereon: *Provided*, That the Commission shall pay to the borrower any difference which may be due him after the appraisal provided for in paragraph (1) of section 209 of this title has been made.

SEC. 220. The Commission is hereby authorized directly to undertake and carry on general water and other development projects in respect to Hawaiian homelands, and to undertake other activities having to do with the economic and social welfare of the homesteaders. The Legislature of the Territory is authorized to appropriate out of the Treasury of the Territory such sums as it deems necessary to provide the Commission with funds sufficient to execute such projects, to carry on its administration and maintenance activities, and to accumulate a revolving loan fund of $1,000,000. The Legislature is further authorized to issue bonds to the extent required to yield the amount of any sum so appropriated.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the consideration of unobjected to bills on the calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. CANNON of Missouri an additional manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6692) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and for other purposes.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2291) to amend the act of May 25, 1933 (48 Stat. 73).

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5394) to provide for the acquisition of certain lands for, and the addition thereof to, the Yosemite National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DEROUEN, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, and Mr. CRAWFORD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed 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. 5996) 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, 1938, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 21, 34, 35, 55, 76, 78, 87, 95, 96, 112, 113, 119, 133, and 134 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 22, 23, 56, 90, 92,

114, 132, 141, and 151 to the bill, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5969) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5969) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITION OF LANDS TO YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POPE in the chair) laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5394) to provide for the acquisition of certain lands for, and the addition thereof to, the Yosemite National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ADAMS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ADAMS, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. ASHURST, Mr. WAGNER, and Mr. NYE conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5996) 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, 1938, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 12, 16, 19, 20, 32, 33, 38, 40, 42, 43, 47, 48, 49, 53, 58, 61, 63, 65, 83, 84, 85, 86, 97, 100, 103, 109, 110, 115, 118, 121, 122, 123, 130, 135, 137, 138, 139, 142, and 150.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 36, 37, 39, 41, 44, 46, 50, 51, 52, 57, 59, 60, 64, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 79, 88, 89, 91, 93, 94, 98, 101, 104, 106, 111, 116, 117, 120, 124, 125, 126, 136, 140, 143, 144, 145, 147, and 148, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$221,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$98,060"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$110,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "$403,730"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$180,260"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$22,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$396,975"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Not exceeding $17,500 for the purchase of land for elementary school purposes in the vicinity of First and Pierce Streets Northwest"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$242,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "the area bounded by Seventh Street on the west and K Street on the south in Southwest Washington"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$442,640"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$29,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The unexpended balance of the appropriation of $100,000 contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1937 for the construction, repair, improvement, and extension of buildings at the National Training School for Girls, in accordance with plans to be approved by the Municipal Architect and the Commissioners; and for additional personnel and maintenance at that institution is hereby continued available during the fiscal year 1938."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$37,760"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 108: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$38,260"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 129: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$54,540"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 131: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "$900,000: *Provided*, That appropriations contained in this act for highways, sewers, city refuse, and the water department shall be available for snow removal when specifically and in writing ordered by the Commissioners"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 146: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 146, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert $367,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 149: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 149, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "In line 8 of the matter restored strike out '$2,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$2,600' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 9, 21, 22, 23, 34, 35, 55, 56, 76, 78, 87, 90, 92, 95, 96, 112, 113, 114, 119, 132, 133, 134, 141, and 151.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARTER GLASS,
ROYAL S. COPELAND,
WILLIAM H. KING,
GERALD P. NYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
ROSS A. COLLINS,
MILLARD F. CALDWELL,
JOE STARNES,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5996, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
June 28, 1937.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 21, 34, 35, 55, 76, 78, 87, 95, 96, 112, 113, 119, 133, and 134 to the bill (H. R. 5996) 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, 1938, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "$131,700, of which $5,000 shall be available without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and Civil Service requirements for examination of estimates of appropriations and for other purposes."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "For personal services, including not to exceed $2,500 for the Secretary of the Board, $8,040."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "For equipment, transportation, and other necessary expenses, $575."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert "$7,167,820."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$468,560, of which $13,000 shall be available for out-patient relief of the poor, including medical and surgical supplies, artificial limbs, and pay of physicians."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"Health Center: For the construction on the site of the Jones Elementary School at First and L Streets, Northwest, of a building for a Health Center, including necessary fixed equipment therefor, $165,000, of which sum $7,000 shall be available for preparation of plans and specifications, administration and inspection, including the employment of personal services without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That all buildings belonging to the District of Columbia shall be under the jurisdiction and control of the Commissioners of said District."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: Strike out the matter inserted and stricken out by said amendment and, on page 63 of the House engrossed bill, strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: ": *Provided further*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, should they deem such action to be to the advantage of the District of Columbia, are hereby authorized to purchase a municipal asphalt plant at a cost not to exceed $30,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert "$2,894,340".

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 151 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In line 1 of the said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "7" and insert "2".

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate agree to the House amendments to Senate amendments numbered 9, 22, 23, 56, 90, 92, 114, 132, 141, and 151 to the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6958) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think that in the case of this appropriation bill, as I have expressed myself with regard to others, the Senator in charge of the bill should make a statement with respect to its provisions, and how it compares with the bill as passed by the House and with the appropriations for last year, what are the controversial items, and so forth.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amount of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives is $123,001,304.85. The amount of the bill as reported to the Senate is $125,161,879.85, or an increase of $2,160,575.

Mr. McNARY. Does that increase conform to the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget, and is it in conformity with the financial program of the President?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. There are two principal items in the billl which are above the Budget estimates. One is an item of $900,000 for a new reclamation project in Colorado, the transmountain diversion project. Next there is an increase above the Budget estimates of $2,200,000 for the construction of a national parkway, known as the Natchez Trace, beginning in Tennessee, and passing through Alabama into Mississippi.

Those are the two principal items which are above the Budget estimates.

Mr. McNARY. These items did not have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. HAYDEN. No Budget estimates were submitted for them. The Natchez Trace appropriation is authorized by law. We did not appropriate the full amount of the authorization, but we did increase the amount above that appropriated by the House.

Mr. McNARY. I assume, then, that these items run counter to the President's financial program.

Mr. HAYDEN. We did not consult the Budget Bureau about them.

Mr. McNARY. Were those items in the House bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. In the House bill, for the Natchez Trace, there was $500,000. The committee increased the amount to $2,700,000, but within the authorization by law of $10,000,000 for that parkway and the Blue Ridge Parkway. The total amount of the appropriation will be $7,200,000. The authorization for this fiscal year is $10,000,000. It is authorized by law, but was not estimated for by the Budget Bureau.

There are other increases and shifts in the bill, I may say to the Senator. The committee tried to improve conditions, for instance, in the General Land Office. As the Senator from Oregon knows, and all western Senators know, there have been great delays in contested cases relating to the public domain, whether they be homesteads, oil leases, grazing leases, or other matters of that kind. We have tried to provide in this bill enough money for the investigation of these contested matters in the field and for their proper and expeditious treatment in Washington. The committee has added something to the appropriation for the Geological Survey for topographic maps, and so forth, but the net effect is as I have stated to the Senator. I have stated to him the two principal increases.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Office of Solicitor", on page 3, at the end of line 8, to change the appropriation for personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field from $275,000 to $286,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 11, to change the appropriation for personal services in the District of Columbia under the Division of Territories and Island Possessions from $55,520 to $58,760.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Division of Investigations", on page 3, line 20, after the word "hereunder" and the comma, to strike out "$416,000" and insert "$500,000"; and in line 21, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$27,000" and insert "$30,500", so as to read:

For investigating official matters under the control of the Department of the Interior; for protecting timber on the public lands, and for the more efficient execution of the law and rules relating to the cutting thereof; for protecting public lands from illegal and fraudulent entry or appropriation; for adjusting claims for swamplands and indemnity for swamplands; and for traveling expenses of agents and others employed hereunder, $500,000, including not exceeding $30,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia; not exceeding $38,000 for the purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and motorboats for the use of agents and others employed in the field service; and not to exceed $5,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, who shall make a certificate of the amount of such expenditure as he may think it advisable not to specify, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior", on page 8, line 6, before the word "of", to strike out "$240,000" and insert "$250,000"; and in line 7, before the word "for", to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$85,000", so as to read:

For printing and binding for the Department of the Interior, including all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, except the Alaska Railroad, the Geological Survey, Vocational Education, and the Bureau of Reclamation, $250,000, of which $55,000 shall be for the National Park Service, $85,000 for the Bureau of Mines, and $50,000 for the Office of Education, no part of which shall be available for correspondence instruction.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 15, to insert:

NATIONAL BITUMINOUS COAL COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenditures of the National Bituminous Coal Commission in performing the duties imposed upon said Commission by the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, approved April 26, 1937 (Public, No. 48, 75th Cong.), including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; traveling expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings which, in the discretion of the Commission, are necessary for the efficient discharge of its responsibilities; contract stenographic reporting services; stationery and office supplies; purchase, rental, exchange, operation, maintenance, and repair of reproducing, photographing, and other such equipment, typewriters, calculating machines, mechanical tabulating equipment, and other office appliances and labor-saving devices; printing and binding; witness fees and fees and mileage in accordance with section 8 of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937; not to exceed $12,500 for purchase, exchange, hire, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for use outside the District of Columbia; garage rentals; miscellaneous items, including those for public instruction and information deemed necessary by the Commission; and not to exceed $8,500 for purchase and exchange of newspapers, law books, reference books, and periodicals, $3,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 16, to insert:

Consumers' Counsel of the National Bituminous Coal Commission, salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenditures of the office of the Consumers' Counsel of the National Bituminous Coal Commission, in performing the duties imposed upon said office of Consumers' Counsel by the Btiuminous Coal Act of 1937, approved April 26, 1937 (Public, No. 48, 75th Cong.), including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, traveling expenses, printing and binding, contract stenographic reporting services, stationery and office supplies and equipment, and not to exceed $1,000 for books and periodicals, $300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 4, to insert:

PETROLEUM CONSERVATION DIVISION

Salaries and expenses, oil regulation and enforcement: For administering and enforcing the provisions of the act approved February 22, 1935 (49 Stat., p. 30), entitled "An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products by prohibiting the shipment in such commerce of petroleum and its products produced in violation of State law, and for other purposes", as amended, and to include necessary personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations, traveling expenses, contract stenographic reporting services, rent, stationery, and office supplies, not to exceed $1,000 for necessary expenses of attendance at meetings and conferences concerned with the work of petroleum conservation when authorized by the Secretary of the Interior, not to exceed $4,000 for printing and binding, not to exceed $500 for books and periodicals, and not to exceed $14,000 for the purchase, exchange, hire, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, $285,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I assume that the language in italics is language not contained in the House bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. The amendments relating to the Petroleum Conservation Division and the National Bituminous Coal Commission are in exact accordance with the Budget estimates submitted to the Senate but not considered by the House.

Mr. McNARY. Why were they not considered by the House?

Mr. HAYDEN. By reason of the delay in the passage of the legislation that was enacted. The Senator will remember that the Guffey Coal Act was passed only quite recently. The estimates under it were not submitted in time to be included in the regular Budget estimates, which were made up a year ago.

Mr. McNARY. Do these appropriations carry out the provisions of the authorizations?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; they are authorized by law and were estimated for by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Later in the day, if the occasion should demand, may I offer an amendment to this provision?

Mr. HAYDEN. I would have no objection.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then I give notice that later in the consideration of the bill I shall offer an amendment to increase the sum in line 16 on page 10 from $3,000,000 to $3,600,000.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. McNARY. Without any further information, the proposal is subject to a point of order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to give additional information.

When the members of the Bituminous Coal Commission made their estimates before the Bureau of the Budget they submitted a schedule which, as I recall, provided for the establishment of five regional offices. The total amount required to provide for these offices, for 23 statistical offices, and for general expense was something in excess of $5,000,000. The Budget Bureau cut the amount to $3,000,000, and sent to Congress an estimate for $3,000,000. The function of the five regional offices——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not care to exact from the Senator a historical discussion. I simply wish to know whether the item conforms to the rule. The Senator ought to know what the rule is.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have listened to the Senator from Oregon, and have tried to learn from him.

Mr. McNARY. Has the item had the sanction of a standing or select committee of the Senate? If not, has it back of it a Budget recommendation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It has neither the sanction of the committee nor the sanction of a Budget estimate.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. Then it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I grant that. It is subject to a point of order.

Mr. McNARY. That is what I wanted the Senator to state.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "War Minerals Relief Commission", on page 12, line 10, after the word "elsewhere" and the comma, to strike out "$18,000" and insert "$20,000"; so as to read:

Administrative expenses: For administrative expenses made necessary by section 5 of the act entitled "An act to provide relief in cases on contracts connected with the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes", approved March 2, 1919 (40 Stat., p. 1272), including personal services, without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations; traveling and subsistence expenses; supplies and all other expenses incident to the proper prosecution of this work, both in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Land Office, on page 12, line 16, before the word "including", to strike out "$587,700" and insert "$637,700"; so as to read:

SALARIES

For Commissioner of the General Land Office and other personal services in the District of Columbia, $637,700, including one clerk, who shall be designated by the President, to sign land patents.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 17, to insert:

Transcribing records: For special personal services in the District of Columbia to transcribe worn and defaced records of the General Land Office, $20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 20, to insert:

Binding records: For personal services in the District of Columbia, purchase and maintenance of equipment, and all other expenses requisite for and incidental to the establishment, operation, and maintenance of a branch of the Government Printing Office in the Interior Building, to bind, rebind, and repair books of record in the General Land Office, to be expended under the supervision of the Public Printer, $24,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Expenses", on page 14, line 3, after the name "Interior" and the comma, to strike out "$675,000" and insert "$1,000,000", so as to read:

Surveying public lands: For surveys and resurveys of public lands, examination of surveys heretofore made and reported to be defective or fraudulent, inspecting mineral deposits, coal fields, and timber districts, making fragmentary surveys, and such other surveys or examinations as may be required for identification of lands for purposes of evidence in any suit or proceeding in behalf of the United States, under the supervision of the Commissioner of the General Land Office and direction of the Secretary of the Interior, $1,000,000, including not to exceed $5,000 for the purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Indian Affairs—Salaries", on page 17, line 7, after the name "District of Columbia" and the comma, to strike out "$505,270" and insert "$510,090", so as to read:

For the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and other personal services in the District of Columbia, $510,090.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Expenses", on page 17, line 16, after the word "available" to strike out "$32,000" and insert "$35,000"; so as to read:

For transportation and incidental expenses of officers and clerks of the Bureau of Indian Affairs when traveling on official duty; for radio, telegraph, and telephone toll messages on business pertaining to the Indian Service sent and received by the Bureau of Indian Affairs at Washington, and for other necessary expenses of the Indian Service for which no other appropriation is available, $35,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri asked that this item under general expenses on line 17, page 17, be passed over. At his request, until he can return to the Senate, I ask to have the amendment passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee,

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 23, after the word "bill" to strike out "therefore" and insert "therefore"; so as to read:

For advertising, inspection, storage, and all other expenses incident to the purchase of goods and supplies for the Indian Service and for payment of railroad, pipe-line, and other transportation costs of such goods and supplies, $700,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in payment for any services except bill therefor is rendered within 1 year from the time the service is performed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 5, after the word "equipment" and the comma to strike out "$210,540" and insert "$216,540"; so as to read:

For pay of judges of Indian courts, pay of Indian police, and pay of employees engaged in the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors, marihuana, and deleterious drugs among Indians, including traveling expenses, supplies, and equipment, $216,540.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 19, after the word "expenses" and the comma, to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$160,000", and in line 21, after the name "District of Columbia", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, not to exceed $3 per diem in lieu of subsistence may be allowed to Indians actually traveling away from their place of residence when assisting in organization work.

So as to read:

For expenses of organizing Indian chartered corporations, or other tribal organizations, in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat., p. 986), including personal services, purchase of equipment and supplies, not to exceed $3,000 for printing and binding, and other necessary expenses, $160,000, of which not to exceed $25,000 may be used for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, not to exceed $3 per diem in lieu of subsistence may be allowed to Indians actually traveling away from their place of residence when assisting in organization work.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I did not quite catch the item on page 18. I wonder if I may ask the chairman of the subcommittee to have that amendment passed over.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly. I can state the purpose of the increase, however. It is due to the application of the Wheeler-Howard Act to the State of Oklahoma; and the Senator from Oklahoma was very anxious to have the Budget estimate allowed. The Budget estimate was $160,000. The amount appropriated by the House was $100,000. The understanding of our committee was that practically the entire $60,000 is to be used in Oklahoma for organizing chartered corporations under the Wheeler-Howard Act. It is especially applicable to Oklahoma.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is, the additional amount?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If I may make a statement at this particular time, I fully appreciate what the Senator from Arizona has stated, that this particular item is to be used for the purpose of organizing chartered corporations under the Wheeler-Howard Act.

Mr. HAYDEN. In Oklahoma.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The additional amount is to be used for that purpose; but, nevertheless, the original amount of $100,000 was to be used throughout the entire Indian area under the provisions of the Wheeler-Howard Act. Since the passage of that act considerable opposition has arisen; and I may say now that so far as the Senators from New Mexico are concerned, and so far as the Senators from some other States are concerned, including the proponent of the original Wheeler-Howard Act, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], inasmuch as the Indians themselves

do not wish to carry on under the provisions of that act, and there is now pending before the Congress and before a standing committee of this body a bill for the repeal of the Wheeler-Howard Act, we do not think this particular item has any place in this appropriation bill.

Of course, if the Wheeler-Howard Act had been accepted by the Indians as a whole, there might have been some justification for the item; but my Indians in New Mexico have turned down the Wheeler-Howard Act and voted against it. The Wheeler-Howard Act was supposed to have for its purpose giving to the Indian the right to govern himself; yet, now that the Indian has turned it down, Congress is asked for an appropriation by which the Indian Office employees may go amongst the Indians in order to carry out and try to put into effect the provisions of the Wheeler-Howard Act.

Of course, I appreciate that every Senator knows more about his individual State than I do; but, so far as New Mexico is concerned, inasmuch as my Indians do not desire to be under the provisions of the Wheeler-Howard Act, I do not see that I would be justified in voting for an appropriation that will give the employees of the Indian Office the opportunity to travel back and forth over the entire State and try to insist on the Indians accepting the provisions of the Wheeler-Howard Act.

I believe that the proponents of that measure should know more about whether it is justifiable for Congress to appropriate some money to carry out its provisions. I know that, so far as New Mexico is concerned, we hope that Congress will not appropriate one dime by which to make it possible for the Indian Office to go into my State and force the Indians of the State to accept money which they do not want.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POPE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on line 19, page 18.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment to the amendment, to read: "*Provided*, That no part of this money shall be used within the State of New Mexico."

Mr. McNARY. Where would the amendment come in the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. It would have to follow the proviso now in the bill at the end of page 18, and should read, "*Provided further*", and so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let the amendment to the amendment be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. After the word "work" in line 25, page 18, and before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the words "*Provided*, that none of this money shall be used in the State of New Mexico."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, from my viewpoint there could be no objection to agreeing to the amendment to the amendment. Under the Wheeler-Howard Indian Reorganization Act every tribe of Indians had the right to vote on whether or not they would accept the provisions of the so-called Wheeler-Howard Act. The Navajo Tribe of Indians, the largest tribe, located in both New Mexico and Arizona, voted on this provision, and decided not to accept the provisions of the act. There is no provision of law whereby they can have a second vote; therefore, so far as they are concerned, the Navajos are not under the act, and so far as they are concerned, the act would not apply to them, and so far as they are concerned, the act is repealed.

So far as an amendment providing that no part of the funds hereby appropriated should be spent in New Mexico, the money would not be spent there, anyway, in my opinion, and there could be no point in trying to force the Indians of that State to accept the money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico again stated.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk, and ask that it be stated in its present form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, line 25, after the word "work" and before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for expenditure in the State of New Mexico.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in the light of the statement made by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], I have no objection to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have not any objection to the amendment to the amendment, and I think it is perfectly proper, but I do think the Senate ought to realize what it is appropriating this money for. The provision is:

For expenses of organizing Indian chartered corporations, or other tribal organizations, in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat., p. 986), including personal services, purchase of equipment and supplies, not to exceed $3,000 for printing and binding, and other necessary expenses, $160,000, of which not to exceed $25,000 may be used for personal services in the District of Columbia.

In other words, we are asked to appropriate $25,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia to carry on work to get these Indians into these chartered companies under the so-called Wheeler-Howard Act. Likewise we are asked to appropriate $160,000 for other expenses. What is that for?

Mr. HAYDEN. The increase recommended by the Senate committee is for the organization of chartered corporations in Oklahoma. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] was very anxious that it be done.

With respect to the $25,000, the committee made careful inquiry in regard to that. The attorneys and others who draft such charters are employed out of Washington. There is a general form that is used in respect to such organizations, and for that reason there must be someone in the central office here to have general supervision over the entire matter throughout the United States.

Mr. WHEELER. While I sponsored the so-called Wheeler-Howard Act, I must say that there has been great waste of public money in the Indian Office, and they have employed many, many people from out of the city of Chicago and the city of New York, and a lot of uplifters, and sent them around to the Indian reservations throughout the country. Many of those people never saw an Indian reservation in their lives, and there is a great waste of public moneys on the part of the Indian Office at the present time.

Hearings have been held by the Committee on Indian Affairs, where the Indians themselves have appeared and complained about the matter, and have referred to the waste and the inefficiency. Since I have been connected with the Committee on Indian Affairs I have never known of as much waste of public money and as much extravagance and as much inefficiency as has been shown during the administration under Mr. Collier. I think it is time the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations should look into some of these appropriations and some of the waste that is going on at some of the Indian reservations throughout the country. As a matter of fact, it is a matter of ridicule to a great many of the people in the West. I know that in New Mexico and in my State and all through the West they are just held up to ridicule for many of the things that are going on.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the plan the Senator from Montana sponsored when he had his bill passed by the Senate was that the Indians should manage their own affairs.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. These chartered corporations and tribal organizations were to be for the purpose of carrying out

that plan. Apparently the Senator has abandoned the idea that it is desirable for the Indians to manage their own affairs, and does not want them to organize in that way, but prefers to have their business done by the old Indian Bureau method.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is entirely wrong about that. I have been one of those who have advocated that the Indians carry on their own business as much as they possibly can. But let there be no mistake about it, the Indians are not today carrying on their own affairs. Testimony came out before the Committee on Indian Affairs showing that in New Mexico and in other States at the present time the Indian Office is going around controlling the elections of the Indians, and they have kept in vogue the same old practice of controlling the Indian councils that was in vogue under the Harding administration, when Mr. Fall was Secretary of the Interior. There is no difference, and today the Indians in my State have no more control over their affairs than they had before we passed the Wheeler-Howard bill. I was for the Wheeler-Howard bill because I thought the Indians were to get a new deal, but anyone who knows a thing about an Indian reservation in this county, and who knows how they are being run, knows of the waste and extravagance, and knows how the Indian Office has sent a lot of uplifters from New York City and Chicago and from other places, who would not know an Indian if they met him on the street, who never saw an Indian except in a moving-picture show in Chicago or some other place. They are sent out to tell the Indians how they should carry on their farming operations, how they should manage their tribal relations, how they should raise their stock and cattle.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator another question in connection with the Wheeler-Howard Act. That act authorized the expenditure of $2,000,000 a year for the acquisition of land. Neither the House nor the Senate committee agreed to allow the appropriation of that much money. Was that action wise, or unwise?

Mr. WHEELER. I think they were probably wise. I know nothing about the specific matter of the purchase of land. So far as my State is concerned, the Indians do not need any more land, and are not asking for any more land. I cannot speak for New Mexico or any other State with reference to that.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator spoke about cutting down expenditures. The principal expenditures authorized under the Wheeler-Howard Act were for the purchase of land.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know where the Indian Office got the money, but I know they have increased the personnel in that office and on the reservations, and we have heard on every hand of waste and inefficiency. One Indian appeared and testified, for instance, that in North Carolina, where there are 700 Indians, 300 are on relief, getting $30 a month. He said the Indians did not any longer walk in North Carolina, but that they ride in taxicabs now. The trouble with the whole Indian Office is that on many of the reservations they have no one who knows anything about Indians or the Indian traditions excepting what they have read out of the books.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The expenditures to which the Senator has referred are not expenditures made in the ordinary way by appropriations made in the Interior Department appropriation bill. Large sums of money have been made available to the Office of Indian Affairs out of the relief appropriations. I am quite sure that if the Senator will check up the matter he will find that almost invariably the expenditures which he criticises were expenditures from relief funds, and not from money carried in the Interior Department appropriation bill.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Referring to this particular item, I fully agree that the Wheeler-Howard Act was passed for the purpose of giving the Indians self-government, and one of the objections I have to this particular item is that it tends to lessen that self-government. Of course, if the Senator from any State desires that the act shall apply to his State, I am in favor of having him get what he wants; but for the very reason that I do not desire the Indians to have others impress their opinions upon them, and because I do not want the Office of Indian Affairs as a whole to be using Government money in order to impose their own particular desires upon the Indians, I oppose generally the particular item under consideration.

Mr. President, I do not want agents of the Indian Service to be running around the desert in my State with the idea of impressing their desires upon the Indians of my State. The Indians in my State today are thoroughly disgusted by reason of what has occurred in this respect heretofore. Those Indians today are more dissatisfied with the waste and extravagance indulged in by the Office of Indian Affairs than they were in the palmy days of Mr. Fall. The Office of Indian Affairs, in what it does, loses sight of the real objectives of the Congress and the administration in providing appropriations. That is what I object to. We do not want Indian agents by the hundreds running around the deserts of New Mexico, Arizona, or other States in Ford cars and imposing their wishes upon the Indians. However, if the Senator from Arizona desires this expenditure in his State, I am for him.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on that point?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from New Mexico whether they think it was ever the intention of the law for Government funds to be spent by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Department of the Interior to propagandize among the Indians in favor of this particular measure.

I have before me a magazine published by the Bureau of Indian Affairs dated March 1, 1937, to which I shall refer later in greater detail. This magazine is apparently published at Government expense, without any authority of law whatever. In it there is a discussion of the Wheeler-Howard Reorganization Act in which the Bureau is attempting to crack the whip over the heads of Indians in behalf of their acceptance of that act.

On page 3 of this magazine, published by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the edition of March 1, 1937, appears among other things this language:

> The Wheeler-Howard, or Indian Reorganization Act, was introduced in 1934. One of its many essential features was language giving the Secretary of the Interior power to bring the allotted lands into a condition where they could be used by the Indians, could be economically administered, could yield increased revenue in cash or kind to the Indians, and could be prevented from going to fee patent. The vested right of allottees to their equities was fully protected by the language, and the guardianship authority of the Secretary was not increased in principle by the language.
>
> A great uproar, directed against the whole of the Wheeler-Howard bill, made of the allotment section its principal talking point. Fear was thrown into the allotted Indians—fear that their holdings might be confiscated, that land might be taken from those who have and given to those who have not. No such consequence was intended or could have followed from the language of the bill.

And the following language is underlined in the document sent out from the Office of Indian Affairs:

> But the fear-nerve had been struck as though with a lash—

I presume that is what the Senator from New Mexico has been referring to here in the last few minutes.

I continue to read—

> reason and fact were of little avail; and in short, to get the other necessary things contained in the bill, the exceedingly important language about allotments was allowed to be stricken out.

Then the article goes on for some pages in the discussion of that measure.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has been referring to the efforts of Indian agents in creating senti-

ment among the Indians. I recall that a few weeks ago, when the deficiency bill was before the Senate, the Senator from New Mexico made the statement that in fact there were more Indian agents in his territory than there were Indians.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And, Mr. President, I still stand by that statement.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator stands by his statement made at that time. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from New Mexico, or any other Senator who may be interested, to the use of Government funds to propagandize in favor of a particular measure.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course I hope the Senator from Missouri understands my position.

Mr. CLARK. I not only understand it but I agree with the position taken by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Wheeler-Howard Act was sponsored in this body by the able Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. It was sponsored on the House side by former Representative Howard, of Nebraska. I happened to be a member of the Indian Affairs Committee of the House at that time; and because I wanted the Indians to get fair play, because I wanted the Indians to have self-government, I supported the Wheeler-Howard bill. But when I saw the Office of Indian Affairs setting aside all the efforts of the Indians in that direction, I became dissatisfied with the administration of the act.

If Senators wish to see dissatisfied Indians, they can find them almost anywhere throughout the United States. Senators will find dissatisfied Indians on the Klamath Reservation in Oregon; they will find them in the State of Montana; they will find them in the State of Washington. Indians from the latter State have been in my office within the last 6 or 7 days, making complaint. Senators will find dissatisfied Indians in New Mexico. Nowhere will they find Indians who are satisfied with the way in which expenditures have been made.

Mr. President, I am not complaining about legitimate expenses. In order to prove that, I may say that I think one of the best items in this bill is the item which will provide for a legitimate, honest expenditure in the State of Arizona in order to provide for a reclamation project which will put people on their feet; but when waste is seen, as I have seen it in New Mexico, I cannot see why the United States Government should furnish the Office of Indian Affairs with money with which to propagandize the Indians into accepting something they do not want.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, what is the status of the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico to the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is now pending.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no objection to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to the amendment reported by the committee on page 18, at the end of line 25.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amendment of the committee on page 17, line 17, dealing with the general expenses of the Office of Indian Affairs, was passed over at the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. I should like to have that amendment considered at this time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I asked to have that amendment passed over temporarily so that I could go to my office and procure some exhibits which it seems to me should be put into the RECORD at this time.

Senators will recall that a few weeks ago, when the deficiency appropriation bill was before this body for consideration, the able Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] rose and offered an amendment to the deficiency appropriation bill in behalf of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I do not recall the exact sum. Can the Senator from Arizona inform me as to the exact amount contained in his amendment to the deficiency appropriation bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not recall it at the moment. It may have been $100,000.

Mr. CLARK. My recollection is that it was in the neighborhood of $100,000. The statement was made to the Senate at that time that this deficit had been incurred by reason of taking care of old and indigent Indians, by reason of an extraordinary drought and the extraordinary and unusual situation then existing in certain Indian territory. At that time I asked the Senator from Arizona, who is also the very able and efficient vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing and chairman of the Printing Committee of the Senate, whether any part of that deficiency had been incurred by the publication, unauthorized by law, of a magazine by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, conducted partly for the putting out of propaganda, not only as to Indian affairs, but as to other matters. It was the impression of the Senator from Arizona at that time that no part of the deficit in the Office of Indian Affairs has been incurred in that way.

Mr. President, I took the trouble to write to the Comptroller General of the United States and inquire as to the authority of law for this publication and the funds out of which this magazine was maintained.

I may say first, Mr. President, that I had previously in the Senate of the United States called attention to section 201 of the Criminal Code of the United States, having to do with the use of Government funds for propaganda. Inasmuch as that was some time ago, I take the liberty again of calling the attention of the Senate to that provision.

Section 201, title 18, of the Criminal Code and Code of Criminal Procedure of the United States, provides as follows:

SEC. 201. Use of appropriations to pay for personal service to influence Members of Congress to favor or oppose legislation: No part of the money appropriated by any act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device—

Which, in my opinion, includes this magazine—

intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers and employees of the United States from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Any officer or employee of the United States—

And I assume that includes the Commissioner of Indian Affairs—

Any officer or employee of the United States who, after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, is found to have violated or attempted to violate this section, shall be removed by such superior officer from office or employment. Any officer or employee of the United States who violates or attempts to violate this section shall also be guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both. (July 11, 1919, c. 6, sec. 6, 41 Stat. 68.)

Mr. President, previous to the consideration of the deficiency bill in this Chamber I had addressed to the Comptroller General of the United States a letter requesting information as to this magazine, Indians at Work, I asked both the authority of law for its publication and the source from which the funds for its publication were derived. Having received no answer to the first letter, and the first telephonic request, I wrote a letter on March 30, 1937, formally requesting the information. On May 17, 1937, 6 weeks after I had requested the information, I received the following answer:

MY DEAR SENATOR: Further referece is made to your letter of March 30, 1937, ackowledged April 8, requesting information as to the appropriation charged for the Office of Indian Affairs' publication, Indians at Work, and the authority for such expenditure.

In reply to my request of April 8, 1937, for a report concerning said publication, the Secretary of the Interior advised me by letter of May 6, 1937—

Some 6 weeks after my request—

as follows:

Indians at Work is a multilithed pamphlet, prepared semimonthly by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. For your information there is enclosed a copy of circular letter no. 42, dated August 3, 1933, at which time this biweekly paper was first issued. Copies of this, as well as copies of all other E. C. W. circulars have heretofore been sent your office. Approval of this circular was given by Mr. J. J. McEntee, Assistant Director of Emergency Conservation Work, and constitutes our authority for this work. This pamphlet was initiated to interest—

I should like Senators present to listen to this, because it is a most illuminating statement by the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the P. W. A.—

This pamphlet was initiated to interest emergency conservation enrollees and workers in the emergency organization and all expenses in connection therewith up until about 2 years ago were paid from emergency conservation funds.

Mr. President, it appears from the statement of the Secretary of the Interior that it is not only necessary to give a man or woman a job, put him to work, and take him off the relief rolls and support him, but it is necessary to use public funds to get out propaganda literature to interest him in the work of the conservation program.

I continue reading from the letter of the Secretary of the Interior:

As more and more general service data was included, one-half of the expense of preparation was charged to the general appropriation for "Support of Indians and administration of Indian property," the other half being borne by "Emergency conservation funds." This arrangement exists at the present time.

In other words, Mr. President, it is demonstrated out of the mouth of the Secretary of the Interior himself that at least a large part of the deficit which was to be covered by the amendment to the deficiency appropriation bill defeated by the Senate 6 or 7 weeks ago was incurred for the publication of this propaganda magazine. The other half is apparently taken from funds set up by the Congress of the United States for the relief of unemployment and for the care of distressed and indigent citizens of the United States. The Secretary goes on to say:

The interest of the Indians (and others) was so great that it was necessary to increase the number of copies of each issue until at the present time approximately 12,000 copies are being issued twice a month.

I assume that, among others who are interested in this magazine, were a vast number of special Indian agents to whom the Senator from New Mexico has just referred.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May I say to the Senator from Missouri that the expenditures he has suggested would not be sufficient to satisfy the Indian agents in my State.

Mr. CLARK. I assume, then, that the Indian agents in New Mexico are being discriminated against. I think they would have a just ground of complaint to the Senator from New Mexico.

The letter of the Secretary of the Interior continues:

The pamphlet is multilithed and assembled in the Miscellaneous Service Division of the Department of the Interior. It is distributed through the Mails and Files Section of the Indian Office.

Then the Comptroller General goes on to say:

The appropriation for emergency conservation work, one of the appropriations referred to in the Secretary's letter, supra, was made in the deficiency appropriation act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1597, 1601), and the other appropriation referred to was made in the Department of the Interior Appropriation Act of the same date (49 Stat. 1757, 1778)—

The exact items covered by the increase in the appropriation now recommended by the Committee on Appropriations—

The copy of circular letter no. 42, referred to in the Secretary's letter, is enclosed herewith.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Comptroller General and the enclosure be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, May 17, 1937.

Hon. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Further reference is made to your letter of March 30, 1937, acknowledged April 8, requesting information as to the appropriation charged for the Office of Indian Affairs' publication Indians at Work and the authority for such expenditure.

In reply to my request of April 8, 1937, for a report concerning said publication, the Secretary of the Interior advised, by letter of May 6, 1937, as follows:

"Indians at Work is a multilithed pamphlet, prepared semimonthly by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. For your information there is enclosed a copy of circular letter no. 42, dated August 3, 1933, at which time this biweekly paper was first issued. Copies of this, as well as copies of all other E. C. W. circulars, have heretofore been sent your office. Approval of this circular was given by Mr. J. J. McEntee, Assistant Director of Emergency Conservation Work, and constitutes our authority for this work. This pamphlet was initiated to interest Emergency Conservation enrollees and workers in the emergency organization and all expenses in connection therewith up until about 2 years ago were paid from Emergency Conservation funds.

"As more and more general service data was included one-half of the expense of preparation was charged to the general appropriation for support of Indians and administration of Indian property, the other half being borne by Emergency Conservation funds. This arrangement exists at the present time.

"The interest of the Indians (and others) was so great that it was necessary to increase the number of copies of each issue until at the present time approximately 12,000 copies are being issued twice a month.

"The pamphlet is multilithed and assembled in the Miscellaneous Service Division of the Department of the Interior. It is distributed through the mails and files section of the Indian Office."

The appropriation for Emergency Conservation Work, one of the appropriations referred to in the Secretary's letter, supra, was made in the Deficiency Appropriation Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1597, 1601), and the other appropriation referred to was made in the Department of the Interior appropriation act of the same date (49 Stat. 1757, 1778).

The copy of circular letter No. 42, referred to in the Secretary's letter, is enclosed herewith.

I trust the foregoing is the information desired by you in the matter.

Sincerely yours,

R. N. ELLIOTT,
Acting Comptroller General of the United States.

[Enclosure]

INDIAN EMERGENCY CONSERVATION WORK, CIRCULAR LETTER NO. 42, BIWEEKLY PAPER

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, August 3, 1933.

To Superintendents and Field Personnel:

This Office is planning to get out a biweekly paper, in pamphlet form, covering Emergency Conservation Work on the various reservations. We shall endeavor to make it interesting and informative, and we believe it will be appreciated in the field.

We should like your cooperation in this matter. Please furnish stories of human interest, production, accomplishments, news stories, pictures, humorous anecdotes, etc. "Before and after" photographs will be appreciated. Articles dealing with recreational activities, family and other camps, will be of interest. These articles should be submitted as often as possible or at least once a week.

Furthermore, we are planning to publish in each number the best story and report submitted, with credit given to the agency or person furnishing it. If your agency is doing something special, along any line of the program, let the others hear about it.

Please remember that the production end should be emphasized. Production and accomplishments are important. While Emergency Conservation Work is primarily a relief measure, we want to know the work accomplished and the benefits received by the Indians.

It is believed the paper will be of help and interest to the field force and the Indians. If you like it, let us know; if you don't, send suggestions as to improvement.

JOHN COLLIER, *Commissioner.*

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, having reference to section 201 of the Criminal Code let us see what this magazine, Indians at Work, consists of.

The first item on page 1 is an editorial written by John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs:

Indians at Work, a News Sheet for Indians and the Indian Service, volume IV, March 1, 1937, no. 14.

I ask unanimous consent at this point, Mr. President, that this article, comprising eight multilithed pages, be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

Indians, it is often said, have in the Supreme Court their best friend. So far as courts go, the statement certainly is true; and looking at Indian affairs across the 105 years since the John Marshall decision on the Cherokee case, one recognizes that the Supreme Court has been the Indians' best friend not only among courts but within the Government.

Indians, therefore, will be particularly concerned over the debate now raging in connection with the President's Court message to Congress.

All of those who are crying to high heaven against the President's proposal, admit that some of the reforms he is advocating are necessary. The attack against the President's proposal strikes chiefly at the part which deals with membership upon the Supreme Court. Efforts are being made to break this part of the reform off from the other parts.

A legislative analogy, which will be understood by Indians, is here mentioned.

As Indians well know, the Secretary of the Interior as guardian of Indian property exercises powers very broad indeed. These powers are necessary to effective guardianship. They are not enumerated here; enough that they are broad and usually are unreviewable.

But one power, and, as it happens, the power which the Indians most need for the Secretary to have and to exercise, is not granted under existing law.

This is the power to do those things which would get the allotted lands back into a state of consolidation, of simplified legal status, of availability for Indian use, and of economical administration. Such a result is necessary if the lands (a) are to be used by the Indians; and (b) are not ultimately to pass to the auction block; while (c) in the meantime they are costing so much to administer that frequently the administrative outlay exceeds the income yield from the land.

Inasmuch as the value of Indian allotted lands far exceeds the value of Indian unallotted land, and more Indians are dependent for their future upon allotted than upon unallotted land, the importance of getting some device for salvaging the allotted lands is too clear to need argument.

The Wheeler-Howard, or Indian Reorganization Act, was introduced in 1934. One of its many essential features was language giving the Secretary of the Interior power to bring the allotted lands into a condition where they could be used by the Indians, could be economically administered, could yield increased revenue in cash or kind to the Indians, and could be prevented from going to fee patent. The vested right of allottees to their equities was fully protected by the language, and the guardianship authority of the Secretary was not increased in principle by the language.

A great uproar, directed against the whole of the Wheeler-Howard bill, made of the allotment section its principal talking point. Fear was thrown into the allotted Indians—fear that their holdings might be confiscated, that land might be taken from those who have and given to those who have not. No such consequence was intended or could have followed from the language of the bill, but the fear nerve had been struck as though with a lash; reason and fact were of little avail; and in short, to get the other necessary things contained in the bill, the exceedingly important language about allotments was allowed to be stricken out.

Therefore, today as 3 years ago, Indian-allotted lands are in thousands of cases unusable by the Indians; administrative costs, measured against land yield, continue to increase each year; each year a larger part of all the allotted lands drifts into the heirship status and then into the triple-complicated heirship status that comes with the third generation. Through consequences of allotment, which the original Wheeler-Howard bill would have corrected but which remain uncorrected, more land is being lost to Indian use each year than can possibly be compensated for through new land purchase under the Indian Reorganization Act.

The debate over the President's court proposals is taking a course not unlike the debate over the Wheeler-Howard Act in 1934. Let us pray that the course of legislation will not be the same.

The President's court proposals are numerous, and they are important at all levels, but clearly the most important of them, and likewise the most reasonable of all of them, is the proposal for additional judges upon the Supreme Court.

So conservative, actually, is the Supreme Court feature of the President's plan, that it turns out to have been proposed 24 years ago by none other than that member of the present Supreme Court who is ranked with the ultra-conservatives, Mr. Justice McReynolds. He made the proposal when Attorney General, in 1913.

There is no constitutional requirement as to the number of Supreme Court Justices. The number has been varied from time to time by Congress.

Whenever, through death or resignation, a vacancy arises upon the Supreme Court, it is the President who nominates the new judge. As most of the judges are elderly, it follows that any President at any time, as a mere result of deaths, might be able to "pack" the Supreme Court. If resignations and deaths happen not to come, then the President and Congress may find themselves confronted by a court "packed" by some earlier President whose political philosophy may have been the opposite of the prevailing philosophy and whose choice of judges may have been made at an earlier and different economic or social epoch.

A word as to the mere dispatch of business by the Supreme Court with its present number of members. The critics of the President's plan are announcing that the Supreme Court is not behind hand on its calendars. That is true, because, since February 13, 1925, the right of a hearing of the Supreme Court has been drastically curtailed. For a vast range of cases, this right has been made into a privilege, rarely accorded, and no longer a right. The aggrieved party petitions the Supreme Court to review his case. About eight hundred of these petitions for a writ of certiorari go before the Court each year. Frequently the cases are momentous ones, and generally they are complicated cases with a long anterior record. The appeals admitted as a matter of rare privilege are likely to be just as important and just as complicated as the smaller class of appeals submitted as a matter of right. Almost never is oral argument permitted upon these petitions. Usually they are denied, and almost never is an explanation vouchsafed by the Court. There is a widespread belief that these petitions often are disposed of by a single judge, and even that the research leading to a decision is frequently delegated to secretaries. The common belief almost necessarily is a correct belief; this follows from a merely statistical consideration of the number of petitions disposed of each year.

There comes to mind, as an illustration, a single one of the approximately 800 petitions denied by the Supreme Court in one of the years 5 or 6 years back.

This was a noted cases arising out of a century-old conflict over land titles in the Pueblo country of New Mexico.

Both the courts and Congress had recognized that the Pueblo Indians' titles to various areas had not been extinguished.

Congress had legislated that certain of these titles could be extinguished, but that compensation must be granted. And pursuant to this legislation, the titles had been extinguished; but in certain important instances no compensation had been granted.

In other cases, the Pueblo Lands Board had ignored the findings of its own appraisers and arbitrarily had slashed the compensation.

Thus, assuming that the Constitution applied to Indians, there was an apparent denial of due process and a taking of property without compensation.

The case was handled for the Indians by competent attorneys. It was brief in extenso, and behind the brief lay a volume of record, and behind that prior Supreme Court opinions pointing toward action favorable to the Indians if a petition for certiorari were granted. The essential subject matter, which would need to have been read to determine the admissibility of the appeal, ran into hundreds of pages.

Knowing the policy of the Supreme Court toward petitions for certiorari, and knowing that under conditions as they existed, this policy was in fact a necessary one, because otherwise the Court would be swamped utterly by the cases admitted for review, those who prepared the Pueblos' petition and those who financed it entertained almost no hope of getting the case into the Supreme Court at all. They justifiably believed that if they did get into the Court they would win.

It was a matter, of course, to have the petition denied and denied without explanation. And out of court, without a hearing, without a word as to the reason why, went this case, along with hundreds of others, at the October term of the Court. Later, Congress, acting on a unanimous report by its Senate and House Indian Committee, provided justice and gave the compensation which the Court had refused to hear arguments about. Even the Budget concurred. Such remedy is, of course, not to be hoped for in 999 of every 1,000 slighted cases.

The above case will help Indians to realize that there are multiple reasons for the President's proposal that added Justices shall be placed on the Supreme Court to increase its power to do business and to help bear the load of elder Justices.

The fundamental reason for the President's Supreme Court proposal clearly is one of social policy—it is to insure a court possessed of a frame of mind receptive toward modern solutions for modern problems.

But, in addition, it is a proposal to get the Supreme Court into a shape, in the matter of sheer manpower, to perform its functions as a court of last resort, passing as a real court upon Constitution controversies applied to particular cases. The Court as now made up could not meet its responsibility if every Justice among the nine were a Solomon of wisdom and a Napoleon of execution.

It was never the intent of the Constitution or of the people that the Court should delegate to one of its members the practical determination of issues in litigation under conditions where he in turn would be compelled to delegate to a secretary much or all of the research upon which his decision would be predicated.

It is no friendly act, either to the Constitution or the present Court, to demand that such an un-American way of handling business shall continue to be forced upon the Supreme Court.

* * * * * * *

Is the debate over the Supreme Court a proper subject matter for an editorial in Indians at Work? Decidedly, yes. In my first paragraph Indians are reminded of their own peculiar indebtedness to and dependency on the Supreme Court. But, in addition, Indians are wholly concerned with the preservation and the increase of efficient, productive democracy in the United States. No debate, reaching, as the Court debate does, to the heart of the

human and social problem of our country can be outside the discussions and concern of Indians—the most recently enfranchised of our citizens and the individuals of the whole country most dependent upon the Federal institution.

JOHN COLLIER,
Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. CLARK. I do not desire to detain the Senate by reading the editorial further than is sufficient to connect the author of the article and anyone who approves of it with an absolute open and flagrant violation of section 201.

I refer again to the first propaganda effort in regard to the Wheeler-Howard or Indian Reorganization Act.

This appears on page 3:

The Wheeler-Howard or Indian Reorganization Act was introduced in 1934. One of its many essential features was language giving the Secretary of the Interior power to bring the allotted lands into a condition where they could be used by the Indians, could be economically administered, could yield increased revenue in cash or kind to the Indians, and could be prevented from going to fee patent. The vested right of allottees to their equities was fully protected by the language, and the guardianship authority of the Secretary was not increased in principle by the language.

A great uproar—

This could only be directed toward the use of the horde of Indian agents and Indian contractors with a view toward influencing the action of Senators and Members of Congress in violation of section 201—

A great uproar, directed against the whole of the Wheeler-Howard bill, made of the allotment section its principal talking point. Fear was thrown into the allotted Indians—fear that their holdings might be confiscated, that land might be taken from those who have and given to those who have not. No such consequence was intended or could have followed from the language of the bill, but the fear nerve had been struck as though with a lash—

That language is underlined—

reason and fact were of little avail——

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. My understanding its they not only sent out what the Senator is reading, but in addition they sent out news letters to all the Indian reservations of the country, and such news letters were and are nothing more than propaganda of one kind or another.

Mr. CLARK. Does not the Senator agree with me, in view of the fact that legislation was already pending for the repeal or for the modification of the so-called Indian reservation act, the Wheeler-Howard bill, that the sending out of this matter to Indian agents and to the Indians, some of whom were voters in various States affected, could only be intended for the purpose of influencing the action of Congress, in violation of section 201 of the Criminal Code?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not think there is any question about it. I think that, as a matter of fact, in some of their propaganda they have expressly mentioned the names of various Senators. I must say that the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs is probably the best propaganda agent in the United States.

Mr. CLARK. I think this pamphlet which I hold in my hand completely demonstrates that to be a fact.

Mr. WHEELER. As a propagandist he is excellent. As an executive of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, in my judgment, he has been a complete failure. That is not only my judgment about it, but I think that is the judgment, if we could get a vote upon it, of everybody connected with the Indian Bureau for a great period of years. The whole Indian administration is in the most chaotic condition it has ever been.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator will agree that the man who devotes himself very largely to propaganda is likely to neglect his duties as an executive.

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

Mr. CLARK. Certainly.

Mr. PITTMAN. I thoroughly agree with what the Senator from Montana has said. I think I should remind him that we participate in these appointments. In the number of years I have been here through various administrations I think the Senate has paid very little attention to the consideration of nominees for the office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs. It seems to be a very unfortunate bureau. No President has ever thought it necessary, apparently, to select a man with any executive ability, any initiative, any business experience, any common sense, and therefore the administration of the Indian Bureau is not now unusual. From the very beginning of the Wilson administration we have had men there such as one who, in one case, broke into tears when discussing a very practical matter. That is where we are now and probably will continue to be until we pay more attention to the interest and joint responsibility which we have in the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as to the conduct of the affairs of the Indian Bureau, I express no opinion whatever. I am directing myself to a specific violation of the law and to a very vicious custom, which has apparently grown up in some of the executive departments, of using public funds for propagandizing purposes in absolute, flagrant, and open violation of the law.

As to the merits of the Indian Bureau reorganization bill, I am frank to say I do not know anything about it and express no opinion one way or the other. As to the administration of the Office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs, I express no opinion one way or the other, because I do not know anything about it.

I am inviting the attention of Senators to this matter of propaganda. The remarks of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] may be entirely correct, but what I am bringing to the attention of the Senate is not an omission in the examination and consideration of the confirmation of an appointee to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs but evidence of the repeated flouting of the law on the part of the heads of executive bureaus and departments in using public funds for propaganda purposes. I intend to make further reference to these departments to show, not only with regard to the Bureau of Indian Affairs but with regard to other bureaus and other matters which have nothing in the world to do with Indian affairs, that this publication to which I have referred is an absolute violation of section 201 of the Criminal Code.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have taken considerable interest in Indian affairs, because they come constanly before the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member. The criticism which has been visited on the head of the administration of Indian affairs might well be passed on down through its various officials, because, so far as I have been able to determine, one of the greatest troubles is that we have too many white people employed to look after Indian affairs. I have never seen so many employees of various kinds. To give an illustration, the Klamath Indians in Oregon, I believe, who were supposed to be well to do because they had large quantities of timber which were being sold, were in charge of a number of employees who, it seems, were being paid out of the proceeds of the sale of the timber. There was a little reservation of some 20 miles square, and there were 57 white employees. Fifty-four of the fifty-seven white employees each had an automobile to travel around on the little piece of ground which the Indians owned.

They not only have automobiles furnished by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and paid for out of the Indians' funds, but they all receive good salaries. Most of them receive from $2,000 or $2,100 up to as high as $4,000 or $5,000. Fifty-four of them each had automobiles, and the only ones who did not have automobiles were three unfortunate stenographers, as I remember, who were left out for some reason. I do not know why they should have been left out, because the other 54 employees out of the 57 each had an automobile.

I think, in the interest of protection of the Indians, this body ought to have a committee which will look into these

matters and see that the Indians are honestly dealt with and that the money appropriated for them goes to the Indians and not to those who would exploit the Indians.

Mr. CLARK. Let me ask the Senator from Tennessee a question. I know the great ability and long experience of the Senator from Tennessee, one of the most useful members of the Appropriations Committee. Does the Senator know anything peculiar to the Bureau of Indian Affairs which entitles its head to set at defiance the statutes of the United States by using public funds for propagandizing purposes?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not at all, and I am utterly opposed to it, but I have been unable to get any kind of information from the Office of Indian Affairs during the Republican administration as well as during the Democratic administration.

Mr. CLARK. I am trying to give the Senator some information. Let me finish reading the paragraph referring to the Wheeler-Howard Act which I was reading a few moments ago when I was interrupted:

> No such consequence was intended or could have followed from the language of the bill, but the fear nerve had been struck as though with a lash; reason and fact were of little avail; and, in short, to get the other necessary things contained in the bill, the exceedingly important language about allotments was allowed to be stricken out.
>
> Therefore, today as 3 years ago, Indian allotted lands are in thousands of cases unusable by the Indians; administrative costs, measured against land yield, continue to increase each year; each year a larger part of all the allotted lands drift into the heirship status and then into the triple-complicated heirship status that comes with the third generation. Through consequences of allotment, which the original Wheeler-Howard bill would have corrected but which remain uncorrected, more land is being lost to Indian use each year than can possibly be compensated for through new land purchase under the Indian Reorganization Act.

Does the Senator have any doubt, in view of the measures proposed for modification of the Wheeler-Howard Reorganization Act and the measures for the repeal of the Wheeler-Howard Reorganization Act, that that is intended purely and simply as an effort to influence the action of Congress?

Mr. McKELLAR. In my judgment, there is a clique in the Office of Indian Affairs which wants to run that Bureau without regard to the Congress. The only interest they have in the Congress at all is to get appropriations which will enable them to carry out their aims and purposes. They think practically nothing of the Indians. I am utterly ashamed of the administration of the Office of Indian Affairs.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator have any doubt the language I have just read is a bare-faced attempt to influence Congress as to future action by using public funds in violation of section 201 of the Criminal Code?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no doubt about it. I want to give the Senator the favorite answer to the question as to why they are spending money. Their favorite answer is, "Oh, well, it does not make any difference. It comes out of the Indians' own funds. It comes out of the tribal funds." That is one of the favorite answers to any question that may be asked about the expenditure of money—"Oh, it does not come out of the Government. It comes out of the tribal funds"—as much as to say that when it comes out of tribal funds anyone of the officials of the Indian Office has the right to take what he wants.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has just stated on his responsibility as a Senator that not only are these funds being used for the purpose of influencing Congress in violation of law, but they are actually being used to influence the Indians, as the Senator from New Mexico believes, in detriment to their own interests and rights.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is provided in some of the regulations issued that the Indians shall be hired at a per diem of $3 in order to carry out the propaganda of the Indian Office which it has in mind. The Senator from Tennesse is correct. Not only does the Indian Office disregard Congress, but it has no regard whatsoever for the Indians.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my judgment about it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. My judgment is that of the money we are going to appropriate this afternoon, presumably for the Indians, the Indians will get very little. We will build houses—$10,000, $12,000, $15,000 houses—but not for the Navajos. We will provide typewriters, but not for the Indian girls. We will provide automobiles by the hundred. In my State it was testified last summer, before the honorable Senator from Oklahoma, that there were over 700 automobiles in one agency alone, over that many trucks, but not for the Indians. We may send an Indian girl to Phoenix, Ariz.; and yet that poor little creature, prepared so that she can pound a typewriter, after she gets back to the reservation will be herding a bunch of goats within 3 weeks. We have people in my State now, some of them from New Jersey, teaching the Navajos to pound silver, and long-haired girls from the city of New York teaching them to dance—people from the eastern sections of the country teaching the Navajos of my State!

I do not object to providing money, and the Congress has always been good to the Indian, but the difficulty has been that we have had too much bureau and not enough Indian.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree entirely with the statement of the Senator.

Mr. MINTON. It is like the old cry of "Lo, the poor Indian!" I do not know anything about Indian affairs, but I was just looking at the statute which the Senator says is being violated, and I should like to know why this propaganda is being sent to Members of the Congress.

Mr. CLARK. I am sorry the Senator from Indiana has not had more opportunity to examine the statute; but if he will examine it he will find that the statute applies to the use of public funds not only as to propagandizing matters addressed to Members of the House of Representatives and Members of the United States Senate, but as to anything used in any way, by telephone, telegraph, mail, printed matter, multilith matter, or anything else, for the purpose of ultimately influencing the action of Members of Congress.

If the Senator from Indiana will listen to what I now intend to read from this section, he will see the point to which I have been addressing my remarks. We have accidentally entered upon the discussion of a phase of the internal affairs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to which I did not presently desire to address myself. I read the extracts from Mr. Collier's magazine, "Indians at Work", with regard to the Wheeler-Howard Act, simply as preliminary to reading certain other extracts.

Passing by for the moment his effort to influence Congress on the Wheeler-Howard Indian reorganization measure, Mr. Collier proceeds to a discussion of the measure intended to pack the Supreme Court of the United States—certainly not a matter immediately concerned with the affairs of the Indian Bureau, and certainly something which falls within the purview of section 201 of the Criminal Code of the United States.

Having given a very unfavorable review of the action of Congress with regard to the Wheeler-Howard Reorganization Act, because the Congress of the United States had had the effrontery to amend a bill sponsored by the Interior Department, by striking out one provision of which Mr. Collier seemed to approve, and having berated Congress over several pages for that assumption of authority, Mr. Collier, over his own signature, in this publication put out at Government expense, continues:

> The debate over the President's court proposals is taking a course not unlike the debate over the Wheeler-Howard Act of 1934. Let us pray that the course of legislation will not be the same.

And you may be certain that when Mr. Collier prays that the course of legislation by the Congress of the United States will not be the same, every Indian agent, every employee of the Office of Indian Affairs, every contractor selling supplies to the Bureau of Indian Affairs will echo the same prayer. Mr. Collier is doubtless familiar with the old saying that "the most sensitive nerve in the human anatomy is the nerve leading to the pocketbook." He also knows that when he says, "Let us pray", those depending on

his favor for enrichment or support will not only fall upon their marrow bones to pray but will get up and get busy to try to propagandize Congress for his wishes.

The debate over the President's court proposals is taking a course not unlike the debate over the Wheeler-Howard Act of 1934. Let us pray——

Let us pray—Indian agents, contractors, everyone dependent upon the favor of the Bureau of Indian Affairs—

Let us pray that the course of legislation will not be the same.

The President's court proposals are numerous, and they are important at all levels; but clearly the most important of them, and likewise the most reasonable of all of them, is the proposal for additional judges upon the Supreme Court.

So conservative, actually, is the Supreme Court feature of the President's plan that it turns out to have been proposed 24 years ago by none other than that member of the present Supreme Court who is ranked with the ultraconservatives.

"Now, you poor, benighted Indians, we are trying to do something for your welfare. Every Indian within the sound of my voice or the reach of my magazine, take notice, because you get allotments. Every agent gets a salary, and every contractor makes rich profits."

It turns out to have been proposed 24 years ago by none other than that member of the present Supreme Court who is ranked with the ultraconservatives, Mr. Justice McReynolds. He made the proposal when Attorney General in 1913.

And I am sure that every Indian for whose welfare Mr. Collier was so deeply concerned when he used Government funds in violation of the law to send out this propaganda document was thoroughly convinced as to the merits of the Supreme Court proposal when Mr. Collier told him that at one time Mr. Justice McReynolds had said something that could be construed as an advocacy of this proposal.

Then Mr. Collier goes on:

There is no constitutional requirement as to the number of Supreme Court Justices. The number has been varied from time to time by Congress.

And I am sure every Indian in the United States will be relieved as to his future welfare when he receives that assurance from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Whenever, through death or resignation, a vacancy arises upon the Supreme Court, it is the President who nominates the new judge. As most of the judges are elderly, it follows that any President at any time, as a mere result of deaths, might be able to pack the Supreme Court.

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

Mr. CLARK. I gladly yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. Has the Senator seen any of the recent magazines in which a compromise may have been urged? I did not know whether or not the Commissioner of Indian Affairs had now told the Indians to be for a compromise.

Mr. CLARK. I dare say that is true, Mr. President, although I have pursued the matter no further than the original exhibit.

If resignations and deaths happen not to come—

Says Mr. Collier—

then the President and Congress may find themselves confronted by a Court packed by some earlier President whose political philosophy may have been the opposite of the prevailing philosophy, and whose choice of judges may have been made at an earlier and different economic or social epoch.

A word as to the mere dispatch of business by the Supreme Court with its present number of members.

Having discussed the general background of this epochal legislation, Mr. Collier, as the father of the Indians, so to speak, representing the Great White Father at Washington, or at least the stepfather of the Indians, proceeds to educate them in such matters—ordinarily considered matters for lawyers rather than for laymen, but proper for consideration by the Indians—as writs of certiorari, and matters of that sort. Having demonstrated his capacity to the Indian Service upon matters of general constitutional theory, it was only a step by the noble Collier to proceed to the elucidation of such highly technical matters of law as the writ of certiorari.

The critics of the President's plan are announcing that the Supreme Court is not behindhand on its calendars. That is true, because, since February 13, 1925, the right of a hearing of the Supreme Court has been drastically curtailed. For a vast range of cases, this right has been made into a privilege, rarely accorded, and no longer a right. The aggrieved party petitions the Supreme Court to review his case. About 800 of these petitions for a writ of certiorari go before the Court each year. Frequently the cases are momentous ones, and generally they are complicated cases with a long anterior record.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not surprised that Mr. Collier is in favor of a reorganization of the Supreme Court. As a matter of fact, long before the President sent his message to Congress, Mr. Collier wanted to reorganize the lower courts. He wanted to set up seven or eight traveling judges to go all over the United States and hear Indian cases only. That provision was in the original bill which he sent down to Congress. He wanted, I think, eight or nine special judges to hear Indian cases only, and wanted to take the jurisdiction away from the present Federal district judges; but, of course, Congress struck out that provision. I am not surprised that he now wants to get the Indians lined up to pack the Court with six additional judges; but I am wondering whether or not he has changed his first opinion, and whether the Senator has seen any of his later bulletins.

Mr. CLARK. I am ashamed to say to the Senator from Montana that the first bulletin was sufficient for me. So complete a case was made in that bulletin that I have not pursued the matter further. It took me 7 weeks from the time I officially made the inquiry on my responsibility as a Senator to get any information at all as to this magazine, and I figured that if I undertook to pursue the inquiry as to subsequent issues of the magazine I should be involved in almost interminable delay, and I wish to bring the matter to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. Collier then goes into a rather lengthy discussion of one particular case in which he feels that the Supreme Court made an error in refusing to grant a writ of certiorari, stating, however, that the lawyers for the appellants in that case, when they filed the application for writ of certiorari, had so little confidence in the merits of the case that they had almost no hope of having it granted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Then Mr. Collier goes on, and this is certainly clearly within the statute—that is, section 201—

The above case will help Indians to realize that there are multiple reasons for the President's proposal that added Justices shall be placed on the Supreme Court to increase its power to do business and to help bear the load of elder Justices.

The fundamental reason for the President's Supreme Court proposal—

I am sure the Indians will be glad to know—

clearly is one of social policy; it is to insure a Court possessed of a frame of mind receptive toward modern solutions for modern problems.

But, in addition, it is a proposal to get the Supreme Court into a shape, in the matter of sheer man-power, to perform its functions as a court of last resort, passing as a real Court upon constitutional controversies applied to particular cases. The Court, as now made up, could not meet its responsibility if every Justice among the nine were a Solomon of wisdom and a Napoleon of execution.

It was never the intent of the Constitution—

I am sure the Indians will be glad to know this—

or of the people that the Court should delegate to one of its members the practical determination of issues in litigation under conditions where he, in turn, would be compelled to delegate to a secretary much or all of the research upon which his decision would be predicated.

It is no friendly act, either to the Constitution or the present Court, to demand that such an un-American way of handling business shall continue to be forced upon the Supreme Court.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield gladly.

Mr. WHEELER. There are seven Indian reservations in my State, and, to show how little influence the Commis-

sioner of Indian Affairs has with those Indians, not one of those long-haired Indians has ever written me a letter about the Supreme Court.

Mr. CLARK. They apparently were not affected by Mr. Collier's great constitutional argument.

Mr. WHEELER. They have not paid any attention to it. They do not pay any attention to him on this or anything else. Nevertheless, I appreciate the fact that he is trying to get the Indian vote lined up against the Senators from the various States where there are Indian reservations.

Mr. CLARK. And the Indian agent vote. The Senator from Montana, of course, is familiar with the fact that there are a large number of Senators on this floor and a number of Members in the other body of the Congress who represent States in which the Indian agent influence might be very considerable, and the Indian contractor influence might be very much larger, to say nothing of those Indians who might have some influence and be qualified to vote. Certainly there can be no purpose whatever for the insertion of such an editorial as the one in this magazine which I have just read, except an effort to influence those Senators and Representatives from the States in which the influence of the Office of Indian Affairs might be of some weight.

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

Mr. CLARK. Gladly.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, the administration has had the Department of Agriculture trying to influence the farmers who were getting money from the Department of Agriculture, they have had the Department of Labor trying to influence labor organizations, they have had the Post Office Department trying to influence those who got post-office appointments, and they have had the office of the Attorney General seeking to influence those who got patronage and came under their domination; so it is not to be wondered at that the Indian Office should try to line up the Indians and all the employees working under that office.

We hear of propaganda being spread in favor of this plan. Never in the history of the United States, certainly never since I have been a Member of the Congress, has there been such tremendous propaganda put out by the various departments in favor of legislation as has been spread in regard to this particular proposal.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator. I have read in the Senate, not once, but several times, the provision of law applicable to this situation. I have proved today out of the mouth of the Secretary of the Interior himself, and out of the specific language of the publication which I have quoted, issued by the Office of Indian Affairs, a flagrant, open, and notorious violation of that statute. I direct the attention of the Secretary of the Interior and of the Attorney General to this violation of the law and to the specific and mandatory provisions of the statute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee appearing on page 17, line 16.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall occupy the floor but a moment for various reasons. I would not have taken the floor except for the fact that I have listened to the able address of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

I was one of the Senators who endorsed Mr. Collier for the position which he now holds. I believed that he would effectuate reforms in the Office of Indian Affairs, that he would reduce expenses, and abolish some of the evils which were manifest, and which were growing constantly in that office.

I recall, during a somewhat prolonged discussion of appropriations for Indian affairs a few years ago, that it was shown that the appropriations were increasing materially from year to year and that the expenses of administration were likewise increasing. My recollection is that those debates showed that out of the enormous appropriation then made, approximately $24,000,000, 25 percent, possibly more, was consumed in payment of salaries of more than five or six thousand employees.

I have learned since coming into the Chamber a moment ago that the appropriation bill now before us carries for the Office of Indian Affairs an appropriation of $33,000,000. The promised reforms have not been brought about, the expenditures have increased, and I have risen only to express my very great regret that the Office of Indian Affairs under Mr. Collier's administration has not lived up to the promises made or the expectations of some of us who strongly endorsed Mr. Collier.

RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ADAMS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 361) making appropriations for relief purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 8, 13, 14, 25, 26, 27, 36, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, and 56.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 2½, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 57, 58, and 64; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "control, conservation, eradication of insect pests, and miscellaneous"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "and self-help,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lines 4, 5 and 6 of the matter inserted by such amendment strike out the words "or for completion of flood control projects already begun and for which other relief money has heretofore been allocated"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "or aliens who have not filed declaration of intention to become citizens"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "who are in need of relief"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "who are in need of relief and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "who are in need of relief"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "or as may be necessary for administrative expenses of the National Resources Committee,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. In carrying out the purpose of the foregoing appropriation the President is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations for the establishment of special funds in the nature of revolving funds for use, until June 30, 1938, in the purchase, repair, distribution, or rental of materials, supplies, equipment, and tools: *Provided*, That the requirement in Section one hereof that no Federal construction project shall be undertaken unless and until there have been allocated and irrevocably set aside sufficient funds for its completion shall not apply to flood control and water conservation projects authorized by other law and prosecuted hereunder."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the

matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "made available in this joint resolution"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "the President shall find that the project to be financed with such loan or grant will not cause or promote competition of the products of convict labor with the products of free labor"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by such amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 201. The Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works (herein called the 'Administration') is hereby continued until July 1, 1939, and until such date is hereby authorized to continue to perform all functions which it is authorized to perform on June 29, 1937. All provisions of law existing on June 29, 1937, and relating to the availability of funds for carrying out any of the functions of such Administration are hereby continued until July 1, 1939, except that the date specified in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936, prior to which, in the determination of the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works (herein called the 'Administrator'), a project can be substantially completed is hereby changed from 'July 1, 1938' to 'July 1, 1939'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by such amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 202. The amount which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized by existing law to have invested at any one time in securities purchased from the Administration is hereby increased from $250,000,000 to $400,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

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

"Sec. 203. The amount of funds which the Administrator, upon direction of the President, is authorized to use for grants from moneys realized from the sale of securities is hereby increased from $300,000,000 to $359,000,000; and after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution no allotment shall be made by the Administrator for any project the application for which has not been approved by the examining divisions of the Administration prior to such date."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by such amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 204. The paragraph in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1938, under the caption 'Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works' is hereby amended by (a) striking out the words 'in connection with the liquidation' and (b) striking out the sum of '$10,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof the sum '$15,000,000'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by such amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 205. The funds available to the Administrator for the making of loans or grants or loans and grants may be used for projects (in addition to other purposes for which funds may be used) of the following classes, in amounts not to exceed the sums specified for each such class: (a) For school projects (other than those included in subdivisions (b) and (c) of this section) to replace, eliminate, or ameliorate existing school facilities or conditions which, in the determination of the Administrator, are hazardous to the life, safety, or health of school children, $60,000,000 for grants and $11,000,000 for loans; (b) for projects which have been authorized, or for the financing of which bonds or other obligations have been authorized, at elections held prior to the date of enactment of this joint resolution, or for projects for which an authority or board constituting an independent corporation without taxing power has been specifically created by a State legislature prior to such date, $70,000,000 for grants and $22,000,000 for loans; (c) for projects for which appropriations have been made by the legislatures of the States, $15,000,000 for grants and $2,000,000 for loans; (d) for projects to be financed, except for the grant, by the issuance to contractors of tax or assessment securities at not less than their par value: *Provided*, That an allotment shall not be made for any such project unless the applicant has, in the determination of the Administrator, made or incurred substantial expenditures or obligations in contemplation of receiving an allotment, $5,000,000 for grants; (e) for projects for which funds have been tentatively earmarked by the Administrator but for which formal allotments have not been made, $54,000,000 for grants and $78,000,000 for loans: *Provided*, That the grant for any such project shall not exceed the amount tentatively earmarked as a grant for such project: *Provided further*, That the amount specified for any of the foregoing classes may be increased by not to exceed 15 per centum thereof by transferring an amount or amounts from any other class or classes in order to effectuate the purposes of the title."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by such amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 207. Title II of this joint resolution may be cited as the 'Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ALVA B. ADAMS,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
FREDERICK STEIWER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

C. A. WOODRUM,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
THOS. S. MCMILLAN,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
JOHN TABER
(except as to no. 47),
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the report of the committee of conference, which represents a complete agreement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the Senator from Colorado what happened to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] requiring certain publicity in respect to employees drawing more than a thousand dollars a year.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I have to inform the Senator that the Senate conferees were unable to retain that provision in the bill. However, the Senate conferees receded only after communication with Mr. Hopkins, the Administrator, and after receiving from him the assurance that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] could have the information which he desired upon his request.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does that privilege attach solely to the Senator from Pennsylvania, or is it to be general?

Mr. ADAMS. The request was only in reference to the Senator from Pennsylvania, but I have no doubt that the Senator from Michigan and other Senators would be accorded the same privilege.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But in the absence of the Senator from Pennsylvania, I may be assured that he can now obtain the information which he sought so strenuously and futilely for so long a period.

Mr. ADAMS. That is the direct information which we received from Mr. Hopkins.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question, which I think possibly I should propound to the Senator from Arizona, who is more familiar with the details of title 2? I should like to know, in the changes which have been made in title 2, what change, if any, was made with reference to the earmarking of the funds to continue the construction of projects which have been delayed by litigation.

Mr. ADAMS. I will ask the Senator from Arizona, who is an expert on that matter, to reply.

Mr. HAYDEN. No change was made. The House accepted the provision as approved by the Senate. Those projects are several large ones, one sometimes known as the tri-county project, in Nebraska, another one the General State Authority of Pennsylvania, another known as the Santee-Cooper project in South Carolina. There is also a slum-clearance and housing project in the city of Chicago. In several instances the projects have been held up due to litigation in court, but the amounts provided for them have been tentatively earmarked. It is the intention of Congress to make the required sums available.

Mr. BYRNES. In the litigation, certainly in Nebraska and South Carolina, attorneys representing the power com-

panies have urged that funds were not available as one argument before the court, and I was therefore anxious to have the Senator state that the conference report does what the bill as originally introduced intended.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator from South Carolina will examine the remarks I made when the amendment was adopted by the Senate, as they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 21, 1937, when the amendment was adopted by the Senate, he will find a specific reference to all projects of class (e) which clearly indicates the intention of Congress to provide funds to carry them out.

Mr. BYRNES. Very well.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Arizona about two amendments which were placed in the bill on the floor of the Senate. One was an amendment authorizing the P. W. A. to accept the authorities which might have been created by legislation in the States. Was that amendment agreed to?

Mr. HAYDEN. The amendment was agreed to with a modification, with which I think the Senator from Oklahoma is entirely familiar, which more clearly defines the nature of the board or agency created by the States with authority to issue bonds.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. My second inquiry is this: An amendment was incorporated in the bill on the floor of the Senate increasing the amount from $300,000,000 to $340,000,000. What was the action on that amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. There was this change in the situation: That as we agreed on the bill in conference we dealt only with the amount available for grants, leaving the amounts for loans unstated, because it was unnecessary to state them.

The amounts for grants are increased over the amounts agreed upon by the House of Representatives in a sufficient amount to take care of all the grants specified in the various classes contained in the House bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Those two amendments were intended primarily to assist two projects, one in Oklahoma and one in Montana. My question now is: Is the law as contemplated by the report sufficiently broad to enable those two projects to be considered and possibly approved?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no question that they can be considered under the law. Whether or not they will be approved is, of course, a matter within the discretion of the Administrator.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator explain what the effect of the amendment will be? The original amendment carried the date of April 24, and the Russell amendment changed that to the effective date of the act.

Mr. HAYDEN. The conferees agreed upon it with a statement changing it from the effective date to the date of approval. That was the only change.

Mr. HATCH. The effect of the amendment remains as it was under the Russell amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. And the amendment relating to bond issues heretofore authorized is substantially the same?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is unchanged.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator.

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

The report was agreed to.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6958) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Indian lands", on page 23, line 20, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$900,000" and insert "$1,000,000", and in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$34,000", so as to read:

For the acquisition of lands, interest in lands, water rights and surface rights to lands, and for expenses incident to such acquisition, in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat., p. 985), including personal services, purchase of equipment and supplies, and other necessary expenses, $1,000,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1937, of which not to exceed $34,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 2, after the word "reservations", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated the Secretary of the Interior may also incur obligations, and enter into contracts for the acquisition of additional land, not exceeding a total of $500,000, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof, and appropriations hereafter made for the acquisition of land pursuant to the authorization contained in the act of June 18, 1934, shall be available for the purpose of discharging the obligation or obligations so created.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator explain the purpose of that amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Wheeler-Howard Act authorizes the expenditure of $200,000 for the acquisition of land in each year. The Budget estimate was for a million dollars to be authorized each year, and authority to contract for the purchase of land in the amount of an additional million dollars. The Secretary of the Interior originally asked for authority to contract for the purchase of an additional million dollars. The committee fixed the figure at half of that amount—$500,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 12, after the word "thereon", to insert "and of improvements on former public-domain lands", so as to read:

For payment, pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 15, 1936 (49 Stat., p. 1272), to the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians in full compensation as to claim for the principal sum for 64,560 acres of land in western Colorado set aside as a naval oil reserve by Executive orders dated December 6, 1916, and September 27, 1924, $161,400: *Provided*, That in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, and with the approval of the tribe expressed through its tribal council, not more than $100,000 of the amount apportioned to the Indians of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, Utah, together with $100,000 additional from tribal funds now on deposit to the credit of the Ute Indians in Utah, may be expended for the acquisition of privately owned lands or interests therein, together with the improvements thereon, and of improvements on former public-domain lands, for said Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 21, to insert:

The unexpended balance of $5,004.25 of the appropriation "Purchase of land for landless Indians in California, act of March 3, 1925, special fund", which appropriation was repealed by section 4 (b 24) of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934 (48 Stat. 1227), is hereby reappropriated and made available until expended for payment of obligations heretofore incurred or to be incurred hereafter in the acquisition of land in California, with such improvements as may be appurtenant thereto, for the relief of homeless Indians of that State.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead, "Industrial assistance and advancement", on page 26, line 9, after the word "allotments", to strike out "other than the Menominee Indian Reservation in Wisconsin", and in line 16, after the word "lands" and the comma, to strike out "$260,000" and insert "$300,000", so as to read:

For the preservation of timber on Indian reservations and allotments, the education of Indians in the proper care of forests, and the general administration of forestry and grazing work, including fire prevention and payment of reasonable rewards for information leading to arrest and conviction of a person or persons setting forest fires, or taking or otherwise destroying timber, in contravention of law on Indian lands, $300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 25, after the word "purposes" and the comma, to strike out "$80,000" and insert "$90,000", so as to read:

For transfer to the Geological Survey for expenditures to be made in inspecting mines and examining mineral deposits on Indian lands and in supervising mining operations on restricted, tribal, and allotted Indian lands leased under the provisions of the acts of February 28, 1891 (U. S. C., title 25, secs. 336, 371, 397), May 27, 1908 (35 Stat., p. 312), March 3, 1909 (U. S. C., title 25, sec. 396), and other acts authorizing the leasing of such lands for mining purposes, $90,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 6, after the word "equipment" and the comma, to strike out "$600,220" and insert "$640,000", so as to read:

For the purpose of developing agriculture and stock raising among the Indians, including necessary personnel, traveling, and other expenses, and purchase of supplies and equipment, $640,000, of which not to exceed $15,000 may be used to conduct agricultural experiments and demonstrations on Indian school or agency farms and to maintain a supply of suitable plants or seed for issue to Indians, and not to exceed $30,000 may be used for the operation and maintenance of a sheep-breeding station on the Navajo Reservation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 21, after the word "crops" and the comma, to strike out "$165,000" and insert "$390,000", so as to read:

For the purpose of encouraging industry and self-support among the Indians and to aid them in the culture of fruits, grains, and other crops, $390,000, which sum may be used for the purchase of seeds, animals, machinery, tools, implements, and other equipment necessary, and for advances to Indians having irrigable allotments to assist them in the development and cultivation thereof, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, to enable Indians to become self-supporting:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 10, after the word "That", to insert "except for the Navajo Indians in Arizona and New Mexico", so as to make the further proviso read:

Provided further, That except for the Navajo Indians in Arizona and New Mexico not to exceed $25,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be expended on any one reservation or for the benefit of any one tribe of Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 13, after the word "Indians", to insert a colon and the following additional provisos:

Provided further, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to make advances from this appropriation to old, disabled, or indigent Indian allottees, for their support, to remain a charge and lien against their land until paid: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $15,000 may be advanced to worthy Indian youths to enable them to take educational courses, including courses in nursing, home economics, forestry, and other industrial subjects in colleges, universities, or other institutions, and advances so made shall be reimbursed in not to exceed 8 years, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $275,000 may be advanced to the Navajo Tribe of Indians for the purchase, feeding, sale, slaughter, or other disposition of sheep, goats, and other livestock belonging to the Navajo Indians, including the erection of necessary structures, the purchase of machinery and equipment, materials and supplies, the purchase or lease of land or buildings, salaries of employees, traveling expenses, advertising, and all other necessary expenses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 5, after the word "expenses" and the comma, to strike out "$42,500" and insert "$50,000", so as to read:

For the development, under the direction of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, of Indian arts and crafts, as authorized by the act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat., p. 891), including personal services, purchase and transportation of equipment and supplies, purchase of periodicals, directories, and books of reference, purchase and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, telegraph and telephone services, cost of packing, crating, drayage, and transportation of personal effects of employees upon permanent change of station, expenses of exhibits and of attendance at meetings concerned with the development of Indian arts and crafts, traveling expenses, including payment of actual transportation expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of members of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, serving without other compensation from the United States, while absent from their homes, not to exceed $2,500 for printing and binding, and other necessary expenses, $50,000, of which not to exceed $16,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Irrigation and drainage", on page 36, line 3, after the word "and", to strike out "$111,000" and insert "$161,000"; in line 7, after the word "and", to strike out "$111,000" and insert "$161,000"; and in line 11, to strike out "$299,500" and insert "$349,500", so as to read:

For operation and maintenance of the San Carlos project for the irrigation of lands in the Gila River Indian Reservation, Ariz., including not to exceed $2,000 for purchase of land, $76,300, reimbursable, together with $112,200 (operation and maintenance collections) and $161,000 (power revenues), of which latter sum not to exceed $25,000 shall be available for major repairs in case of unforeseen emergencies caused by fire, flood, or storm, from which amounts of $112,200 and $161,000, respectively, expenditures shall not exceed the aggregate receipts covered into the Treasury in accordance with section 4 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934; in all, $349,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 16, after the word "Indians", to insert a comma and "and such revenues are hereby made available for payment of irrigation operation and maintenance charges assessed against tribal or allotted lands of said Pima Indians in accordance with tribal resolution of June 16, 1937, and subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Pima Indians are hereby authorized to employ an attorney and an accountant for the purpose of advising them in connection with the legality and equity of these operation and maintenance assessments at a cost of not to exceed $2,000 including all expenses connected therewith payable from tribal funds", so as to read:

For continuing subjugation and for cropping operations on the lands of the Pima Indians in Arizona, there shall be available so much as may be necessary of the revenues derived from these operations and deposited into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of such Indians, and such revenues are hereby made available for payment of irrigation operation and maintenance charges assessed against tribal or allotted lands of said Pima Indians in accordance with tribal resolution of June 16, 1937, and subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Pima Indians are hereby authorized to employ an attorney and an accountant for the purpose of advising them in connection with the legality and equity of these operation and maintenance assessments at a cost of not to exceed $2,000 including all expenses connected therewith payable from tribal funds.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 5, after the word "Idaho", to strike out "$18,000" and insert "and for the investigation of damage claims on this project, $25,000", and in line 7, after the word "with", to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$25,000", so as to read:

For improvements, maintenance, and operation of the Fort Hall irrigation system, Idaho, and for the investigation of damage claims on this project, $25,000, together with $25,000, from which amount expenditures shall not exceed the aggregate receipts covered into the Treasury in accordance with section 4 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 16, to insert:

For the rehabilitation and maintenance and operation of the irrigation system on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont., including the purchase of any necessary rights or property, $95,000 reimbursable.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 25, after "1040)", to strike out "$700,000, reimbursable" and insert "$500,000, reimbursable, and in addition thereto the Secretary of the Interior may also incur obligations and enter into a contract or contracts not exceeding the total amount of $750,000 and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof, and appropriations hereafter made for continuing construction of this project shall be available

for the purpose of discharging the obligation or obligations so created", so as to read:

Arizona: Colorado River, as authorized by and in accordance with section 2 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, approved August 30, 1935 (49 Stat., pp. 1039, 1040), $500,000, reimbursable, and in addition thereto the Secretary of the Interior may also incur obligations and enter into a contract or contracts not exceeding the total amount of $750,000 and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof, and appropriations hereafter made for continuing construction of this project shall be available for the purpose of discharging the obligation or obligations so created; Fort Apache, $10,000, reimbursable; Hopi, $25,000, reimbursable; Navajo, Arizona, and New Mexico, $60,000, reimbursable; Salt River, $650,000, reimbursable; San Xavier, $30,000, reimbursable;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 15, after the word "Flathead" and the comma, to strike out "$200,000" and insert "including, $51,275, Camas division betterment, $251,275,"; in line 16, after the word "reimbursable" and the semicolon, to insert "Crow, $200,000, reimbursable;", and in line 18, after the word "reimbursable", to insert "Poplar River, $50,000, for resurveying Popular River project, reimbursable;"; so as to read:

Montana: Flathead, including $51,275, Camas division betterment, $251,275, reimbursable; Crow, $200,000, reimbursable; Fort Belknap, $12,000, reimbursable; Poplar River, $50,000, for resurveying Poplar River project, reimbursable;

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment: On page 43, line 19, after the word "reimbursable", to insert "Fort Peck, $100,000, reimbursable."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 43, line 19, after the word "reimbursable", it is proposed to insert "Fort Peck, $100,000, reimbursable."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the committee was quite liberal with Montana. I shall be glad to take the amendment to conference. I cannot assure the Senator that the House will agree to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the clerk be authorized to change the totals in this committee amendment, as amended, so as to conform to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

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

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 20, after the word "Nevada" and the colon, to strike out "Moapa, $20,000, reimbursable; Summit Lake, $10,000, reimbursable", so as to read:

Nevada: Western Shoshone, $100,000, reimbursable.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 4, to insert:

Miscellaneous garden tracts, $60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 9, after the words "In all" and the comma, to strike out "$2,288,000" and insert "$2,219,275", so as to read:

In all, $2,219,275, to be immediately available, which amount, together with the unexpended balances of funds made available under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1937, shall remain available until June 30, 1938.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Education", on page 48, after line 12, to insert:

The appropriation of $100,000 contained in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, for cooperating with public school districts in Glacier County, Mont., in the improvement and extension of school buildings to be available to both Indian and white children, as authorized by the act of June 7, 1935 (49 Stat. L. 327), is hereby made available under the same conditions as specified in the said second deficiency appropriation act until June 30, 1938, for improvement and extension of school buildings in rural communities in District No. 9, Glacier County, as well as other public-school districts within said county.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 3, after the figures "$75,000", to insert "and for cooperation with the Hays Public School District, Hays, Mont., for construction and improvement of grade- and high-school buildings as authorized by the act of May 15, 1936 (49 Stat., p. 1274), $50,000; in all, $125,000", so as to read:

For cooperation with Wellpinit School District No. 49, Stevens County, Wash., for the construction and equipment of a public-school building in the vicinity of Wellpinit, Wash., as authorized by the act of May 15, 1936 (49 Stat., p. 1273), $75,000 and for cooperation with the Hays Public School District, Hays, Mont., for construction and improvement of grade- and high-school buildings as authorized by the act of May 15, 1936 (49 Stat., p. 1274), $50,000; in all, $125.000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 24, after the word "balances", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior the construction and improvements authorized for the Hays Public School District, Mont., may be planned, erected, and operated by the Indian Service in which event the requirements of the act of May 15, 1936, and of this paragraph, with reference to the preparation of plans, the erection of buildings, and the reccupment of expenditures are hereby waived.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, at the beginning of line 8, after the figures "$115,750", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the amount available during the fiscal year 1937 for the acquisition of lands adjacent to this school is hereby continued available for the same purpose until June 30, 1938", so as to read:

Pierre, S. Dak.: For 300 pupils, $97,750; for pay of superintendent, drayage, and general repairs and improvements, $18,000; in all, $115,750: *Provided*, That the amount available during the fiscal year 1937 for the acquisition of lands adjacent to this school is hereby continued available for the same purpose until June 30, 1938.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 8, to insert:

For an additional amount for education of natives of Alaska, fiscal year 1937, to remain available until June 30, 1938, $55,000, and the limitation in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1937 on the amount which may be expended under this head for freight and operation and repair of vessels is hereby increased from $65,000 to $120,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Conservation of health", on page 55, line 24, after the word "diseases" and the comma, to strike out "$4,400,000" and insert "$4,595,690", and on page 56, line 1, before the word "for", to strike out "$3,242,220" and insert "$3,332,200", so as to read.

For conservation of health among Indians, including equipment, materials, and supplies; repairs and improvements to buildings and plants; compensation and traveling expenses of officers and employees and renting of quarters for them when necessary; transportation of patients and attendants to and from hospitals and sanatoria; returning to their former homes and interring the remains of deceased patients; and not exceeding $25,000 for clinical surveys and general medical research in connection with tuberculosis, trachoma, and venereal and other disease conditions among Indians, including cooperation with State and other organizations engaged in similar work and payment of traveling expenses of physicians, nurses, and other persons whose services are donated by such organizations, and including printing and binding circulars and pamphlets for use in preventing and suppressing trachoma and other contagious and infectious diseases, $4,595,690, including not to exceed $3,332,220 for the following-named hospitals and sanatoria:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 22, after the figures "$22,500", to insert "Cass Lake Hospital, $30,000; Fond du Lac Hospital, $20,000; Red Lake Hospital, $20,000; White Earth Hospital, $20,000", so as to read:

Minnesota: Pipestone Hospital, $22,500: Cass Lake Hospital, $30,000; Fond du Lac Hospital, $20,000; Red Lake Hospital, $20,000; White Earth Hospital, $20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, after line 7, to strike out:

Support of hospitals, Chippewas in Minnesota (tribal funds): For support of hospitals maintained for the benefit of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota, $90,000, payable from the principal sum on deposit to the credit of said Indians arising under section 7 of the act of January 14, 1889 (25 Stat. p. 645).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General support and administration", on page 60, line 6, after the word "provisions" and the comma, to strike out "$2,604,600" and insert "$2,700,000", so as to read:

For general support of Indians and administration of Indian property, including pay of employees authorized by continuing or permanent treaty provisions, $2,700,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, after line 7, to insert:

For an additional amount for general support of Indians and administration of Indian property, including pay of employees authorized by continuing or permanent treaty provisions, fiscal year 1937, $80,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 3, after the figures "$17,800", to insert a comma and "together with the unexpended balance under this head for the fiscal year 1937"; in line 4, before the word "together", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$7,500"; in line 5, after the word "together", to insert "with the unexpended balance under this head for the fiscal year 1937"; in line 7, after the word "Indians", to insert "additional for water supply, $2,500"; and in line 9, after the words "in all" and the comma, to strike out "$25,550" and insert "$28,050", so as to read:

Washington: Puyallup, $1,000 for upkeep of the Puyallup Indian cemetery; Taholah (Quinaielt), $17,800, together with the unexpended balance under this head for the fiscal year 1937; (Neah Bay), $7,500, together with the unexpended balance under this head for the fiscal year 1937 ($4,000 for monthly allowances for care of old and indigent Indians, additional for water supply, $2,500, and $1,000 for burial expenses); Yakima, $250; Tulalip, $1,000; Swinomish, $500; in all, $28,050.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 10, before the word "including", to strike out "$75,500" and insert "$85,500", and in line 11, before the word "for", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$20,000", so as to read:

Wisconsin: Keshena, $85,500, including $20,000 for monthly allowances, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, to old and indigent members of the Menominee Tribe who reside with relatives or friends: *Provided*, That not more than $14,000 of this appropriation may be used for fees and expenses of attorneys employed under contract, approved by the Secretary of the Interior, during the fiscal years 1936, 1937, and 1938.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$421,900" and insert "$434,400", so as to read:

In all, not to exceed $434,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, after line 8, to insert:

For compensation and expenses of an attorney or attorneys employed by the Chippewa Tribe under a contract, approved by the Secretary of the Interior on April 15, 1937, $10,000, payable from the principal sum on deposit to the credit of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, arising under section 7 of the act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota", approved January 14, 1889 (25 Stat., p. 645), of which so much as may be necessary shall be available for compensation earned and expenses incurred during the fiscal year 1937.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, after line 19, to insert:

There is hereby authorized to be expended out of the fund "Interest on judgment Court of Claims, Creek Indian Nation", now standing to the credit of the Creek Nation of Indians in the Treasury of the United States, the sum of not exceeding $2,000 to be paid, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, to attorneys for said Creek Nation of Indians employed under the authority of the act of Congress approved May 24, 1924 (43 Stat. 139), the payments to be made in such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the attorneys for such proper and necessary expenses as may have been incurred or may be incurred in the investigation of records and preparation, institution, and prosecution of suits of the Creek Nation of Indians against the United States under the above-mentioned act of May 24, 1924: *Provided further*, That the claims of the attorneys shall be filed by said attorneys with the Secretary of the Interior and shall be accompanied by the attorneys' itemized and verified statement of the expenditures for expenses and by proper vouchers, and that the claims so submitted shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, after line 2, to insert:

For acquisition, rehabilitation, and preservation of the Tuskahoma Council House in Pushmataha County, Choctaw Nation, Okla., $10,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary, payable from the fund "Fulfilling treaties with Choctaws, Oklahoma" now to the credit of the Choctaw Indians of Oklahoma, and the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1937, is hereby continued available until June 30, 1938.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, after line 6, to insert:

For compensation and expenses of William H. Fuller and Melven Cornish for services rendered the Chickasaw Nation of Oklahoma, under the terms of a contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior on May 13, 1935, in the case of *The Choctaw Nation v. The United States and the Chickasaw Nation* in the United States Court of Claims, case numbered J–231, $15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, payable from funds on deposit to the credit of the Chickasaw Nation of Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Roads and Bridges", on page 69, line 1, before the words "to be", to strike out "$2,700,000" and insert "$3,000,000", so as to read:

For construction, improvement, repair, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads under the provisions of the acts of May 26, 1928 (U. S. C., title 25, sec. 318a), and June 16, 1936 (49 Stat., p. 1521), $3,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction and repair", on page 70, after line 9, to insert:

Claremore Hospital, Oklahoma: Employees' quarters, $40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 11, after the figures "$8,500", to insert "improvement of water supply, $21,000", so as to read:

Colorado River, Ariz.: Telephone line, $8,500; improvement of water supply, $21,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, after line 13, to insert:

Colville, Wash.: Improvement of water supply, $35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 8, after the figures "$73,000" and the semicolon, to insert "two physicians' cottages, $15,000", so as to read:

Kiowa, Okla.: Riverside, dormitory facilities, $73,000; one cottage, $6,000; Fort Sill, school building, $73,000; two physicians' cottages, $15,000; improvements to sewer system, $20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, after line 9, to insert:

Mescalero, N. Mex.: Office building, $25,000;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, after line 2, to insert:

Tongue River, Mont.: Birney day school, including sewer and water systems, and light plant, $30,000;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, after line 4, to insert:

Turtle Mountain, N. Dark.: Day-school facilities, $62,500;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 23, after the words "in all" and the comma, to strike out "$1,866,500" and insert "$2,095,000"; so as to read:

For administrative expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $2,500 for printing and binding; purchase of periodicals, directories, and books of reference; purchase and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; traveling expenses of employees; rent of office and storage space; telegraph and telephone tolls; and all other necessary expenses not specifically authorized herein, $175,000; in all, $2,095,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until June 30, 1939.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 25, after the numerals "1939", to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That not to exceed 5 percent of the amount of any specific authorization may be transferred, in the discretion of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to the amount of any other specific authorization, but no limitation shall be increased more than 5 percent by any such transfer.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Annuities and per-capita payments", on page 74, after line 18, to insert:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States $105,000 of any funds on deposit to the credit of the Menominee Indians in Wisconsin (except the Menominee log funds), and to expend said sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for a per-capita payment of $50 to each enrolled member of the Menominee Tribe: *Provided*, That such payment shall be in lieu of the payment authorized by the act of June 15, 1934 (48 Stat., p. 964), for the fair market stumpage value of timber cut on the Menominee Reservation during the fiscal year 1937: *Provided further*, That in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior the payment herein authorized may be made in two installments.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation", on page 81, line 14, after the word "revenues", to strike out "as hereinafter stated", so as to read:

Rio Grande project, New Mexico-Texas: For operation and maintenance, $350,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to enter into a contract with the El Paso County water improvement district no. 1 and the Elephant Butte irrigation district of New Mexico, by which the districts will be relieved of the obligation of making payment of the construction cost chargeable to the development of power of Elephant Butte Dam in the amount determined as equitable by the Secretary of the Interior in return for the conveyance by the said two districts to the United States of all the districts' right, title, interest, and estate in the use of said dam and other project works, including the project water supply, for the development of hydroelectric energy: *Provided further*, That in such contracts it shall be stated that the use of the dam, project works, and water supply for power purposes shall not deplete or interfere with the use thereof for irrigation purposes: *Provided further*, That the net earnings of the power plant and system belonging to the United States and any other available revenues shall be applied, until the cost thereof has been met, upon the cost of the power development, including (1) the cost of power facilities, (2) the amount invested, as herein authorized, in the cost of Elephant Butte Dam, and (3) the amount invested by the Bureau of Reclamation in Caballo Dam: *Provided further*, That after the cost of the power development has been met the net earnings of the power plant and system shall be disposed of as Congress may direct.

The next amendment was, on page 85, after line 6, to insert "Gila Project, Arizona, $1,250,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Gila project is authorized by law and a Budget estimate which was submitted for this amount. The project will obtain its supply of water from the Colorado River. The sole source of water for the project will be water impounded by the Boulder Canyon Dam. In order to make it perfectly clear that the project shall be operated in accordance with the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and shall be subject to and controlled by the Colorado River compact as provided by that act, I have agreed with the Senators from the upper-basin States that there shall be added to the bill a legislative provision which I now offer. The text of the amendment does not change existing law, but merely directs attention to an act of Congress which applies to the Gila project and which makes the Colorado River compact effective so far as the Gila project is concerned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I say for the RECORD that the amendment which is now being offered by the Senator from Arizona is in accordance with an understanding which has been had by him with the Senators from the States in the upper basin of the Colorado River? The language of the amendment was submitted to the attorney general for Wyoming, who in turn took it up with the attorneys general for Colorado and New Mexico. It is now in accordance with suggestions received from them. I believe that it is altogether satisfactory to the upper-basin States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 85, line 7, it is proposed to strike out—

Gila project, Arizona, $1,250,000.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Gila project, Arizona, $1,250,000, said Gila project, including the waters to be diverted and used thereby and the lands and structures for the diversion and storage thereof to be subject to the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, and subject to and controlled by the provisions of the Colorado River compact signed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., November 24, 1922.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arizona to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, on page 85, after line 11, to insert:

Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado: For construction in accordance with the plan described in Senate Document No. 80, Seventy-fifth Congress, $900,000: *Provided*, That no construction thereof shall be commenced until the repayment of all costs of the project shall, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior, be assured by appropriate contracts with, water-conservancy districts, or irrigation districts or water-users' associations organized under the laws of Colorado, or other form of organization satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, after line 23, to insert:

Frenchtown project, Montana, $35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, line 10, after the word "investigations" and the comma, to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$250,000", so as to read:

Colorado River Basin investigations, $250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, after line 11, to insert:

For administrative expenses on account of the above projects, including personal services and other expenses in the District of Columbia and in the field, $750,000, in addition to and for the same objects of expenditure as are hereinbefore enumerated in paragraphs 2 and 3 under the caption "Bureau of Reclamation"; in all, $10,535,000: *Provided*, That of this amount not to exceed $75,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, after line 19, to insert:

The unexpended balances of the amounts appropriated from the reclamation fund, special fund, under the caption "Bureau of Reclamation, Construction", in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1937, shall remain available for the same purposes for the fiscal year 1938.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the amendment which has just been agreed to covers all of the unexpended balances which were appropriated by the Interior Department Act for 1937 for these various projects.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly correct, and was so stated by the Commissioner of Reclamation in requesting the adoption of this amendment. It is in accordance with the Budget Bureau estimates and is designed to carry out the purpose stated by the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 1, after the word "fund" and the comma, to strike out "$9,416,600" and insert "$11,701,600", so as to read:

Total, from reclamation fund, $11,701,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 6, after the word "projects", to insert "and for general investigations", so as to read:

For continuation of construction of the following projects and for general investigations in not to exceed the following amounts, respectively, to be expended from the general fund of the Treasury in the same manner and for the same objects of expenditure as specified for projects included hereinbefore in this act under the caption "Bureau of Reclamation", and to be reimbursable under the reclamation law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, after line 20, to insert:

For general investigations, $300,000 to enable the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to carry on engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects, surveys for reconstruction, rehabilitation, or extension of existing projects and studies of water conservation and development plans, such investigations, surveys, and studies to be carried on by said Bureau either independently, or, if deemed advisable by the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with State agencies and other Federal agencies, including the Corps of Engineers, National Resources Committee, and the Federal Power Commission;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, line 13, after the words "in all" and the comma, to strike out "$26,250,000" and insert "$26,550,000", so as to read:

For administrative expenses on account of the above projects, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, $750,000, in addition to and for the same objects of expenditure as are hereinbefore enumerated in paragraphs 2 and 3 under the caption "Bureau of Reclamation"; in all, $26,550,000: *Provided*, That of this amount not to exceed $75,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Geological Survey—Salaries", on page 92, line 4, after the name "District of Columbia" and the comma, to strike out "$140,000" and insert "$165,000", so as to read:

For the Director of the Geological Survey and other personal services in the District of Columbia, $165,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General expenses", on page 92, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,500" and insert "$3,000", so as to read:

GENERAL EXPENSES

For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the authorized work of the Geological Survey, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, including not to exceed $30,000 for the purchase and exchange, and not to exceed $55,000 for the hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles for field use only by geologists, topographers, engineers, and land classifiers, and the Geological Survey is authorized to exchange unserviceable and worn-out passenger-carrying and freight-carrying vehicles as part payment for new freight-carrying vehicles, and including not to exceed $3,000 for necessary traveling expenses of the Director and members of the Geological Survey acting under his direction, for attendance upon meetings of technical, professional, and scientific societies when required in connection with the authorized work of the Geological Survey, to be expended under the regulations from time to time prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, and under the following heads.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 93, line 2, after the name "United States", to strike out "$650,000" and insert "$800,000", so as to read:

Topographic surveys: For topographic surveys in various portions of the United States, $800,000, of which amount not to exceed $250,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 93, line 23, before the word "may", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$34,000", so as to read:

Mineral resources of Alaska: For continuation of the investigation of the mineral resources of Alaska, $60,000, to be available immediately, of which amount not to exceed $34,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 94, line 5, after the word "resources" and the comma, to strike out "$800,000" and insert "$1,000,000", so as to read:

Gaging streams: For gaging streams and determining the water supply of the United States, the investigation of underground currents and artesian wells, and the preparation of reports upon the best methods of utilizing the water resources, $1,000,000, of which amount not to exceed $100,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 94, line 15, after the word "That", to strike out "$600,000" and insert "$800,000", so as to make the additional proviso read:

Provided further, That $800,000 of this amount shall be available only for such cooperation with States or municipalities.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 95, line 2, before the word "may", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$70,000", so as to read:

Classification of lands: For the examination and classification of lands with respect to mineral character and water resources as required by the public-land laws and for related administrative operations; for the preparation and publication of mineral-land classification and water-resources maps and reports; for engineering supervision of power permits and grants under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior; and for performance of work of the Federal Power Commission, $100,000, of which amount not to exceed $70,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 95, line 18, after the word "thereto" and the comma, to strike out "$275,000" and insert "$350,000", and in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$60,000" and insert "$75,000", so as to read:

Mineral leasing: For the enforcement of the provisions of the acts of October 20, 1914 (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 435), October 2, 1917 (U. S. C., title 30, sec. 141), February 25, 1920 (U. S. C., title 30, sec. 181), as amended, and March 4, 1921 (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 444), and other acts relating to the mining and recovery of minerals on Indian and public lands and naval petroleum reserves; and for every other expense incident thereto, including supplies, equipment, expenses of travel and subsistence, the construction, maintenance, and repair of necessary camp buildings and appurtenances thereto, $350,000, of which amount not to exceed $75,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 98, line 3, after the word "Survey" and the comma, to change the total appropriation for the United States Geological Survey from $2,787,000 to $3,237,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Mines—Salaries and general expenses", on page 98, line 13, after the word "Interior" and the comma, to strike out "$65,000" and insert "$68,380", and in line 14, after the word

"exceed", to strike out "$52,000" and insert $"54,900", so as to read:

Salaries and general expenses: For general expenses, including pay of the Director and necessary assistants, clerks, and other employees, in the office in the District of Columbia and in the field, and every other expense requisite for and incident to the general work of the Bureau in the District of Columbia and in the field, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, $68,380, of which amount not to exceed $54,900 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 99, line 21, after the name "District of Columbia" and the comma, to strike out "$615,000" and insert "$637,500", so as to read:

Operating mine rescue cars and stations and investigation of mine accidents: For the investigation and improvement of mine rescue and first-aid methods and appliances and the teaching of mine safety, rescue, and first-aid methods; investigations as to the causes of mine explosions, causes of falls of roof and coal, methods of mining, especially in relation to the safety of miners, the appliances best adapted to prevent accidents, the possible improvement of conditions under which mining operations are carried on, the use of explosives and electricity, the prevention of accidents, statistical studies and reports relating to mine accidents, and other inquiries and technologic investigations pertinent to the mining industry; the exchange in part payment for operation, maintenance, and repair of mine rescue trucks; the construction of temporary structures and the repair, maintenance, and operation of mine-rescue cars and the Government-owned mine rescue stations and appurtenances thereto; personal services, traveling expenses and subsistence, equipment, and supplies; travel and subsistence, and other incidental expenses of employees in attendance at meetings and conferences held for the purpose of promoting safety and health in the mining and allied industries; purchase not exceeding $6,000, exchange as part payment for, operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in field work; purchase and exchange in part payment therefor of cooks' uniforms, goggles, gloves, rubber boots, aprons, and such other articles or equipment as may be necessary in connection with the purposes of this paragraph; including not to exceed $67,100 for personal services in the District of Columbia, $637,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 100, line 12, before the word "of", to strike out "$240,400" and insert "$250,400", so as to read:

Testing fuel: To conduct inquiries and scientific and technologic investigations concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, and use of mineral fuels, and for investigation of mineral fuels belonging to or for the use of the United States, with a view to their most efficient utilization; to recommend to various departments such changes in selection and use of fuel as may result in greater economy, and upon request of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to investigate the fuel-burning equipment in use by or proposed for any of the departments, establishments, or institutions of the United States in the District of Columbia, $250,400, of which amount not to exceed $29,400 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 102, line 10, before the word "of", to strike out "$305,000" and insert "$388,850", so as to read:

Mining experiment stations: For the employment of personal services, purchase of laboratory gloves, goggles, rubber boots and aprons, the purchase not to exceed $3,000, exchange as part payment for, maintenance and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in field work, and all other expenses in connection with the establishment, maintenance, and operation of mining experiment stations, as provided in the act authorizing additional mining experiment stations, approved March 3, 1915 (U. S. C., title 30, sec. 8), $388,850, of which appropriation not to exceed $17,100 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 102, line 20, after the word "improvements" and the comma, to strike out "$82,690" and insert "87,690", so as to read:

Buildings and grounds, Pittsburgh, Pa.: For care and maintenance of buildings and grounds at Pittsburgh and Bruceton, Pa., including personal services, the purchase, exchange as part payment for, operation, maintenance, and repair of passenger automobiles for official use, and all other expenses requisite for and incident thereto, including not to exceed $5,000 for additions and improvements, $87,690.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 103, line 14, after the word "foregoing" and the comma, to strike out "$274,790" and insert "$324,970"; and in line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$262,700", so as to read:

Economics of mineral industries: For inquiries and investigations, and the dissemination of information concerning the economic problems of the mining, quarrying, metallurgical, and other mineral industries, with a view to assuring ample supplies and efficient distribution of the mineral products of the mines and quarries, including studies and reports relating to uses, reserves, production, distribution, stocks, consumption, prices, and marketing of mineral commodities and primary products thereof; preparation of the reports of the mineral resources of the United States, including special statistical inquiries; and including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase of furniture and equipment; stationery and supplies; typewriting, adding and computing machines, accessories and repairs; newspapers; traveling expenses; purchase, not exceeding $1,200, exchange as part payment for, operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in field work; and for all other necessary expenses not included in the foregoing, $324,970, of which amount not to exceed $262,700 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 105, line 25, after the words "in all", to strike out "$2,500" and insert "$3,000", so as to read:

For necessary traveling expenses of the director and employees of the Bureau, acting under his direction, for attendance upon meetings of technical, professional, and scientific societies, when required in connection with the authorized work of the Bureau of Mines and incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of the Interior, there is hereby made available from any appropriations made to the Bureau of Mines not to exceed in all $3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 107, line 7, to change the total appropriation for the Bureau of Mines from $2,119,240 to $2,293,650.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading, "National Park Service", on page 107, line 24, before the words "of which", to strike out "$196,940" and insert "$150,000", so as to read:

Salaries: For the Director of the National Park Service and other personal services in the District of Columbia, including accounting services in checking and verifying the accounts and records of the various operators, licensees, and permittees conducting utilities and other enterprises within the national parks and monuments, and including the services of specialists and experts for investigations and examinations of lands to determine their suitability for national park and national monument purposes and members of the commission appointed under the provisions of the act of February 21, 1925 (43 Stat., p. 959): *Provided*, That such specialists and experts may be employed for temporary service at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior to correspond to those established by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and without reference to the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, $150,000, of which amount not to exceed $23,680 may be expended for the services of field employees engaged in examination of lands and in developing the educational work of the National Park Service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 110, after line 11, to insert:

Fish hatchery for Glacier National Park: For acquisition, by the Secretary of the Interior, of such real property and rights therein in township 28 north, range 20 west, Montana meridian, as may be necessary for the establishment and operation of a fish hatchery for Glacier National Park, $16,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 116, to insert:

Oregon Caves National Monument, Oreg.: For the improvement of the lighting system, including the purchase and installation of equipment and supplies, at Oregon Caves National Monument, Oreg., $20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 118, after line 14, to insert:

Appropriations herein made for the national parks, national monuments, and other reservations under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, shall be available for the giving of educational lectures therein and for the services of field employees in

cooperation with such nonprofit scientific and historical societies engaged in educational work in the various parks and monuments as the Secretary, in his discretion, may designate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 120, line 11, after the word "expended" and the comma, to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$7,200,000", so as to read:

Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways: For continuing the construction and maintenance, under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 16, 1936 (49 Stat., pp. 1519–1522), of the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways, to be immediately available and remain available until expended, $7,200,000, of which amount not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 120, line 13, after the word "Columbia" and the colon, to strike out the following proviso: *"Provided,* That not exceeding $500,000 of this appropriation shall be available for construction of the Natchez Trace Parkway" and in lieu thereof to insert:

Provided, That $2,700,000 and any other sums received from other sources for said Natchez Trace Parkway shall be allotted and expended ratably between the States of Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee according to mileage of said parkway in each respective State.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 121, line 2, to strike out "$24,000" and insert "$50,000", so as to read:

Historic sites and buildings: For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat., p. 666), $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 122, line 4, after the word "vehicles" and the semicolon, to strike out "$7,137,280" and insert "$7,237,280", and in line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$5,036,980" and insert "$5,136,980", so as to read:

Salaries and general expenses, public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia: For administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement of public buildings, monuments, memorials, and grounds in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, including the National Archives Building; per-diem employees at rates of pay approved by the Director, not exceeding current rates for similar services in the District of Columbia; rent of buildings; demolition of buildings; expenses incident to moving various executive departments and establishments in connection with the assignment, allocation, transfer, and survey of building space; traveling expenses and carfare; leather and rubber articles and gas masks for the protection of public property and employees; arms and ammunition for the guard force; not exceeding $13,000 for uniforms for employees; and the purchase, maintenance, repair, exchange, storage, and operation of four motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; $7,237,280, of which amount not to exceed $5,136,980 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia and not to exceed $500,000 shall be available for major repairs and improvements to public buildings, monuments, memorials, and grounds in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 123, line 16, after the word "equipment", to insert "per-diem employees at rates of pay approved by the Director not exceeding current rates for similar services in the District of Columbia, the hire of draft animals with or without drivers at local rates approved by the Director, traveling expenses and carfare, and leather and rubber articles for the protection of public property and employees, $176,000", so as to read:

Salaries and expenses, National Capital parks: For administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement of the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway, Arlington Memorial Bridge, George Washington Memorial Parkway, Federal parks in the District of Columbia, and other Federal lands authorized by the act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 482); including the pay and allowances in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 27, 1924, as amended, of the police force for the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway and the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and the purchase of one passenger-carrying automobile and operation, maintenance, repair, exchange, and storage of three automobiles, revolvers, ammunition, uniforms, and equipment, per-diem employees at rates of pay approved by the Director not exceeding current rates for similar services in the District of Columbia, the hire of draft animals with or without drivers at local rates approved by the Director, traveling expenses and carfare, and leather and rubber articles for the protection of public property and employees, $176,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of Education—Vocational education", on page 126, line 2, after "1488)" and the comma, to strike out "$350,000" and insert "$425,000", so as to read:

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Salaries and expenses: For carrying out the provisions of section 7 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational education, etc.", approved February 23, 1917, as amended by the act of October 6, 1917 (U. S. C., title 20, sec. 15), and of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories", approved June 8, 1936 (49 Stat., p. 1488), $425,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 126, after line 2, to strike out:

Further development of vocational education: For carrying out the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories", approved June 8, 1936 (49 Stat., pp. 1488–1490), $14,483,000.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Further development of vocational education: For the first installment of a 4-year program to carry out the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories", approved June 6, 1936 (49 Stat., pp. 1488–1490):

For salaries and necessary travel expenses of teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural subjects, $1,031,000;

For salaries and necessary travel expenses of teachers, supervisors, and directors of home-economics subjects, $1,021,000;

For salaries and necessary travel expenses of teachers, supervisors, and director of trade and industrial subjects, $1,032,000;

For salaries and necessary travel expenses of teachers, supervisors, and directors of, and maintenance of teacher training in, distributive occupational subjects, $649,000;

For preparing teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural, trade, and industrial, and home-economics subjects, $557,000;

In all, $4,290,000.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senate to reject the amendment which is now pending so as to restore the appropriation provided by the House.

This is an appropriation made for the purpose of the development of vocational education under an act which was passed by the last Congress, and which supplements, of course, the original appropriation under the act of 1916.

The Budget Bureau recommended some $3,000,000 in round numbers—I do not undertake to use the exact odd numbers—but the House Appropriations Committee, notwithstanding, recommended some $7,000,000 under the act known as the George-Deen Act passed during the last Congress.

When the matter came on the floor of the House, the House itself inserted in the bill the full amount authorized under that act for the expansion and further development of vocational education. The Senate Committee on Appropriations reduced the amount carried in the bill as it came from the House to $4,000,000, in round numbers, which is a million dollars, in round numbers, above the Budget estimate, but some $10,000,000, in round figures, below the amount appropriated by the House.

Mr. President, I may say that when the bill under which this appropriation was made was introduced, conferences were had, and those who were sponsoring the bill definitely agreed that no additional appropriation would be asked for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937. Since the approval of that act many of the States throughout the country have made provision for the use of the entire appropriation. Forty-five States have made provision for the use of the full amount.

There are more than 15,000 rural high schools in the United States. There are only about 6,100 such high schools which provide vocational training. There are some 4,000 additional high schools that have asked for this money.

The same proportion applies to those schools that make provision for the teaching of home economics. So the question of need for this appropriation is hardly open to debate; in fact, it is not open to debate; and, if it were open to debate, Congress settled that matter last year when the act was passed, when for the first time since the passage of the original act provision for a continuing, additional annual appropriation was made.

As I have said, 45 States are actually in position to make or have made provision for the use of the full amount authorized by the George-Deen Act. Three or four State legislatures have petitioned the Congress to make the full appropriation, among them the great State of Texas, the State of Wisconsin, the State of Arkansas, and, I believe, the State of Nebraska, though I am not sure about the last-named State.

The needs and the demands for vocational education are not only strong but are growing stronger. We have unemployment, particularly among the young men and young women of the country. The young men and young women who have just become or who are becoming of age and who are without any special vocational training have become helpless, or almost so, so far as securing employment is concerned under the adverse conditions which we have recently experienced. Not only is that true now, but it will be increasingly so, for the reason that industry will not be able longer to provide apprenticeships and will not be able longer to furnish the necessary training to the young men who want to go into trades or into occupations training for which may be furnished under the Vocational Act. With minimum wages and with maximum hours and with the keen competition, of course, that must necessarily come, in order to maintain itself on a new economic basis industry will be obliged to find well-trained and well-equipped and well-qualified men and women to do the job that is before it, if it can find such men and such women.

The figures and statistics furnished by one similar institution, an institution providing vocational training in California, afford a striking illustration of what I am trying now to say. During the last year some 3,000 young men found employment after receiving training in this particular vocational institution. The ages of the young men ranged from 18 to 25 years.

In order to meet new conditions, indeed, in order to meet satisfactorily any condition, vocational training in agriculture, home economics, the trades, industries, and distributive occupational industries as well, must go forward in earnest in this country and must take even a wider scope than it has hitherto taken.

Mr. President, it is quite true that some three or four States in the Union may not use all of the money carried in the bill as it came from the House, should that amount be retained by the Senate, but in that event the money does not go out of the Treasury. It simply is not used. It automatically becomes a fund available for the purposes of the Treasury hereafter. In other words, there is no use of the money unless the State is appropriating to match the fund on the basis provided in the George-Deen Act. There can be no misuse of the funds or dissipation of the funds because the States must actually use the money before any money is paid out of the Treasury.

What happens, in fact, is this: The schools putting in vocational courses, whether in agriculture, trade, or the industries select their own teachers. The teachers must, of course, meet certain standards and certain requirements. The schools pay their teachers and, in effect, a requisition is made through the Bureau of Education to reimburse the schools carrying on the vocational work, and, therefore, there can be no actual dissipation or actual wastage of the money.

Mr. President, I may say also that at this time and in this bill it seems to me we ought not to hesitate to restore the amount proposed by the House to be appropriated, because we are making large appropriations for other uses, and this use is certainly one which commends itself most heartily to the country and is one which serves the real purposes of the country.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly.

Mr. BLACK. May I ask the Senator whether or not he has any figures as to what would be the result in the employment of teachers in connection with this reduction? I ask that because in the last hour I have received information from gentlemen from my State as to what would be the result in Alabama alone.

Mr. GEORGE. I have not those figures. All this appropriation really goes into salaries. It really goes into compensation and pay. None of it is used for the purpose of buying equipment or materials of any kind. It all goes into the salaries paid to teachers, as I understand.

Mr. BLACK. In that connection Alabama, like a number of other States, during the last year has added very substantially to its opportunities for vocational training. I have been informed that if this reduction as reported by the committee should go into effect, it would require the discharge of more than 100 teachers who have already been employed to teach vocational training in Alabama next year. I was informed also that it would cut off thousands of adults who are taking such training. If that be true as to one State it can easily be seen, if the same result should occur in other States, how disastrous it would be with reference to vocational education.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator's information must be correct so far as the coming fiscal year is concerned. Of course the bill would actually cut in half the appropriation which was contemplated by all the States. The net effect of the adoption of the committee amendment would be to cut the fund in half, and, therefore, it would necessitate the failure to employ those teachers, if it did not result in actual release of teachers from contracts made.

Mr. BLACK. It is my understanding contracts have already been made, and the State of Alabama will be in the same situation in that respect as other States will be. I hope we shall be able to reinstate the full amount proposed by the House to be appropriated for this purpose.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

In Georgia alone some 500 additional schools have made application for additional vocational teachers, and preparations have been made, and no doubt contracts have been made, because the new school year for vocational work is commencing in July in many of the States. Necessarily those teachers who have been engaged would now find themselves unable to enter upon the performance of their contracts if the appropriation should be reduced.

The appropriation of $14,000,000 in round figures is not all additional money. It is, of course, so far as this particular appropriation is concerned, but under the original act for vocational education $7,000,000 in round figures was appropriated annually. In 1928 Congress passed a bill providing for an additional appropriation, which went up by steps or stages over a period of 6 years to $2,500,000 additional, making some $9,500,000 or nearly $10,000,000 which was thereafter available for vocational education for the United States.

In 1934, when that act was about to expire, Congress passed another bill known as the George-Ellzey bill, which made a flat additional appropriation of $3,000,000 annually for vocational education. We are yet operating under that act, which expires the 30th of the present month. Under that act between $10,000,000 and $11,000,000 is appropriated for vocational education. That act which expires June 30 and carries an authorization for $3,000,000, will, of course, pass out of the picture after June 30. What is actually being done under the Senate amendment is to appropriate in round figures only $4,000,000 against the $3,000,000 which for some years has been appropriated under special or supplemental acts. Actually not a single additional dollar is made available for the teaching of vocational agriculture or domestic

economy within the rural high schools of the country, because under the George-Deen Act two additional activities were added—distributive occupational education and teachers' training. The George-Ellzey Act which expires June 30 contained no provision for an additional appropriation for teacher training, so that it will be impossible under this appropriation to provide for the training of a single additional farm boy in agriculture or a single additional farm girl in economics.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. During the last few moments I have received three telegrams on this identical item; and, sustaining what has just been said, I desire to call attention to one or two lines from these telegrams.

I quote part of a telegram received from Oklahoma City:

Vocational agricultural program, vocational work in Oklahoma popular. One hundred and fifty new teachers called for. Thirty-five new teachers employed.

And if the item is reduced, of course, the teachers called for will not be used, and the teachers employed likewise will not be used.

The telegram from which I have just quoted is signed by H. J. Denton, president, Oklahoma Agricultural Cooperative Council.

I have received another telegram from the President of the Oklahoma Farmers' Union. I desire to read one or two lines from this telegram:

More than 150 farm communities in Oklahoma want vocational education programs. Many, acting in good faith, have already employed qualified teachers and expended large sums on equipment for conserving and restoring our soil.

Mr. President, in my State the demand for an increased appropriation comes from the farm population. There is no doubt that the teachers themselves, if they were heard from, would be most vociferous in asking for the money; but I am not urging the appropriation on that basis. I am urging the increased appropriation on the basis of the farm demand, directly from farmers and farm organizations.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, I do not care to prolong the discussion. I think the Senate well understands that in the case of this particular appropriation, if the States are not prepared to match it, the money will not go out of the Treasury; and I think it also true that no money can go out of the Treasury until the appropriation, even if made, is by the President allocated, or at least notice given by him of allocations actually made to the several States which are ready to meet the fund.

Telegrams and letters of course have reached me from time to time because I have been somewhat active in connection with this type of legislation. I should like to read just a few lines from the director of the State Board of Vocational Education of Wisconsin, typical of all the other thoughtful letters upon the subject:

Much of the social legislation recently enacted is greatly dependent upon Federal aid for vocational education—

Writes the director.

With our rapidly changing industrial processes and technological changes, it is highly important that our increasing number of unemployable people be given vocational training preparatory for job opportunities. Those already employed must be prepared to meet industrial changes, and given an opportunity to combine education with labor. Unless the Federal Government participates in a substantial way to aid the cause of vocational education, we shall soon be faced with a permanent army of unemployable people as well as unemployed.

I do not look upon Federal participation in an adequate vocational-training program as an expense. It is rather in the nature of an investment that brings back to our country a wealth return commensurate with the wise administration of vocational courses to improve the employability of our people.

And not only is the director of vocational education in the State of Wisconsin, Mr. Hambrick, asking for the full amount, but that State is one of the States whose legislature petitioned the Congress to make an appropriation of the full amount for the fiscal year 1938.

Mr. President, I think the Senate should reject this amendment, because then the matter will be put beyond peradventure of doubt. The fiscal year and the school year for vocational work and training are upon many of our States. If the Senate shall reject the amendment made by the Appropriations Committee, the matter will be put at rest so far as this particular item in the bill is concerned, and the States may go on with confidence with the programs they have already commenced; and let me say that if this full appropriation is allowed, in round numbers the total contribution of the Federal Government to vocational training—not only in agriculture but in domestic science, the trades and industries, distributive occupational training, and teaching, for all of these various types of education—will amount to no more than $21,000,000. That is a negligible appropriation for this country to make in a line of educational work which has demonstrated its value, and which can be carried on and is being carried on by the States, under the jurisdiction of the States, with the aid and assistance of the Federal authorities here at Washington, but without interference with the internal affairs and management of the schools of the country.

Mr. President, if it were a question of economy, and if we had resolved not to make additional apropriations, we should face a different question; but in this very bill, which has reduced the appropriation for vocational education by $10,000,000, we find increases of more than $12,000,000 for various other purposes, doubtless all good; so it is not a question of economy. In this very bill, which cuts down the House appropriation for this worthy object and purpose, we find a total sum exceeding by more than $2,000,000 the appropriation carried in the House bill. So it cannot be argued as a question of economy. The facts put the argument out of the question.

Mr. President, the people of this country do not want Congress to take this appropriation out of the hides of the farm boys and girls and the young men seeking vocational education in the trades and industries.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to give the Senate a brief statement of the reasons that induced the Committee on Appropriations to suggest a reduction in this appropriation.

Senators should understand, first of all, that there is a permanent annual appropriation for vocational education under what is known as the Smith-Hughes Act which amounts to $7,157,000. That money is automatically appropriated each year without action by Congress. In addition to that, as the Senator from Georgia has well stated, during the current fiscal year Congress appropriated an extra $3,084,000, so that the amount of money that is expended for vocational education during the current fiscal year is $10,200,000.

The Budget estimate for this item was $3,000,000; but upon examining the situation in the committee we found that the $3,000,000 would have to be divided five ways instead of three ways. The $3,000,000 heretofore has been spent for vocational instruction in agriculture, home economics, and trades, and industries. Under the George-Dean Act, as passed last year, two new subjects were introduced—teacher training and instruction in distributive occupations. To divide the same amount of money five ways instead of three, without increasing the Federal appropriation, was obviously unfair. The committee therefore proposes to carry on, in exactly the same manner as for the present fiscal year, all activities which heretofore have been provided for, and to add two new activities—teacher training and instruction in distributive occupations—to the extent of one-half the amount authorized by law. If that were done, there would be available in this fiscal year the old $7,000,000, plus $4,200,000, or $11,400,000, for all purposes.

The House Committee on Appropriations came to the same general conclusion as the Senate committee, that to appro-

priate the entire amount would be unwise. Their recommendation was to appropriate 50 percent of the authorizations, or $7,000,000, for the next fiscal year. On that basis there would be $7,000,000 from the old Smith-Hughes Act and $7,000,000 more from the George-Deen authorization, making a total of $14,000,000.

What the Senator from Georgia now proposes is to make a total appropriation of $21,000,000; to jump the amount of money we have expended for this purpose from the $7,000,000 plus of the Smith-Hughes Act and the $3,000,000 under the George-Ellzey Act which he mentions, a total of $10,000,000, in 1 year to $21,000,000.

The best information the Senate committee could get was that there are not enough well-trained teachers of vocational education in the United States to make proper use of the money. It is the same situation we had about 25 years ago, when Congress for the first time made appropriations for county farm advisers. A sum of money was made available rather unexpectedly, but the necessary trained and equipped personnel was not to be found, so the authorities would go into a county where, for lack of anything else, they would pick out the best farmer in the county and say, "Let us put him on the job of telling the other farmers how to farm."

He himself might know how to farm, but he did not know how to teach others how to farm. Anyone who has had anything to do with education knows that it is vital in any educational program to understand the methods of giving instruction.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, at what place does this information appear in the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. The information I am giving to the Senate I have derived from the report of a special committee appointed by the President of the United States. The President appointed an advisory Committee on Education at the time the George-Deen Act was approved. My information is that the President hesitated a long time about approving that measure, believing that it was too great and too sudden a jump into this new field; but finally he determined to approve the act, and at the same time to appoint an advisory committee to determine how it should be carried out. That committee reported to the President on April 24 of this year. I read some extracts from the report:

> Our feeling that there should be no expansion of the funds provided for vocational education until after there has been a thorough replanning of Federal relations to all education is reenforced by the studies we have already made of the vocational-education statutes and administration.
>
> The basic vocational-education statute, the Smith-Hughes Act, has not been revised since its enactment 20 years ago. Even as supplemented by additional legislation, it does not provide the basis under present conditions for a sound program of Federal aid to vocational education. The several vocational statutes are a patchwork of complex and obscure provisions, many of which are inconsistent with present conditions and needs.
>
> The basis for the distribution of funds among the States as provided in the vocational-educational statutes tends in many cases to increase rather than to decrease inequalities in educational opportunity. Inequalities arise from the operation of the State minimum allotments and from the matching provisions. They arise also from the difficulties encountered in attempts to administer a vocational program in small rural high schools. The areas most in need of aid are the ones least able to meet the matching and other qualifying provisions.
>
> We believe that the training of the personnel necessary for extension and improvement of vocational education is a problem of the first importance and one that should receive early attention. Readjustments to make possible an expansion and improvement in the training of teachers could be made under current appropriations. At present, however, the teacher personnel is not available in most of the States to staff enlarged programs of vocational education unless certification standards are materially reduced and teachers are employed who are not well qualified.

This was a commission of educators appointed by the President of the United States, who examined into the subject of vocational education in all the States of the Union. They made a report to the President that properly qualified, trained personnel does not exist, and upon that basis the committee of the Senate makes the statement which it included in its report.

I have no doubt that there are exceptions to that rule in certain States. There may be some States where there is an ample number of qualified teachers, whereas in others there are not enough. But, taking the country as a whole, the Commission appointed by the President to study how this great piece of legislation should be carried out makes this finding in a report to the President.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did not the President's Commission recommend an expenditure of $20,000,000 for vocational training?

Mr. HAYDEN. They did not. The Commission recommended that there be no increase at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. My information is that it had recommended an expenditure of not less than $20,000,000.

In this connection, Mr. President, I might add that whereas the report of the President's Committee may not recommend an expenditure of $20,000,000, the fact remains that a greater sum than that was spent by other agencies of the Government in order to give to the youth of our Nation a chance to study vocational training. I am quite certain that the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Works Progress Administration, and National Youth Administration have spent many more millions for vocational training than the small amount now asked, and it may be because of such expenditures that the President's Commission did not name a specific sum, but recommended that financial support by the Federal Government for vocational training be continued without curtailment during the coming fiscal year. I am of the opinion that we could more effectively carry on vocational training to the youth of our Nation through the public schools established in each State than by any other method now in force or that has been proposed.

I do not know that I could add any more than has already been said on the subject. The hearings before the committee show that approximately 500,000 boys and girls are graduated each year from the high schools of our Nation, and most of them, because of lack of finances, are unable to enter college. I believe this administration would help greatly toward relieving unemployment should it provide the means for giving to our boys and girls a chance to study a vocation while they are in attendance at our high schools. Especially would it benefit those who are afforded an opportunity of studying home economics, animal husbandry, and agriculture in general.

We will make no mistake by inducing the youth of our country to become producers of wealth by placing them in a position whereby they can grow their own living on the farm, become home owners, and make them independent citizens. I am proud to state that in my own home parish we have a high school that teaches vocational training in agriculture to the youth of our community. I have never experienced such interest in farming as is evidenced by the boys who specialize in agriculture. A large percentage of them study agriculture and many of them have made good on the farm after graduating from high school. I know of one boy in particular, C. A. Duplantis, Jr., who was a State leader in the Future Farmers of America, and who today owns a large farm and is making a success as a farmer. He has purchased the necessary equipment and is doing very well. This young man, together with many others who graduated from the high school in my parish, are doing well, and there is no doubt in my mind but that the training that these boys received in high school developed in them the urge for farming, and I cannot help but feel that they will succeed.

Mr. President, I believe that this small additional appropriation will, in the long run, do more good toward relieving unemployment, than if many more millions were spent through other Government agencies now attempting to help the youth of our country. The school systems in practically all of our States are highly organized and are in charge of well-trained teachers. These schools have the proper organization to undertake this work. Before any Federal money is advanced to a State high school, a thorough investigation is made of the facilities of the school applying,

and I am sure that no money will be advanced by the Federal Government unless and until it can be shown that the school applying for this money will spend it properly toward the vocational training of the boys and girls attending such school.

I repeat, Mr. President, the money will be spent for a good purpose, and I hope that the Senate will not agree to the amendment proposed by the Appropriations Committee. The House of Representatives, after a thorough study, recommended the appropriation of fourteen millions and some-odd dollars, and the Senate should by all means stand by the recommendations of the House.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is mistaken, because I have just read their report to the President, wherein they recommend no expansion until there is further study. The commission also makes this statement:

> We would also call attention to the fact that the vocational education program under the Smith-Hughes and related statutes is not the only program through which the Federal Government is now providing assistance in meeting the needs for vocational training. Such training has become increasingly important among the purposes of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

As a matter of fact in the act passed a few days ago we specifically directed that vocational education be expanded in the Civilian Conservation Corps. I read further:

> It is also receiving attention in the educational programs of the Works Progress Administration and the National Youth Administration. We plan to give further consideration to the experience of these emergency and new programs, and to the needs in the newer fields of vocational education such as the distributive and the public-service occupations.

This is another quotation from the committee report:

> In the judgment of this committee the necessary statistical studies for planning economically sound programs of vocational education do not exist.

We called before our committee the Commissioner of Education. Of course, he was bound by the Budget estimate of $3,000,000; he could not advocate any expenditure of any more money. We did ask him, however, to make a break-down of the authorization in the George-Deen Act to indicate a 3- or 4-year program whereby we could step gradually into this new activity. Instead of jumping from $10,000,000 to $20,000,000 in 1 year, I am sure that it is the sound judgment of the best educators in the United States that it ought to be broken down into a program covering advances over 3 or 4 years.

Let me comment further upon a remark made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] a few moments ago. He stated that heretofore there had been a stepping-up from year to year in these appropriations. That is true as to every kind of vocational education work that has been undertaken either by the Department of the Interior or by the Department of Agriculture. In all instances, except in this, the authorizing legislation steps it up a year at a time. For some reason last year Congress authorized a lump sum of $14,000,000 without a step-up.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the reason for that was that we had been carrying on the program since 1917, and we had been constantly trying to step it up to above $20,000,000, and last year happened to be the year in which we got the bill through the Congress. The last appropriation that was made did not contain any step-ups; it was the act passed in 1934, which provided a flat appropriation of an additional sum of $3,000,000 annually.

Mr. HAYDEN. But that $3,000,000 had been arrived at by a series of step-ups, had it not?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, it had; but let me say that the Senator is reading from a report I have not seen. It is a very simple matter to explain why the commission which wrote that report wants to deal with the subject in another way. I will take occasion to say something about it directly.

It was back during the administration of President Hoover when I introduced into this body a bill for a permanent appropriation, and the step-ups were made by Mr. Hoover, who would not approve a bill for a blank increase and on a permanent basis. I had no objection to taking what we could get, but we were simply driven to it; and now, after these long years of experimentation and of demonstration of the value of this work, when there is a desire to carry on vocational agriculture in the W. P. A. and in the National Youth Association there is a disposition to come in and interfere with this program for the single purpose of having the funds handled in Washington only.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not so interpret the recommendation made to the President in the report of this commission. The commission has nothing to do with the Works Progress Administration; it has nothing to do with the Civilian Conservation Corps; it has nothing to do with any of these other activities. It is a committee of educators, the best the President could assemble, who were asked to study this subject and they reported.

There are several significant facts to be considered; first, that we have been appropriationg $10,000,000 a year, and they urge that there is not the necessity and that it is unwise, due to the lack of trained personnel, to undertake this work on so grand a scale in such a hurry.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr, President, I should like to ask the Senator about how many or what percentage of the pupils in the public schools would be able to get the benefit of vocational education even under the appropriation made by the House of $14,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. I cannot furnish the Senator with that information. I had occasion to meet the president of a great State university not so very long ago. My recollection is that under the $14,000,000 program there would be some 84 or 86 high schools in his State which could institute programs of vocational education. That would be what the program meant. I asked him to tell me candidly whether they had in his State the trained personnel to put into those eighty-odd high schools, and his answer was, "No; we have not." His conclusion was that it would be very much better to wait a year or two and allow the State university properly to prepare instructors.

Mr. PEPPER. Does not the Senator think that it might be a little better to err on the side of giving the benefit of this service to the larger number of people, rather than on the other side?

Mr. HAYDEN. This money goes entirely to one pay roll, and if incompetent instructors are placed on the pay roll, they will not be gotten off the pay roll. On the other hand, if time is taken properly to prepare the instructors, there will be better instructors, there will not be men giving out misinformation to pupils who are studying vocational subjects.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator does not have any figures as to the number of unemployed school teachers in the United States, does he?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sure I have not, but I rather suspect that the better school teachers are employed, and that those who are not well qualified are out of jobs.

Mr. PEPPER. That is a suspicion which, I dare say, the school teachers of the United States wish were well founded.

Mr. HAYDEN. If that is the case, and we are in a big hurry, we go out and pick up anyone who says he is qualified and put him on a pay roll. This money goes to salaries only, it goes to add to the pay rolls in the States. No State could have made a vast series of contracts. I was surprised to hear the Senator from Alabama say that it meant the discharge of a large number of teachers. That could not be possible, because the amount of money which has been heretofore appropriated by Congress is increased by the committee amendment, so no one could lose a job. Where a school board had come to a teacher and said, "If we get this Federal money we will hire you, and if we do not get it we will not", if that means discharging someone, it presents a different picture from what I ordinarily understand the term "discharge" to mean.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator anticipate that the teachers will prepare themselves for this kind of work upon no more basic assurance than that there probably will be an appropriation in the future?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly the assurance we have tried to give and to write into the law.

That was for the further development of vocational education for the first installment of a 4-year program to be carried out under the George-Deen Act. Then in our committee report we set up exactly what that program is to be, upon which the State may rely.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, with reference to the teachers, I may state that it is my understanding that they have already been employed upon the basis of a reasonable expectation that the program would be carried out. In addition to that fact, a great many additions have been made to the schools; and from the statements made to me by a friend from Alabama who is closely connected with the subject, I am confident that it would mean the discharge of many from employment, and it would mean a release of others from the promise of employment which has been made. While it is distressing that 100 men should be released from an agreement which may have been made, the bad feature is that it would mean the loss of that much training for the pupils who would otherwise receive vocational education in line with the authorization which had been previously made.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Board had knowledge of at least two facts if they did not know all the facts. The first is that Congress had passed a bill authorizing this undertaking to be made. The second is that, instead of asking the Congress, when the Budget was made up last January, for the $14,000,000 authorized by law, the request was for only $3,000,000. What basis did they have for hiring teachers in the light of a Budget estimate that was only $3,000,000 out of a $14,000,000 authorization?

Mr. BLACK. In my judgment, they had plenty of basis. They knew that Congress itself had authorized $14,000,000. They knew that Congress itself would be the body to vote, and that the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget would not be final. Naturally, they probably assumed that if Congress last year thought we ought to have $14,000,000 to give the boys and girls vocational education, Congress would not change its mind simply because a Budget Director reported an estimate of $3,000,000.

So far as I am concerned, I have not changed my mind, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to the contrary notwithstanding. I still believe we ought to carry out the $14,000,000 authorization, and I am confident the money can be used to the advantage of the education of the farmers' sons and daughters, and not only for them but for others who are taking vocational-education training.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought something besides farming was taught.

Mr. BLACK. Teaching is provided for others. However, a suggestion was made awhile ago with reference to rural schools, and that is the reason I mentioned the matter. But simply because the Bureau of the Budget sent to Congress a $3,000,000 estimate, or because some committee made a report that it did not believe the full amount of money could be used to advantage, I hope we shall not be persuaded either by the Bureau of the Budget or by the committee, because, as stated by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], if we do not have the teachers and cannot use the money to advantage, it will be returned into the Treasury.

Mr. HAYDEN. No, Mr. President; that is not what will happen at all.

Mr. BLACK. What will happen?

Mr. HAYDEN. Ill-trained and incompetent teachers will be employed, because this money is all for pay roll, and not a dollar of it will be allowed to get away if it is made available. Do not let the Senator deceive himself and think that any of this money will ever come back to the Treasury.

Mr. BLACK. It may be that the teachers will not be trained as well as they would be if they had several years of experience; but how will they get the experience unless they are trained? Let us train them for the work.

Mr. HAYDEN. Who are the agents now, and who are those who get training in agriculture? We have established a system of this kind, and throughout the United States the universities are giving courses of instruction to young people, and they get into that field. In the beginning, as I stated a while ago, there had to be employed the man who was supposed to be the best farmer in the county; and the Department of Agriculture will say today that people were placed on the pay roll then who never should have been put on it, and once on they never get off.

Mr. BLACK. I am not sure they are not better equipped to teach than others.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Is not the Senator aware of the fact that in every State we have agricultural colleges, and in many States we have agricultural colleges of high character that are turning out well-trained men and women?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly what the committee proposes to take advantage of.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me remind the Senator that we have had such colleges for years; and, instead of a shortage of teachers, employment cannot be found for the teachers who are actually graduated by these training schools.

Let me ask the Senator also if he does not know that before any school can qualify and can participate in the distribution of this fund, it must have a teaching staff which meets the requirements of the Department in Washington. The school must come up to that standard. Persons who are not trained cannot be placed at the head of these schools.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let us see what kind of people we get. I will admit for the sake of the argument that there are available plenty of persons who are qualified as teachers in agricultural subjects. Then we come to the question of home economics. Whether there is such a bountiful supply in that field, I cannot certify. Certainly with respect to the trades and industries they do not exist. Those who have been employed generally are tradesmen, carpenters, blacksmiths, and mechanics, who have not had the training in teaching methods. Now we enter into teaching in a wholly new field, that of distributive occupations—that is to say, vocational education in distribution occupations. That is something entirely new, something that never has been taught in the high schools before. We may get a grocery clerk to act as teacher. The business of grocer is a distributive occupation. We may get someone who is engaged in some retail business, distributive occupation, and put him in the high school to teach it, but we will have better instruction if we wait a year or two and have the universities properly prepare the teachers.

Money is provided in the bill for teachers' training for these purposes. It is an increase over the old Smith-Hughes Act, providing $1,089,000. We propose to add to that $557,000 for teacher training in these subjects. That is the way to bring about a better system.

I do not desire to take the time of the Senate by any elaboration of the proposition; but I can state frankly that it is the best judgment of those who have studied the problem of vocational education throughout the United States that we should not make this sudden increase in the appropriation, but should do as we have done in all cases, step it up.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, is it not a fact that we have increased the appropriation that is now available?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The committee has added how much to the amount that is being used?

Mr. HAYDEN. It has added for salaries and necessary travel expenses of teachers, supervisors, and directors of, and maintenance of teacher training in, distributive occupational subjects, $649,000; and for preparing teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural, trade and industrial, and home-economics subjects, $557,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In other words, we have added more than $1,000,000 to the amount that is now available?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. May I ask how much the committee added to the amount which is now available for the teaching of vocational agriculture?

Mr. HAYDEN. We have reappropriated the amount now available for this particular year.

Mr. GEORGE. Nothing has been added besides that?

Mr. HAYDEN. Nothing besides that.

Mr. GEORGE. How much has been added to the teaching of home economics?

Mr. HAYDEN. We have left those three projects exactly as they were, as recommended by the President's commission.

Mr. GEORGE. And nothing has been added to trade and industry?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the same as the other items.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as illustrating the nature of the problem which is presented by this question I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Committee on Appropriations found itself confronted with the necessity of making provision for expenditures that are absolutely essential under law, as well as making expenditures or continuing expenditures for objects which are merely desirable. Among the Budget estimates which came to us was one providing for $3,000,000 for the enforcement of what is known as the Guffey Coal Act. When the Congress passed the bituminous coal act it created a special commission to administer the coal industry and committed to that Commission certain duties, some of which were mandatory and some of which were discretionary. This Bituminous Coal Commission has the duty of administering the bituminous coal industry throughout the United States. For the purpose of making that administration acceptable and reasonable and convenient to all of the coal-mining districts it was provided that the Coal Commission could establish regional offices in order that those who are engaged in producing coal, those who are engaged in mining coal, and those who are engaged in purchasing coal might not find it necessary to go to the expense of coming to Washington every time a question arose.

The cost of establishing these five regional offices throughout the United States was something over $600,000.

The Bituminous Coal Commission went to the Budget Bureau and laid down an estimate calling for the expenditure of a little more than $5,000,000. The Bureau of the Budget cut that estimate to $3,000,000. The committee accepted the action of the Bureau of the Budget. The Coal Commission accepted the action of the Bureau of the Budget. And this bill, as it has now been presented to the Senate, calls for the expenditure of $3,000,000 to carry on only a portion of the work which the Congress by law has committed to this Commission. The Budget Bureau and the committee were trying to save a little money.

It is perfectly obvious to the members of the Appropriations Committee that the Commission cannot possibly carry out all of its duties in an efficient manner and in a manner that will be convenient for those who are intimately affected by the operations of the law on the money which we are now appropriating, but the committee was under the necessity of making some attempt to keep the appropriations within the revenues of the Federal Government. There is not a Member of the Senate who does not know that we are facing a stupendous deficit, and that every dollar we add to this appropriation bill, whether it be for vocational education or for anything else, will increase the deficit. Let us not make any mistake about that.

When the Appropriations Committee comes upon the floor urging the Senate, as it does, to hold appropriations down to those which are deemed to be essential, we are immediately confronted with the demand emanating from all sections of the country, sent here by telegrams to Members of the House and Members of the Senate, saying "this must be done, that must be done; increase this appropriation, increase that appropriation", all without the slightest consideration for estimates or revenues. We have increased this appropriation by $1,000,000, but the theme song seems to be "no additional appropriation is made available."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to ask the Senator whether he does not think it probable that money spent now for vocational education will save a relief appropriation in years to come?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not know what may happen in years to come, but I do know that any increase in this appropriation at this time is going to increase the deficit of the Federal administration, and the Finance Committee is not bringing in any measure to provide new taxation.

Mr. PEPPER. And the failure to spend the money for this kind of a purpose is going to cause a deficit in the population of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I doubt that very much. I think that is one of the happy arguments that are made by those who are anxious to get upon the pay roll of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, it seems to me that if the Appropriations Committee of the Senate of the United States is to have any credit at all in this body it really ought to be sustained upon an important amendment of this character.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am very much in favor of rejecting the committee amendment insofar as it relates to the appropriation for vocational education. As I understand, these items should be considered on their merits and on the basis of the purpose for which the appropriation is designed. The Coal Commission, it seems to me, has absolutely no relevancy so far as the merits of this particular appropriation affecting vocational education are concerned.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator came upon the floor a few days ago urging an amendment of the tax laws, which would have increased the revenues of the Federal Government. I was happy to support his amendment but it was defeated. He may with propriety ask for increased expenditures for he has tried to get increased revenues.

The question, however, as I see it, is not whether a particular expenditure is meritorious, but whether, in view of the present condition of the Federal Treasury, we can afford to expend additional funds for purposes of this kind which are really not essential, no matter how meritorious they may be.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I take the other view, and I contend that we cannot afford not to spend the money for vocational education.

I appreciated very greatly the Senator's support of the amendment which I offered to the tax measure a few days ago, but, as I started to say before being interrupted, I do not believe the action which the committee has taken with regard to other amendments should influence Senators in their judgment in determining whether or not this amendment should be accepted or rejected.

So far as I am concerned, I am in favor of giving the Coal Commission a sufficient appropriation so that it may fulfill the responsibilities and perform obligations that have been devolved on it by the Congress in enacting the statute. But that is not the issue upon which the Senate is about to vote. The question is whether or not the Senate is willing to appropriate the full authorization for vocational education.

I think that every Senator who has studied the hearings taken by the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate in relation to the relief bill, and every Senator who listened to the arguments upon that measure when it was under consideration must be impressed with the fact that one of the chief factors in our problem of unemployment in this country today is that each year approximately 500,000 young men and young women, untrained and unsuited to find responsible places of employment in their communities, are coming of working age.

It is well enough for the Senator from Arizona to take the position that this program should not be expanded so

rapidly in order that time may be afforded to train teachers for it; but the fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that the depression is now in its eighth year and we have not adopted an adequate program for vocational education. That is one of the factors that is contributing to the permanent unemployment problem with which this country is confronted.

Even if we provide the full authorization by rejecting the committee amendment we will not, in my judgment, have adopted a program for vocational education in the United States which is commensurate or adequate to deal with it. Therefore I hope that the committee amendment will be rejected.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I desire to state the reasons actuating me in supporting the subcommittee with reference to this amendment.

At the time the President signed the George-Deen Act he issued a statement that he would appoint a committee to make an investigation of the subject. The report of that committee has been referred to by the Senator from Arizona. The committee which was composed of distinguished educators reported:

> The committee is unanimous in the recommendation that financial support by the Federal Government for the types of vocational education now receiving support should be continued without curtailment during the coming fiscal year. We are not in favor of the enlargement of Federal support at this time.

After that report was considered by the subcommittee of which the Senator from Arizona is chairman, the subcommittee reported to the full Committee on Appropriations the sum carried in the bill. I think the membership of this body will say that the Senator from Arizona has never been regarded as being niggardly or economical when it comes to appropriations, and certainly he has never failed to show interest in the cause of vocational education. I believe that the cause of vocational education would be best promoted by following the report of the committee, which increases the amount available by more than $1,000,000 for the next fiscal year.

Reference has been made to the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget. Of course, we are not bound entirely by the Budget estimate, and neither are we bound by the fact that an authorization has heretofore been established by the Congress for a given amount. If the Congress appropriated this year every dollar that has been authorized by acts of Congress the deficit would be much greater than we anticipate. As to the Budget estimate I call attention to the fact that about the time that this matter was considered in the House the President sent a message to the Congress in which he said:

> It is a matter of concern to you and to me, who are working for a balanced Budget, that so many special groups exert the strongest pressure to bring about increases in Government expenditures. They pay little attention to the fact that the Budget as submitted represents a coordinated fiscal program and that material departures therefrom destroy the whole purpose of the program. If we are to avoid a continuation of deficits we must resist the importunities or provide the necessary revenue to meet the increasing cost.

The President said in the same Budget message:

> While I recognize many opportunities to improve social and economic conditions through Federal acts, I am convinced that the success of our whole program and the permanent security of our people demands that we adjust all expenditures within the limit of my Budget estimate.

His Budget estimate was $3,000,000. The report of the Senate Appropriations Committee exceeds that amount. In my opinion the amount recommended by the committee provides all the funds that are essential and all that can be wisely expended during the next fiscal year.

I want to pay tribute to the most effective work that has been done in a propaganda way in a long, long time. We have become quite excited at times in our investigation of lobbyists and propagandists, and ordinarily we call for the appointment of a committee to investigate. There comes to my attention with reference to this matter an instance of most effective propaganda.

When this matter was pending in the House after the House Appropriations Committee had gone into it thoroughly and made its report, some Members of Congress became quite active to increase the appropriation of $14,000,000. That amount was finally provided in the bill as it came to the Senate. Some House Members did not know from whence the pressure came. Finally it was learned that there had been sent throughout the country a telegram similar to the following:

> Dr. L. A. WILSON,
> *State Department of Education, Albany, N. Y.:*
> Seems quite apparent that House Appropriations Committee may not recommend sufficient amount for George-Dean vocational appropriation. Amendment to report of appropriations committee will be submitted on floor of House by Congressman FULLER, Arkansas, to increase amount recommended by committee for vocation education. Very essential that your Congressman contact, cooperate with, and support Congressman FULLER and his amendment. Unless this is done vocational appropriations for next 5 years will be in serious danger. This is most urgent crisis we have faced during the last 3 years. We must have flood of telegrams and air-mail letters from influential persons and organizations to all your Congressmen requesting them to cooperate with Congressman FULLER. Chances for satisfactory vocational appropriation depend upon magnitude and thoroughness of this effort. Telegrams and letters must reach Congressmen Tuesday and Wednesday at the latest. Telegrams to Congressman FITZPATRICK should not mention Fuller amendment but should urge full fourteen million vocational appropriation. A thorough job should be done in his congressional district.
> (Signed) L. H. DENNIS,
> *Secretary, American Vocational Association,*
> *Denrike Building, 1010 Vermont Ave., Washington, D .C.*

The telegrams came and the votes came and the $14,000,000 was appropriated. The bill was reported to the Senate by the Senate Appropriations Committee last Saturday. A few moments ago I was advised that 73 telegrams had been received in my office during the last 3 hours. They read alike, and that they are inspired is evident. Somebody has been spending from 60 to 75 cents per telegram to wire me to vote for the proposed increase in this appropriation. I do not blame the Mr. Dennis whose name appears on the telegram I have read. I suspect that he has inspired these telegrams. I do not blame this man for wiring throughout my State, not only to educators, but to American Legion Posts and labor organizations and farm organizations; but it is the most thorough job that has been done since the days when we received telegrams to oppose the utility holding-company bill.

This telegram says that "a thorough job should be done in the congressional district" of a certain Congressman. It may be I have been singled out for similar attention, but one Senator bows his head to indicate that he has been subject to the same bombardment in the last few hours. My purpose in referring to it is to send a message to this gentleman in the city of Washington that I have received his telegrams via South Carolina and, having received them, that I am going to stand by the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee because I believe it is the wise thing to do for the cause of vocational education in this country. I believe that we should increase this appropriation gradually, and that neither Mr. Dennis nor any other man located in an office in the city of Washington can send telegrams to my State to flood me with messages and influence my vote on this or any other question.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I am strongly in favor of a substantial appropriation for vocational education. It is no new proposition. It has been invoked since the World War. We started vocational training for the veterans of the World War. That was a very popular movement. It did a great deal of good. It has been going on in a great many schools for several years. It seems to me it is one of the methods for a permanent solution of the unemployment situation.

Only recently someone told me about a check-up in his State in regard to those on relief and the unemployed to see whether or not any of those on relief at the present time had ever had vocational educational training within

the last 2 or 3 years. A thorough check-up disclosed that not a single one on relief had taken vocational training.

This afternoon I received a telegram from the president of the State school of science, Mr. E. F. Riley, of Wahpeton, N. Dak., reading as follows:

This school turned away 300 students desiring trades training last year. All of them could have been placed in jobs. Demand for trade-trained youth far exceeds supply. State legislature appropriated funds for a new building now ready to start construction; also appropriated funds for additional instructors to take care of students who could not be admitted last year. All these preparations made expecting the full allotment of George-Deen funds in accordance with the act.

That is just one school. I presume they heard this morning about the appropriation being reduced. Three or four other State institutions in my State, I am sure, would join in a similar message because they are strongly in favor of vocational training.

It seems to me, as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] said, that we cannot afford to cut down vocational training, especially when we have so many unemployed and are confronted with cutting down relief and unemployment of necessity. Vocational training, it seems to me, is the best method of taking care of the young people who are coming along, and will be on the unemployed list or on relief if they are not trained to some vocation so they can earn an honest living.

I hope the amendment of the committee will be rejected.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Connally	Logan	Reynolds
Andrews	Copeland	Lonergan	Robinson
Ashurst	Dieterich	Lundeen	Russell
Austin	Ellender	McAdoo	Schwartz
Bailey	Frazier	McCarran	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	George	McGill	Sheppard
Barkley	Gerry	McKellar	Smathers
Berry	Green	Minton	Steiwer
Bilbo	Guffey	Murray	Thomas, Okla.
Black	Hale	Neely	Thomas, Utah
Bulkley	Hayden	Nye	Townsend
Burke	Holt	O'Mahoney	Truman
Byrnes	Hughes	Overton	Van Nuys
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper	Wagner
Caraway	King	Pittman	Walsh
Chavez	La Follette	Pope	Wheeler
Clark	Lodge	Radcliffe	

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

Mr. BLACK. I ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment in the form of a substitute for the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Alabama, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the committee amendment on page 126, it is proposed to insert the following:

Further development of vocational education: For carrying out the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories", approved June 8, 1936 (49 Stat., p. 1488–1490), $7,241,500: *Provided*, That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, the apportionment to the States and Territories shall be computed on the basis of 50 percent of the sum authorized for each of the purposes enumerated in sections 1, 2, and 3: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 providing minimum allotments, the allotment of funds to any State or Territory for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, shall be not less than 50 percent of the minimum amount specified for each of the purposes enumerated in these sections: *Provided further*, That the apportionment to the States shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed $7,398,750 for the fiscal year 1938.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, first a parliamentary inquiry.

The item for vocational education carried in the bill as it came from the House has been stricken out by the Senate Appropriations Committee; and the question, of course, is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Senate committee. Those who favor it will vote "yea." Those who are opposed to it, who wish to restore the provision inserted in the bill in the House, will vote "nay." The inquiry is, Is the amendment just proposed by the Senator from Alabama in order at this stage of the proceedings?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order in lieu of the entire amendment reported by the committee, but it has the effect of a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Then the vote will come first on that amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote will come first on the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on that point I wish merely to say—I will not make any argument about it—that the amendment to the committee amendment, as I understand, is the provision as reported by the House Appropriations Committee; not the amendment as adopted by the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, now the parliamentary situation as I have just stated it. Those who wish to sustain the Senate committee should vote "yea", and those who wish to reject that amendment and restore the provision made by the House should vote "nay"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. That is the inquiry I made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, before the roll call begins, in view of the fact that a great number of the Senators now in their seats were not here during the debate, it seems to me attention should be called to the fact that the committee amendment provides for approximately $1,000,000 more than is now being expended, and that the bulk of the sum which appears in the House bill was added upon the floor of the House. So the request which is now being made to vote down the committee amendment is a request to increase the appropriation without support by the Appropriations Committee in either the Senate or the House; and, as I called to the attention of the Senate a few moments ago, every dollar of this appropriation over and above that which has been recommended by the Committee on Appropriations is adding to the deficit now existing in the Federal Treasury.

The Appropriations Committee is emphatically in favor of the committee amendment.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Wyoming if the amount at present left in the bill by the committee would not be adding to the deficit.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would. That is just another reason why it should not be increased.

Mr. FRAZIER. It is like the fellow who had lots of debts—why worry about them? [Laughter.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is right; spend all that you have, and all that you do not have.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I had not expected to say anything else, but I cannot refrain from calling to the attention of the Senate and calling to the attention of the country the fact that the Appropriations Committee have increased the appropriations carried in the House bill, which totaled $123,000,000, in round numbers, by more than $2,000,000 to $125,000,000. What happened? They simply cut the heart and life out of this appropriation for vocational education and then added other items in excess of the reduction made in the appropriation.

Where is the economy? My distinguished friend, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], is disturbed because someone sent him a telegram. I have received telegrams about almost every important issue I have ever faced since I became a Member of the Senate. I have never been afraid that anyone would convince me

unless I believed honestly that he was right. I have never been afraid that anyone would make me do the wrong thing, and I do not think the Senator from South Carolina is disturbed about that. But he is disturbed now because these telegrams are coming in. I have not spent a dime to bring a telegram here, and never would if I stayed here another 20 years.

I think every Member of the Senate knows that very well. But the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate did not make this report until sometime Saturday. There was no news of it until Saturday night. The people of this country are interested in this vocational educational provision, and they have a right to be interested in it. I say again to the Senator from South Carolina and to others who are disturbed about it that you cannot take all of your economy out of the hides of the boys and the girls who want some sort of vocational education in the rural high schools without hearing from them. You will hear from it now or at some other time.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. While the report of the committee carries a million dollars more than is now being expended——

Mr. GEORGE. Two million more.

Mr. BARKLEY. How does the amount reported compare with the amount authorized under the act of last year?

Mr. GEORGE. I am not so familiar with the reports of the Committee on Appropriations, but I will read the figures:

Amount of regular and supplemental estimates for 1938, $124,463,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am speaking of this particular vocational education item.

Mr. GEORGE. Approximately $10,000,000 more.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am seeking to obtain information as to the relation between the amount carried in the committee amendment and the authorization for this purpose.

Mr. GEORGE. The amount carried in the committee amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. The amount which reduced the House appropriation from fourteen million to four million. How much less is that than the amount which was authorized under the law to be appropriated for this purpose?

Mr. GEORGE. Approximately $10,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, the item in the House bill absorbs the entire authorization?

Mr. GEORGE. It does.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, during the present fiscal year there is available for vocational education $7,157,000 under the Smith-Hughes Act, which is a permanent appropriation, and $3,084,000 under what is known as the George-Ellzey Act, which will expire this year. The committee recommends a total appropriation of $4,290,000 in lieu of the $3,084,000. So that the total amount available for vocational education if the committee amendment shall prevail will be $7,000,000 under the Smith-Hughes Act, $4,200,000 under the George-Deen Act, a total of $11,448,000, an increase of over a million dollars above the appropriation of last year.

The proposal we are to vote on will include the amount of $7,000,000, will add $14,000,000 to that, and will make the total for vocational education $21,955,000, or an increase over the present amount of money appropriated for vocational education in this fiscal year of about $11,000,000.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. That will still be within the amount which the Congress has authorized by law to be appropriated for that purpose?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no question about that. The only difference is that the authorization is of one lump sum, and heretofore Congress has stepped up such appropriations. The committee suggested a program that will increase the amount each year.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has referred to the fact that while the committee has decreased the appropriation, it has increased others. What are two or three of the outstanding increases, and for what purposes are they appropriated, so that we may judge the merits of this decrease in comparison with the increases which have been referred to?

Mr. HAYDEN. The principal increase is the appropriation for the so-called Natchez Trace, which is in the same situation as this item. There is a law for the appropriation of $10,000,000 for the Natchez Trace Highway in Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi, and for the so-called Blue Ridge Parkway. The committee recommended $7,200,000 for those two purposes; that is one of the principal increases allowed in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the pending amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 126, line 3, to strike out the following:

Further development of vocational education: For carrying out the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories", approved June 8, 1936 (49 Stat., p. 1488–1490), $14,483,000.

And to insert the following:

Further development of vocational education: For the first installment of a 4-year program to carry out the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories", approved June 8, 1936 (49 Stat., p. 1488–1490):

For salaries and necessary travel expenses of teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural subjects, $1,031,000;

For salaries and necessary travel expenses of teachers, supervisors, and directors of home-economics subjects, $1,021,000;

For salaries and necessary travel expenses of teachers, supervisors, and directors of trade and industrial subjects, $1,032,000;

For salaries and necessary travel expenses of teachers, supervisors, and directors of, and maintenance of teacher training in, distributive occupational subjects, $649,000;

For preparing teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural, trade and industrial, and home-economics subjects, $557,000;

In all, $4,290,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIETERICH (when Mr. LEWIS' name was called). I announce that my colleague is detained from the Senate on departmental matters.

Mr. LOGAN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], who is absent, and I do not know how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are detained in important committee meetings. If present and voting, I am advised that they would vote "nay."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] is detained because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. DUFFY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

The Senators from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW and Mr. HITCHCOCK] are detained in Government Departments on matters pertaining to their State.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are detained on departmental matters.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] is necessarily detained from the Senate. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "nay."

I desire to add that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], who is necessarily detained from the Senate, is opposed to the committee amendment, and, if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON];

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS];

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON] with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN];

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. DUFFY]; and

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BROWN].

I am not advised how any of these Senators would vote on this question if present.

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—26

Adams	Green	McKellar	Steiwer
Ashurst	Guffey	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Bailey	Hale	Murray	Townsend
Burke	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Truman
Byrnes	Johnson, Colo.	Pope	Wheeler
Chavez	King	Radcliffe	
Gerry	Lodge	Schwellenbach	

NAYS—39

Andrews	Clark	Lonergan	Robinson
Austin	Connally	Lundeen	Russell
Bankhead	Copeland	McAdoo	Schwartz
Barkley	Dieterich	McCarran	Sheppard
Berry	Ellender	McGill	Smathers
Bilbo	Frazier	Neely	Thomas, Okla.
Black	George	Nye	Van Nuys
Bulkley	Holt	Overton	Wagner
Capper	La Follette	Pepper	Walsh
Caraway	Logan	Pittman	

NOT VOTING—31

Bone	Donahey	Hitchcock	Norris
Borah	Duffy	Hughes	Reynolds
Bridges	Gibson	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brown, Mich.	Gillette	Lee	Smith
Brown, N. H.	Glass	Lewis	Tydings
Bulow	Harrison	McNary	Vandenberg
Byrd	Hatch	Maloney	White
Davis	Herring	Moore	

So the amendment of the committee was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 127, after line 3, to insert: "In all, $4,290,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 130, line 3, after the word "of" where it occurs the first time, to strike out "$2,500" and insert "$3,000"; so as to read:

Not to exceed an aggregate of $3,000 of appropriations available to the Office of Education for salaries and expenses for vocational education shall be used for expenses of attendance at meetings of educational associations and other organizations which in the discretion of the Commissioner of Education are necessary for the efficient discharge of its responsibilities.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Government in the Territories—Government of the Virgin Islands", on page 135, after line 12, to insert:

For defraying the deficits in the treasuries of the municipal governments because of the excess of current expenses over current revenues for the fiscal year 1938, municipality of St. Thomas and St. John, $60,000, and municipality of St. Croix, $50,000; in all, $110,000, to be paid to the said treasuries in monthly installments.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. By direction of the committee, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, after line 25, it is proposed to insert:

Furniture, furnishings, and equipment, new Interior Department Building: The provisions of Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5) shall not apply to any expenditure authorized under this head in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1936 (49 Stat., p. 1619), when the aggregate amount involved is less than $300.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. By direction of the committee, I offer a further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, after line 24, it is proposed to insert:

GEORGE ROGERS CLARK SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission created by the joint resolution approved May 23, 1928, as amended, shall cease and terminate June 30, 1938, and the unexpended balances of the appropriations heretofore made for carrying out the purposes of such joint resolution, as amended, shall be available until June 30, 1938.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Finally, Mr. President, I offer a further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 142, after line 3, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph as follows:

SEC. 3. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1937, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between July 1, 1937, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

Mr. HAYDEN. That amendment is offered in the event that the bill shall not become a law before the end of the fiscal year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offer a further amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 142, line 4, it is proposed to change the section number to read "4."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in line 16, page 10, I move to amend by striking out "$3,000,000" and inserting "$3,600,000" in lieu thereof.

This amendment is intended to provide the sum necessary to permit the Bituminous Coal Commission to provide five regional offices throughout the United States in accordance with the terms of the Bituminous Coal Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To make that amendment in order it will be necessary that the vote by which the committee amendment was adopted be reconsidered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment, on page 10, line 16, was agreed to, be reconsidered. I gave notice that I should make this request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection. The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The amendment is that the figures "$3,000,000" be stricken out, and the figures "$3,600,000" inserted in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming to the committee amendment on page 10, line 16.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the committee amendment on page 10, line 16.

The amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert, at the proper place in the bill, the following:

No portion of the money appropriated in this or any other act shall be used for the payment of expenses or compensation of any officer or employee of the United States or any other person while en route to, engaged in, or returning from any dedication, cornerstone laying, or ceremonies connected with the beginning, completion, or progress of any building, bridge, highway, or other public works constructed from funds of the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that amendment is subject to a point of order.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, of course, the amendment in its present form is subject to a point of order; but the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] realizes clearly that I can amend it to make it in order on this bill by limiting its application to this bill. It seems to me it ought not to apply particularly to this particular appropriation bill, however, because, as a matter of fact, the officials whose salaries and traveling expenses are covered in this bill have not been the most flagrant violators in regard to expending public funds in the matter of traveling to make political speeches ostensibly at the dedication of post-office buildings or subtreasuries or roads or highways or other things. If the Senator from Arizona makes the point of order, I will amend my amendment by striking out the words "or any other act" and offer the amendment again in that form.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to this bill, in that it seeks to change existing law, and is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CLARK. I would be glad to have the Senator from Arizona state his views on that point. If amended as I have suggested, this is a limitation only on the funds appropriated in this bill, because I have stricken out the words "or any other act."

If the Senator from Arizona will withhold his point of order just a moment I will say that it is a matter of knowledge common to everyone that a very great amount of public funds have been expended, not only in the last 3 or 4 years during this administration, but over a period of years, by public officials, officials of the Treasury Department, the Post Office Department, Interior Department, and every other department of the Government, who have taken advantage of the dedication of a public building or the opening of a highway or the opening of a bridge or any other public work upon which the funds of the Government of the United States are expended to hold forth their own views and make political stump speeches. I submit that in a time when the country is interested in economy, as we all claim to be, there could not be any more wanton expenditure of money than this expenditure to keep officials out of their offices in attempts to influence Congress.

In the form in which I have last offered the amendment I suggest to the Senator from Arizona and to the Chair that it is an entirely proper limitation on an appropriation bill at any time for Congress to say that "no part of these funds shall be expended" in a certain way.

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

Mr. CLARK. Certainly.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have been trying to think of anyone connected with the Department of the Interior who has traveled over the United States laying cornerstones and making speeches. I cannot remember any such instance.

Mr. CLARK. I can inform the Senator from Arizona of several instances of my own knowledge.

Mr. HAYDEN. In the Interior Department?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. As a matter of fact, I do not wish to make any invidious personal references and therefore offered the amendment to apply to all Government activities. If the Senator from Arizona desires me to do so, I can tell of certain instances in which I have heard officers in the Department covered by the bill now before us. I do not desire to do that because it seems to me to be a principle of general application that Government officials ought not to take advantage of occasions such as I have mentioned to go throughout the country and impose their political views on the people of the United States, who after all, are taxpayers and pay all the expenses of the Government.

Mr. HAYDEN. The only dedicatory occasion I remember in connection with the Interior Department was held in the city of Washington where the Secretary of the Interior took part in the dedication ceremonies of the new Interior Department Building. There was no expense to the United States in that connection.

Mr. CLARK. No one has any objection to such a thing as that. We all know of such instances as I have mentioned, and it would take an investigation by a Senate committee to compile a list anywhere near complete; it probably would not even then be a complete list of the number of dedications that have been held in connection with public-works projects and W. P. A. projects—Treasury buildings and most notably post-office buildings, and this, that, and the other thing. The amendment I offered simply applies to every governmental activity and applies against the expenditure of public funds in propaganda in that connection.

Mr. HAYDEN. No appropriation for the Works Progress Administration is carried in this bill. No expenditure by the Public Works Administration is provided for in the bill. Those are provided for in deficiency bills and are not in any manner connected with the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. Then the amendment certainly would not injure anybody and I do not see why the Senator from Arizona should object to it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Merely on principle.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator object to the principles of prohibiting the expenditure of Government funds by employees in going around and making stump speeches?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; but that implies criticims of a department not guilty of that practice, when the Senator desires to reach officers in other departments who may have done what he has stated.

Mr. CLARK. I offered the amendment in general terms. The Senator from Arizona announced he was going to make the point of order against it. I revised the amendment and reduced it to a status where it seems to me it is entirely in order on this bill. If the amendment should be adopted on this bill I intend to offer it on every other appropriation bill that comes along. Further than that, whether the amendment is adopted or not, I intend to offer it on every appropriation bill that comes before the Senate. I think it is a very vicious practice that ought to be stopped.

Mr. HAYDEN. Realizing that this is the last appropriation bill to be passed at this session of Congress, if the Senator is going to offer his amendment he will have to wait until next January to do it. Why pick on this particular measure at the last moment when the officials of the Interior Department have not been guilty of the practice to which the Senator objects?

Mr. CLARK. The officials of the Interior Department in common with those of all other departments have been guilty of the practice. I announce my intention of offering the amendment on every future appropriation bill. I intend

to offer the amendment on every appropriation bill that comes before the Senate so long as I remain a Member of the Senate, until the principle is established.

Mr. HAYDEN. Perhaps we have discussed it long enough. I insist upon my point of order and ask the Chair to rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the amendment as modified by the Senator from Missouri is in order because it is merely a limitation upon the appropriation provided for in the pending bill.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. (Putting the question.) The "noes" seem to have it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Ellender	McCarran	Radcliffe
Andrews	Frazier	McGill	Robinson
Bailey	George	McKellar	Schwartz
Bankhead	Gerry	Minton	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Green	Murray	Sheppard
Bilbo	Guffey	Neely	Smathers
Black	Hale	Nye	Thomas, Okla.
Bulkley	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Utah
Burke	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper	Truman
Clark	La Follette	Pittman	Wagner
Connally	McAdoo	Pope	Wheeler

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-four Senators have answered to their names—not a quorum. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. With the consent of the Senator from Missouri, I wish to make an inquiry. My inquiry is whether or not——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present, and no business can be transacted until one is obtained.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I should like to complete my inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate is not in order until a quorum is obtained.

Mr. ADAMS. I was recognized.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a point of order. A parliamentary inquiry is in order. That is not business. The Senator from Colorado is making a point of order.

Mr. ADAMS. I thought I was recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ADAMS. My inquiry was to be directed to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who has an amendment pending. My inquiry is whether or not the amendment adds anything to the present law, and whether or not under the present law any official of the Government can spend Government funds in traveling about the country for the purpose of dedicating buildings or making political speeches.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, manifestly at this juncture this proceeding is out of order. Until a quorum has been ascertained to be present, no business is in order; so I make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators; and Mr. ASHURST, Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. BONE, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DIETERICH, Mr. DONAHEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. KING, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LOGAN, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. VAN NUYS answered to their names when called.

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I desire to make an inquiry of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. He has offered an amendment which seeks to forbid the use of any of the money appropriated by this bill for the traveling expenses of any public official to a dedication or to the laying of a cornerstone. My inquiry is whether or not, under the law as it now exists, any public official is authorized to use public money for traveling expenses for such purposes; because, unless the present law authorizes these personal trips, I see no occasion for voting for a repetition and restatement of what is already the law.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Colorado that, so far as I know, there is nothing in the law which forbids the use of public funds for trips to participate in dedications, or the laying of cornerstones, or the opening of parks or highways, or anything of the sort.

There is, to be sure, a statute, to which I have referred previously today—section 201 of the Criminal Code—which prohibits the use of Government funds generally for the purpose of trying to influence the action of Congress.

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

Mr. CLARK. I will yield in just a moment, if the Senator will pardon me. When a member of the Cabinet or any other Government official takes a trip for the purpose of opening up a public work, it is always then a question of fact as to whether he is violating section 201 of the Criminal Code by making a political speech.

I will say that I myself have been present at instances of that sort which were rather appalling to me. Not only has that occurred when the Republican Party was in power, and when I thought very bad taste was used, and when I thought that it was an abuse of public funds, but even when my own party was in power I have been present on occasions of that sort. I have been present when I was in entire accord with the propositions and policies that were being advocated by the speaker. Even when I myself have been lauded in very agreeable terms, I have felt that it was an abuse of public money. We all know of instances where some of our most prominent public officials probably have not been in their offices for an average of 3 days a month for the past 6 months, because of their activities in connection with the laying of cornerstones and making dedications and matters of that sort. It seems to me, without any reflection on anybody, as a matter of general public policy, that the situation should be corrected.

I shall be glad now to yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to make an inquiry of the Senator from Missouri. Suppose the Senator's amendment should be adopted, what good would it do?

A man goes out on official business to inspect a project. While there, he dedicates it. Someone there probably invites him to make a speech on politics, or someone else makes a speech. What are we going to do about it?

I do not object to gentlemen making speeches. We are a political people. Our's is a political country. Everybody knows these men are away at Government expense. The masses of the public know it, and they more or less discount the utterances of the speakers. I am not going to vote for the Senator's amendment. Let them talk.

Mr. CLARK. Does not the Senator think some officials really ought to put in a few days in Washington once in a while, attending to business, instead of cruising around over the country making dedications and laying cornerstones? Does the Senator think that having the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, or the Third Assistant Postmaster General, or the Second Assistant Postmaster General, or the First Assistant Postmaster General, or even the Postmaster General himself on hand to dedicate a building renders the Postal Service any more efficient than it would be if they simply opened the building and started to operate, take the mail through, and attend to the Postal Service, without any cornerstone laying and without any dedication?

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with the Senator that it is more the duty of the Post Office Department to deliver the mail than it is to deliver comments. Still, I do not think the amendment would be of any avail, and I shall not vote for it.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator think that a hospital built with P. W. A. funds would cure any more people by reason of having the Secretary of the Interior, or the Assistant Secretary, or the Assistant Director of the P. W. A., or anyone else there, than it would without that?

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator a question. A public official, a Senator, a Representative, a Cabinet member, or any other public official, goes out and dedicates a building or a project, and while he is in town he makes a political speech. Is his mouth to be closed? Let him talk. I do not object to that.

Mr. CLARK. I draw the attention of the Senator to the fact that when a Senator goes out to attend one of these exercises he pays his own way, but when a Government official goes out to the laying of a cornerstone he travels at public expense, ostensibly on official business.

Mr. CONNALLY. Most of the people know that they talk about things they are told to talk about, and that frequently they are not reflecting their own views; and I do not object to that.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator think any public purpose is to be served by the expenditure of public funds in that way?

Mr. CONNALLY. They are going to expend the funds; let us not abuse our minds with any other idea.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator, in view of the fact that section 201 of the Criminal Code has been so flagrantly violated for so many years. It may be that the addition of another provision will not help in that situation, but I am offering the amendment, and I hope the Senator from Texas will see his way clear to support it.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; the Senator from Texas does not believe it possible to close the mouths of these officials, and there is no use in trying, and personally I do not want to try.

Mr. CLARK. I have no desire to close the mouth of anyone in this country. Any of them, so far as I am concerned, have a right to express their opinions as citizens at any time they please; but I think it is a miscarriage of the governmental function to have them express their opinions at governmental expense.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. Can the Senator give us any information as to the number of post offices which have been dedicated since the 5th of February on the patriotic theme "Down with the Supreme Court"?

Mr. CLARK. I have only the information which has been contained in the public press, but I can say to the Senator that I am certain the number is very large.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Can the Senator give us any estimate as to the number of days the Members of the Senate—and I say this without any criticism whatsoever—receiving pay from the United States Government presumably to represent their States in this body, have missed sessions of the Senate while they were out making speeches on the other side of the Court question?

Mr. CLARK. I am not able to tell the Senator from Washington, particularly by reason of the fact that the Senate has been in session very few days during the present session of Congress. Since the Court bill was introduced there has been a cloud over the Senate during the entire session. Very few bills of any importance have been taken up. We have frequently adjourned for as long as 2 or 3 days at a time, and it would be impossible to tell the number of days any Senator has been away. I know of no means by which any Senator has been able to attend a dedication, or a cornerstone laying, or any other public function, at the public expense. If the Senator from Washington knows of any way by which that can be done, I should be very glad to have him disclose it.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I know of no instances where Senators have had their expenses paid out of public funds, but I understand that there have been certain organizations in this country which have been interested in the Court matter which have at least made offers to Senators that their expenses would be paid if they made speeches against the proposal, and certain additions to the amount.

Mr. CLARK. I should be very glad to have the Senator take the floor in his own time and elucidate that suggestion. So far as I am concerned, no such proposition has been made to me. I have been in attendance at the sessions of the Senate continually except when I was detained by reason of certain misfortunes in my family. Senators on both sides have been out addressing the public at various times on the Court issue, which has nothing whatever to do with the subject I am discussing, which is the use by public officials, executive officials, of public funds for the purpose of attending ostensible public functions, which have nothing to do with public duties, but are really political discussions. Whether or not they were political discussions, I say that no public purpose is ever served by the dedication of a post office at Squedunk or the opening of a Federal building at Podunk. My amendment is directed to the proposition that no part of the public funds shall be expended for the traveling expenses of those attending ceremonies of that kind. If my amendment could be adopted, which I know it will not, the saving to the Nation in having public officials at their desks performing their functions might well amount to millions of dollars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

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

The years and nays were not ordered.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 9, beginning with line 16, was agreed to be reconsidered. I understand that Senators cast their votes on the amendment I offered to this amendment under a misunderstanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I now reoffer my amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 10, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,600,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, to which I invite the attention of the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 91, line 24, after the figures "1935", it is proposed to insert "or any subsequent allotment made or to be made from the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937 shall be and."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the language of the bill refers to the Industrial Recovery Act of 1933 and the emergency relief appropriation of 1935. The Senator desires to extend the same provisions to the act of 1937?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I will take the matter to conference. I can give the Senator no assurance with regard to it, but I will be glad to take it to conference.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senate adopts the amendment, it will be construed as the act of the Senate, not of the Senator.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the text on page 66.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 66, line 6, it is proposed before the period to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided further, That section 2 of the act of Congress approved August 12, 1935, shall not apply to the Five Civilized Tribes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma whether this is the amendment he brought to the attention of the committee and was authorized to offer.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 18, line 3, after the word "marihuana", to insert the word "peyote."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there other amendments to be offered? If not, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the 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. 6523) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and for other purposes, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate nos. 88, 124, 126, and 134 to the bill, and concurred therein.

ENDORSEMENTS OF LOW-COST HOUSING BILL

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, a number of organizations throughout the country have endorsed the so-called Wagner-Steagall bill, and I ask that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the names of these organizations.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS WHICH HAVE ENDORSED WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL, URGING ITS ENACTMENT AT THE PRESENT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.
American Association for Social Security.
American Association of Social Workers.
American Association of Visiting Teachers.
American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.
American Federation of Hosiery Workers.
American Federation of Housing Authorities.
American Federation of Labor, housing committee.
American Federation of Labor, executive council, building-trades department.
American Federation of Musicians.
American Federation of Teachers.
American Home Economics Association.
American Institute of Architects.
American Planning and Civic Association.
American Society of Sanitary Engineering.
Association of Women in Public Health.
Big Brother and Sister Federation.
Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers International Union.
Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers.
Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.
Catholic Daughters of America.
Cigar Makers' International Union of America.
Committee for Industrial Organization.
Construction League of the United States.
Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.
Federal Housing Administration.
Federation of Flat Glass Workers.
Glass Blowers Association.
Granite Cutters' International Association of America.
Hotel and Restaurant Employees International Alliance.
Housing Legislation Information Office.
International Association of Bridge and Structural Iron Workers.
International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators and Asbestos Workers.
International Association of Machinists.
International Association of Marble, Stone, and Slate Polishers, Rubbers, and Sawyers, Tile and Marble Setters Helpers, and Terrazzo Helpers.
International Broom and Whisk Makers' Union.
International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers, and Helpers.
International Brotherhood of Boilermakers and Iron Ship Builders and Helpers of America.
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, and Helpers.
International Federation of Technical Engineers', Architects', and Draftsmen's Unions.
National Urban League.
International Fur Workers' Union.
International Hod Carriers, Building, and Common Laborers' Union.
International Ladies Garment Workers Union.
International Union of Elevator Constructors.
International Union of Operating Engineers.
International Association of Operative Plasterers and Cement Finishers.
International Metal Engravers' Union.
Inter-Professional Association.
Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers Union.
Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association of North America.
Labor Housing Conference.
Labor's Non-Partisan League.
Lathers' International Union, Wood, Wire, and Metal.
League for Industrial Democracy.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
National Association of Letter Carriers.
National Catholic Welfare Conference.
National Conference of Catholic Charities.
National Council of Catholic Men.
National Council of Catholic Women.
National Council of Education.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Federation of Day Nurseries.
National Federation of Rural Letter Carriers.
National Federation of Settlements.
Conference of National Federation of Settlements.
National Lawyers Guild.
National Presbyterian Neighborhood House Workers Conference.
National Public Housing Conference.
National Women's Trade Union League of America.
New York Times.
Piano, Organ, and Musical Instrument Workers Union.
Public Works Administration.
Stove Mounters International Union.
Sheet Metal Workers' International Association.
Twentieth Century Fund.
United Association of Journeymen Plumbers and Steam Fitters.
United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners.
United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers.
United Leather Workers' International Union.
United Mine Workers of America.
United National Association of Post Office Clerks.
United Rubber Workers of America.
United Slate, Tile, and Composition Roofers Damp and Waterproof Workers' Association.
United States Conference of Mayors.
United Wall Paper Crafts of North America.
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.
Wood, Wire, and Metal Lathers' International Union.
Y. W. C. A. National Board.
Public Ownership League of America.

FEDERAL AGENCIES ENDORSING THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

Mr. John H. Fahey, Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board.
Stewart McDonald, Federal Housing Administrator.
Howard A. Gray, Director, Housing Division P. W. A. (with minor amendments).
Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior (with minor amendments).

ALABAMA ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

Federated Women's Clubs of Alabama.
State Federation of Labor.
Anniston Central Labor Union.
Birmingham Labor Housing Committee.
Birmingham Building Trades Council.
Pastors' Union, Birmingham.
Birmingham Housing Authority.
Department of Labor, Birmingham.
Third District Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs.
Stenographers, Typists, and Bookkeepers Union No. 19403.
Local Bricklayers, Masons, Plasterers, International Union, Dothan.
Local Union No. 607, Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, Florence.
International Union of Operative Engineers, No. 320.
Muscle Shoals Building Trades Council.
Jasper Central Labor Union.
Anti-Tuberculosis Association of Jefferson County.
Mrs. Frances Durham, women's editor, Mobile Times.
International Association of Machinists, River Front Lodge, No. 261, Mobile.
Montgomery Central Labor Union.

Muscle Shoals Building and Construction Council.
Tri-Cities Central Labor Union, Muscle Shoals.
Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America, No. 836.
International Association of Bridge, Structural, and Ornamental Iron Workers, Local No. 477.
International Molders' Union, Local No. 100, Tarrant.
Tarrant Central Labor Union.
United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, No. 109.
Winfield Central Labor Union.

ARIZONA ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Etc., No. 274.
International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 428.
Phoenix Central Labor Council.
Evan S. Stallcup, city manager, Phoenix.
Tucson Central Trades Council.

ARKANSAS ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, Local 381.
Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, Shenandoah Colliery Local, No. 1443.
Arkansas State Federation of Labor.
Dr. Thomas M. Fly, city health officer, Little Rock.
Pine Bluff Central Trades and Labor Council.

CALIFORNIA ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Assembly of the State of California.
Painters Local Union No. 835.
Walter A. Gordon, attorney at law, Berkeley.
San Mateo Central Labor Council.
Fresno Central Labor Council.
Fresno County Building Trades Council.
Tri-County Labor News.
American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, Local 1001.
Benjamin J. Bowie Post, No. 228, American Legion.
Los Angeles Building Trades Council.
Central Employment Bureau for Veterans.
Council of Social Agencies of Los Angeles.
East Side Citizens Committee.
Golden State Mutual Life Insurance Co.
Los Angeles Committee on Public Housing.
Los Angeles Municipal Housing Commission.
Los Angeles County Legislative Committee of the Standard Railroad Shop Craft Organizations.
Los Angeles Young Men's Christian Association, San Fernando Valley branch.
Mayor of Los Angeles.
Metropolitan Central Council, Archdiocese of Los Angeles, Society of St. Vincent de Paul.
Plaza Community Center.
Social service department, director of out-patient department, director of nursing of the Children's Hospital.
Southern California Chapter, Institute of Architects.
Alameda County Building Trades Council.
Chemical Workers Union, Local 20280.
Salinas Central Labor Union of Monterey County.
San Francisco Dressmakers Union, No. 101.
San Francisco Ladies' Garment Cutters, No. 213.
Plumbers Local Union 442.
San Francisco Housing Association.
San Francisco Labor Council.
United Association of Journeymen Plumbers and Steam Fitters, Local No. 442.
Central Labor Council of San Joaquin County.
San Jose Building Trades Council.
Central Labor Council, San Mateo.
Santa Barbara City Council.
Santa Rosa Central Trades Council.
Stockton Central Labor Council.
Vallejo Carpenters Local, No. 180.
Consolidated Building and Metal Trades Central Labor Council, Vallejo.
Carpenters' Local Union, Yuba City.

COLORADO ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

State Federation of Labor.
Fremont County Central Labor Union.
Colorado State Conference, Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers' International Union of America.
Mayor Ben F. Stapleton, Denver.
United Slate, Tile, and Composition Roofers, Damp- and Waterproof Workers' Association, Local No. 55.

CONNECTICUT ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Connecticut Federation of Labor.
Bridgeport Central Labor Union.
Chamber of Commerce, Bridgeport.
Building Trades Council, Bridgeport.
City of Bridgeport, Common Council.
City of Bridgeport, mayor.
Disabled War Veterans.
East Side Business Men's Association.
Family Welfare Society.
Holy Rosary Roman Catholic Church.
Housing Authority of the City of Bridgeport.
Manufacturers' Association.
St. Cyril and Methodius Roman Catholic Church of Bridgeport.
St. John's Roman Catholic Church, Bridgeport.
St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church, Bridgeport.
St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church.
Slovak Alliance of Bridgeport and vicinity.
Veterans of Foreign Wars.
Danbury Central Labor Union.
Herbert Gibson, president, City Planning Commission.
Hartford Central Labor Union.
Meriden Central Labor Union.
United Association of Journeymen Plumbers and Steam Fitters, Local No. 21.
Central Labor Union of New Britain.
Rev. Fleming James, New Haven.
Dr. C. E. A. Winslow, Yale School of Medicine.
Stamford Painters' Union, No. 192.

DELAWARE ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Central Labor Union, Wilmington.
Delaware State Board of Housing.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

Maryland State and District of Columbia Federation of Labor.
District of Columbia Chapter American Association of Social Workers.
Monday Evening Club.
Voteless League of Women Voters.
Warren Jay Vinton.
Washington Building Trades Council.
Washington Central Labor Union.
Washington Housing Association.

FLORIDA ENDORSEMENTS OF WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Florida Federation of Labor.
Union Foreign District Sunday School and B. Y. P. U. Convention, Clearwater.
Building Trades Council of Jacksonville.
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, No. 177.
Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers Union, No. 7.
International Longshoremen's Association, Local No. 1416.
South Florida District Sunday School and Baptist Young Peoples' Union Conference, Mt. Bilgoa Baptist Church.
Orlando District Conference, A. M. E.
Bricklayers of Panama City, Local Union 16.
B. M. P. I. U. Union, No. 16, Panama City.
Florida Carpenters Union, Local 1510.
International Brotherhood of P. M., Local No. 267.
Paper Makers Local Union, No. 267.
United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Local No. 1510.
International Association of Machinists, No. 192.
Bartow District Conference Central Florida A. M. E. Church.
St. Petersburg Building Trades Council.
Central Labor Union, St. Petersburg.
Florida Building Trades Conference.
Bethel Baptist Church, Tampa.
Tampa Central Trades and Labor Assembly.
Manatie District Conference of A. M. E. Church.
Morning Star Missionary, Baptist Church, Tampa.
New Salem Missionary, Baptist Church, Tampa.
St. Paul A. M. E. Church.
Mount Sinai A. M. E. Z. Church, Tampa.
Tampa Ministerial Association.
Tampa Municipal Housing Board.
Tampa Urban League.
Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers Local, No. 6.
Building Trades Council, West Palm Beach.
Central Labor Union, West Palm Beach.
United Association of Journeymen Plumbers and Steamfitters, No. 630.

GEORGIA ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Georgia Federation of Labor.
American Federation of Hosiery Workers.
City Council, Atlanta.
Mayor William B. Hartsfield, Atlanta.
C. F. Palmer, chairman, executive committee, Techwood Homes, Atlanta.
Atlanta Federation of Trades.
Building Trades Council, Atlanta.
Central Labor Union, Augusta.
Central Labor Union of Brunswick.
City Council, Brunswick.
International Union of Operating Engineers, Local Union No. 328.
Columbus Federation of Trades.
Macon Federation of Trades.
Savannah Building and Construction Council.
Trades and Labor Assembly of Savannah.

IDAHO ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

State Federation of Labor.
Lewiston Central Labor Council.
City Council, Nampa.
Mayor Lewis Ord, Nampa.
Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, Lodge 1147.
Nampa Trades and Labor Council.

ILLINOIS ENDORSEMENTS OF WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Illinois State Housing Board.
Illinois State Federation of Labor.
Alton Building Trades Council.
Alton Carpenters Union, No. 377.
Alton Boilermakers Union, No. 483.
Alton Bricklayers Union, No. 8, of Illinois.
Alton Electrical Workers Union, No. 649.
Alton Engineers Union, No. 520.
Alton Iron Workers Union, No. 392.
Alton Laborers Union, No. 218.
Alton Painters Union, No. 471.
Alton Plasters and Cement Finishers, No. 90.
Alton Plumbers and Steamfitters, No. 163.
Alton Roofers Union, No. 2.
Alton Sheet Metal Workers Union, No. 169.
Alton Teamsters and Chauffeurs Union, No. 525.
Ladies Garment Workers Union, No. 189, Batavia.
Belleville Building Trades Council.
Belleville Trades and Labor Assembly.
Belleville City Council.
Benton Central Labor Union.
Blue Island Central Labor Union.
Twin City Federation of Labor.
Mr. Frank Elder, Champaign, Ill.
City Council, Chicago.
M. D. Carrel, Chicago.
Chicago Building Trades Council.
Chicago Commons.
Chicago Federation of Labor.
Chicago Federation of Settlements.
Chicago Housing Authority.
Chicago Sign and Pictorial Painters Union, No. 830.
Chicago Urban League.
William J. Cowley, alderman, forty-first ward, Chicago.
Federal Local Union, No. 20335.
Social Service Employees Union, Chicago.
Ernest A. Grunsfeld, Jr., architect, Chicago.
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local No. 134.
National Council of Jewish Women, Chicago section.
Newberry Avenue Center, Chicago.
South Chicago Trades and Labor Assembly.
Terrazzo Workers Helpers, Local Union No. 98.
University of Chicago Settlement.
R. Clyde White, University of Chicago.
Women's City Club of Chicago.
Decatur Trades and Labor Assembly.
Department of Public Health and Safety, Decatur.
East St. Louis Building Trades Council.
East St. Louis Central Trades and Labor Union.
Central Labor Union, Freeport.
Galesburg Trade Assembly.
Central Trades and Labor Council of Joliet.
Kankakee Building Trades Council.
Kankakee Federation of Labor.
Kewanee Trades and Labor Assembly.
Stove Mounters' International Union, Local 47, Lebanon.
City Council, Moline.
United Cement Workers Union, No. 20066, Oglesby.
Distillery Workers' Union, No. 19538, Pekin.
International Union of Operative Engineers, No. 8, Peoria.
Peoria Federation of Women's Clubs.
Peoria Women's Club.
Progress Club, Peoria.
Welfare League, Peoria.
Greater Peoria Civic Association.
Zoning Commission, Peoria.
Central Labor Union, Rockford.
United Association of Journeymen Plumbers and Steam Fitters, Local 201, Rockford.
Olof, F. Cervin, Architect, Rock Island.
South Chicago Trades & Labor Assembly.
International Union of Operating Engineers, Locals Nos. 965 and 965–A, Springfield.
Springfield Federation of Labor.
United Cement Workers' Union, No. 20266.
Lake County Central Labor Council.
City Council, Waukegan.
Mancel Talcott, Mayor, Waukegan.
West Frankfort Trades and Labor Council.

INDIANA ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Indiana State Federation of Labor.
James W. Geater, Anderson.
Bloomington Central Labor Union.
International Association of Marble, Stone and Slate Polishers, Rubbers and Sawyers, Tile and Marble Setters' Helpers and Terrazzo Workers Helpers, Local No. 89.
Clinton Central Labor Union.
Crawfordsville Central Labor Union.
Judge T. Joseph Sullivan, Thirty-first Judicial Circuit, Crown Point.
Bricklayers' Union, No. 6, East Chicago.
Carpenters' Local No. 565, Elkhart.
Elkhart County Central Labor Union.
Building Trades Council of Evansville.
Carpenters' Local Union, No. 90, Evansville.
Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, Local No. 469.
Fort Wayne Federation of Labor.
International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, No. 116, Fort Wayne.
International Union of Operative Engineers, No. 19, Fort Wayne.
Lake County Central Labor Union.
Lake County Department of Public Welfare.
Mayor Frank R. Martin, Hammond.
Miss Irma Harris, Indianapolis.
Indiana Farm Bureau.
L. V. Sheridan, State Planning Board, Indianapolis.
Mrs. Ida Mell Weesner, Indianapolis.
Federal Labor Union, No. 19522, Kokomo.
Kokomo Trades and Labor Council.
Muncie Central Labor Union.
Central Labor Union, South Bend.
Central Labor Union, Terre Haute.
International Hod Carriers', Building and Common Laborers' Union of America, Local 204.

IOWA ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Iowa State Federation of Labor.
Building Trades Council, Cedar Rapids.
Cedar Rapids Federation of Labor.
Tri-City Labor Congress, Clinton.
Central Labor Union, Council Bluffs.
City Council, Des Moines.
Mayor J. H. Allen, Des Moines.
Building Trades Council, Des Moines.
Corn Products Workers, Local No. 19931, Keokuk.
Keokuk Trades and Labor Assembly.
City Planning and Zoning Commission, Sioux City.
City Council, Waterloo.

KANSAS ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Central Labor Union of Arkansas City.
Coffeyville Central Labor Union.
Operative Plasterers and Cement Finishers, Local No. 291.
Hutchinson Central Trades and Labor Council.
Pittsburg United Trades and Labor Council.
Wichita Trades and Labor Assembly.

KENTUCKY ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Kentucky Federation of Labor.
Board of Aldermen, Louisville.
Mayor Neville Miller.
City Council, Louisville.
Lather's Local Union 18, Louisville.
Louisville Central Labor Union.
Louisville Municipal Housing Commission.
Mothers' Club, Neighborhood House, Louisville.

LOUISIANA ENDORSEMENTS OF WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Lake Charles Building Trades.
Bryan Bell, president, New Orleans Association of Commerce.
Rev. B. Tait Bell, Tulane Y. M. C. A.
Rev. J. Bondra, Bethel Presbyterian Church, New Orleans.
Rev. Herman Borne, St. John Evangelical Church, New Orleans.
Rev. R. Coleman, First African Baptist Church, New Orleans.
Rev. C. Girelius, First Unitarian Church, New Orleans.
Rev. D. B. Rawlins, Carrollton Avenue Methodist Church, New Orleans.
The Catherine Club, New Orleans.
Chalmette Chapter, U. S. D. 1812, Louisiana.
A. W. Dent, superintendent, Flint-Goodridge Hospital of Dillard University.
Mrs. Roberta Falk, Family Service Society, New Orleans.
Myron Falk, State department of public welfare, New Orleans.
Executive committee of Federal Council of Churches, New Orleans.
Rev. J. S. Laird, St. Charles Avenue, New Orleans.
Louisiana Colonials, New Orleans.
Louisiana League for Peace and Freedom, New Orleans.
Louisiana-Mississippi Chapter, National Executive Housekeepers' Association, Inc.
Rev. Norman Maunz, First Evangelical Church.
New Orleans Association of Commerce.
New Orleans Board of Trade.
Committee on Legislation, New Orleans Board of Trade.
New Orleans Business and Professional Women's Club.
New Orleans Federation of Clubs.
New Orleans Homestead Clearing House Association, Inc.
New Orleans W. C. T. U.
Ninth Ward Improvement and Protective Association, New Orleans.
Mabel Palton, executive secretary, Y. W. C. A., New Orleans.

Mrs. A. Prior, Amalgamated Garment Workers, New Orleans.
Quota Club, New Orleans.
Rev. D. B. Raulins, Methodist Episcopal Church, South, New Orleans.
Rev. F. Schwenfurth, Salem Evangelical Church, New Orleans.
Rev. A. J. Sherer, Trinity Evangelical Church, New Orleans.
Rev. C. Taylor, St. John's Church, New Orleans.
Rev. W. Weaver, Carrollton Avenue Christian Church, New Orleans.
Woman's Auxiliary of the Louisiana State Optometric Association, New Orleans.
Verbon Gay, Tulane Y. M. C. A.

MAINE ENDORSEMENT OF WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Maine State Federation of Labor.

MARYLAND ENDORSEMENTS OF WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Baltimore Federation of Labor.
Allegheny Trades Council, Cumberland.
United Mine Workers of America, Local No. 2835.

MASSACHUSETTS ENDORSEMENTS OF WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Massachusetts State Federation of Labor.
Boston Conference on Slum Clearance and Low-Rent Housing.
Boston Housing Authority.
Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, Local No. 11, Boston.
Building Trades Council, Boston and vicinity.
Central Labor Union of Boston and vicinity.
Building Trades Council, Lawrence.
State Board of Housing.
Brockton Building and Construction Trades Council.
Brockton Central Labor Union.
Building Trades Council of Brockton and vicinity.
Cambridge Central Labor Union.
Cambridge Housing Authority.
Mayor John D. Lynch, Cambridge.
Federal Labor Union 18518, Chicopee.
International Union of Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers, Local No. 11, Fall River.
Mayor Dewey G. Archambault, Lowell.
American Federation of Hosiery Workers, No. 105, Lowell.
Building Trades Council, Lowell.
Central Labor Union, Lowell.
International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers of America, No. 49, Lowell.
Lynn Building Trades Council.
Lynn Central Labor Union.
Norwood Building Trades Council.
Wire Workers Local Union, No. 19859, Worcester.
Worcester Building Trades Council.

MICHIGAN ENDORSEMENTS OF WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Michigan Federation of Labor.
Battle Creek Federation of Labor.
International Union of Operating Engineers, Local No. 356, Battle Creek.
Carpenters' Local Union No. 116, Bay City.
Mayor Frank Couzens, Detroit.
Detroit Housing Commission.
Mayor Harold E. Bradshaw, Flint.
Bricklayers' International Union, No. 12.
City Council, Hamtramck.
Carpenters' Local No. 297, Kalamazoo.
United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Kalamazoo.
Council of Social Agencies of Kalamazoo.
Kalamazoo Trades and Labor Council.
City Council, Kalamazoo.
City Commission, Kalamazoo.
M. & M. Trades Council, Menominee.
International Brotherhood of Pulp Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers, No. 172, Menominee.
City Council, Lincoln Park.
Plumbers' Local Union 85, Saginaw.
Barton P. Jenks, Jr., Walled Lake.
City Council, Wyandotte.

MINNESOTA ENDORSEMENTS OF WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

Minnesota State Federation of Labor.
Minneapolis Building Trades Council.
Central Labor Union, Minneapolis.
City Council, Minneapolis.
Mayor Thomas E. Latimer.
Minneapolis Central Labor Union.
City Council, St. Paul.
Mayor M. H. Gehan, St. Paul.
Building Trades Council, St. Paul and vicinity.
Minnesota State Employees Union, No. 10, St. Paul.
Winona Trades and Labor Council.

MISSISSIPPI ENDORSEMENTS OF WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Mayor Louis Braun, Biloxi.
Gulfport Central Labor Union.
Jackson Central Labor Union.

MISSOURI ENDORSEMENTS OF WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Missouri State Federation of Labor.
Central Labor Union, Carthage.
Combined Building Trades Council, Kansas City.
Kansas City Building and Construction Trades Council.
United Association of Journeymen Plumbers and Steam Fitters, Local No. 533, Kansas City.
Urban League of Kansas City.
Moberley Central Labor Union.
J. Bertram Black, St. Louis.
Brotherhood of Railroad Depot, Bus Terminal, Etc., Federal Labor Union, 20419, St. Louis.
Committee on social legislation, the Urban League of St. Louis, Inc.
Miss Gladys Gray, St. Louis Relief Administration.
International Association of Bridge Structural and Ornamental Iron Workers, St. Louis.
Legislative committee, Women's Auxiliary, Central Trades and Labor Assembly, St. Louis.
City Council, St. Joseph.
Building Trades Council, Springfield.

MONTANA ENDORSEMENTS OF WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Wood, Wire, and Metal Lathers International Union, No. 258, Billings.
Cascade County Trades and Labor Assembly.
City Council, Great Falls.
Mayor A. J. Finsek, Great Falls.
Helena Trades and Labor Assembly.
Lewiston Building Trades Council.
Miles City Trades and Labor Council.

NEBRASKA ENDORSEMENTS OF WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Nebraska State Federation of Labor.
Miss Edith Carse, housing and equipment division, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.
Board of directors, Omaha Social Settlement.
Omaha Social Settlement, settlement board.
Urban League of Lincoln.

NEVADA ENDORSEMENT OF WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Nevada State Federation of Labor.

NEW HAMPSHIRE ENDORSEMENTS OF WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

New Hampshire State Federation of Labor.
Cheshire County Trades and Labor Assembly.
Manchester Building Trades Council.
Manchester Central Labor Union.

NEW JERSEY ENDORSEMENTS OF WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL

Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers Union, Local No. 8, Asbury Park.
Monmouth County Building Trades Council.
Atlantic County Central Labor Union.
Robert A. Watson, district manager, New Jersey State Housing Authority.
Board of Commissioners, Camden.
Central Labor Union, Camden.
Labor Housing Committee, Camden.
Central Planning Board, Elizabeth.
Union County Central Labor Union.
Central Labor Union, Glen Rock.
International Union of Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers, Local No. 2, Haledon.
Monmouth County Executive Committee for Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers International Union.
Aluminum and Tin Foil Workers Union, No. 20533.
C. A. Capron, member of Mayor's Housing Committee.
Board of Commissioners, Newark.
Essex County Building Trades Council.
New Jersey Chapter, American Association of Social Workers.
State Housing Authority.
City Council, Orange.
Dyers Local, No. 1733, Paterson.
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, No. 102, Paterson.
Agricultural Workers', No. 20318, Perrinesville.
International Ladies Garment Workers Union, No. 149, Plainfield.
Plainfield Housing Committee.
Princeton Conference, Princeton League of Women Voters.
Dr. Robert R. Wicks, Princeton University.
Municipal Advisory Board on Housing, Trenton.
Trenton Chamber of Commerce.
New Jersey State Federation of Labor.
American Federation of Hosiery Workers, New Jersey and New York District Council.
Association of Chosen Freeholders.
Federation of Dyers and Finishers.
New Jersey Bar Association.
New Jersey Board of Children's Guardians.
New Jersey Building Trades Unions.
New Jersey Business and Professional Women's Clubs.
Catholic Daughters of America.
Committee on Labor Standards.

Conference of Social Work.
Consumers' League.
Council of Jewish Women.
Federation of Colored Women's Clubs.
Federation of Women's Clubs.
New Jersey Housing League.
New Jersey Inter-Professional Association.
New Jersey League of Municipalities.
New Jersey League of Women Voters.
New Jersey Medical Association.
New Jersey Parent-Teachers Association.
Salvation Army.
New Jersey Urban League.
Young Men's Christian Association.
Mayor George E. Brunner, Camden.

NEW YORK ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

New York Assembly.
State Conference of National Council of Jewish Women, meeting at Utica.
New York State Federation of Labor.
Bronx Youth Council.
Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers, No. 454.
Operative Plasterers and Cement Finishers International Association, Riverdale.
Mrs. Jas. Russell Bourne, Bronxville.
Bricklayers International Union, Local No. 9.
Bricklayers Union No. 1, Brooklyn.
Building Trades Council, Brooklyn.
Brooklyn Committee for Better Housing.
Department of Christian Social Service of the Diocese of Long Island.
International Longshoremen's Association, Brooklyn.
International Bricklayers Union, No. 9, Brooklyn.
Wholesale Dry Goods Employees Union, Local 19932, Brooklyn.
Women's Organization of the Church of the Saviour, Brooklyn.
New Lots Regular Democratic Club, Brooklyn.
Young Democratic League, Brooklyn.
American Federation of Hosiery Workers, No. 40, Buffalo.
Bricklayers, Masons, Tile, and Marblesetters Union of Buffalo, No. 45.
Buffalo Diocesan Council of the National Council of Catholic Women.
Central Labor Council of Buffalo.
International Union of Operating Engineers, Locals 17 and 17–A, Buffalo.
Plasterers Union, Local No. 9, Buffalo.
Westminster Community House, Buffalo.
Central Trades and Labor Assembly, Elmira.
International Union of Operating Engineers, Locals 138 and 138A, Hempstead, Long Island.
Ithaca Building Trades Council.
Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, Local No. 1035.
Building Trades Council, Jamestown.
Central Labor Union, Jamestown.
Lackawanna City Housing Authority.
Aluminum Workers Union, Local No. 19256, Massena.
Amalgamated Ladies' Garment Cutters' Union, Local No. 10.
Benjamin R. Andrews, Columbia University.
Architectural and Engineering Guild, Local No. 66, New York City.
Board of Estimate and Apportionment, New York City.
Bookkeepers, Stenographers, and Accountants Union, New York City.
Joseph M. Brody, New York City.
Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, No. 971, New York City.
Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, No. 905, New York City.
Building and Construction Trades Council.
Central Trades and Labor Council of Greater New York.
Chelsea Tenants League, New York City.
Citizens Union of the City of New York.
City Affairs Committee, New York City.
City Wide Tenants' League, New York City.
Cloak, Suit, Skirt, and Reefer Makers Union Joint Board of Greater New York.
Louis Cohen, New York City.
Cooperative Housing Association of Civil Service Employees, New York City.
Dressmakers' Union, No. 22, New York City.
L. Dwyer, New York City.
Edwin G. Elkund, New York City.
Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations, New York City.
Goddard Neighborhood Centre, New York City.
Willystine Goodsell, New York City.
Grand Street Boys' Association, New York City.
Mrs. Lena Heisler, New York City.
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, No. 3, New York City.
International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects and Draftsmen Unions of the A. F. of L., Local 66, New York City.
International Ladies Garment Workers Union, New York City.
International Longshoremen's Association, Local No. 327.
International Longshoremen's Local, No. 1100.
Jewish Social Service Association, New York City.
Mayor Fiorella LaGuardia, New York City.
Loula D. Lasker, Survey Graphic, New York City.
John Lovelock, New York City.
Lower East Side Association of Agencies, New York City.
Madison House Society, New York City.
Edward J. McAlinn Association, New York City.
Mid Town Tenants' Association, New York City.
Navy Yard Local of Plumbers and Steamfitters, Brooklyn.
Mailton House, New York City.
New York City Chapter, American Association of Social Workers.
New York City Housing Authority.
New York Post.
New York Tenement Housing Committee.
New York Typographical Union, No. 6.
N. O. Masters, Mates and Pilots of America, New York City.
North Harlem Community Council, New York City.
Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America, Local No. 692, New York City.
Paperhangers Local Union, No. 490, New York City.
Plumbers and Steamfitters Union, New York City.
Printing Pressmen's Union, No. 51, New York City.
Frank L. Reed, New York City.
Trustees of Phelps Stokes Fund.
Mrs. John E. Rousmaniere, New York City.
Heber Smith, member Yonkers Authority.
Nathan Straus, New York City.
United Upholsterers' Union of New York, Local No. 44.
Welfare Council, New York City.
Housing Section, Legislative Committee, New York City.
Welfare Council, Executive Committee, New York City.
W. P. A. Teachers Union, Local 453, of the American Federation of Teachers, New York City.
Cynthia Wentworth, assistant editor, American City, New York City.
Edith Elmer Wood, New York City.
Yorkville Tenants' League, New York City.
Yoruba Literary and Debating Club.
City Council, Niagara Falls.
Niagara Falls Central Labor Union.
Building Trades Council of Dutchess County and Vicinity.
International Union of Operative Engineers, Local No. 71, Rochester.
Lewis Street Center, Rochester.
Rochester Diocesan Council of National Council of Catholic Women.
Schenectady City Housing Authority.
Schenectady Building Trades Council.
City Council, Syracuse.
Syracuse Women's Housing Committee.
Syracuse Housing Authority.
Association of Journeymen Plumbers and Steamfitters, Tarrytown.
Utica Trades Assembly.
Federation of Labor of Westchester County.
First Presbyterian Church of Yonkers.
Joseph F. Loehr, mayor of city of Yonkers.
Municipal Housing Authority, Yonkers.
Council of Social Agencies, Welfare Federation of Yonkers.
Yonkers Coordinating Council.
Bryn Mawr League of Women Voters.
St. Johns Church.
H. Otheran Smith, Baptist Church of the Redeemer, Yonkers.
Yonkers Herald-Statesman.
Yonkers Welfare Federation.
Syracuse Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

NORTH CAROLINA ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

North Carolina State Federation of Labor.
Barbers' Local, No. 68, Asheville.
Durham Central Labor Union.
United Textile Workers, Gastonia.
Central Labor Union, Winston-Salem.

NORTH DAKOTA ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

North Dakota State Federation of Labor.
United Association of Journeymen Plumbers and Steamfitters, Local No. 338.
Chauffeurs, Teamsters, and Helpers Local Union, No. 116, Fargo.
Fargo Trades and Labor Assembly.
Union of All Workers, Local No. 1, Fargo.

OHIO ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

Ohio State Federation of Labor.
Ohio State Senate.
City Council, Akron.
B. and W. Federal Labor Union, Local No. 20186, Akron.
Barberton Central Labor Union.
Chillicothe Central Labor Union.
Mr. Samuel Ash, Cincinnati.
Associated Charities of Cincinnati.
Babies Milk Fund Association, Cincinnati.
Better Housing League, Cincinnati.
J. J. Hurst, Central Labor Council, Cincinnati.
Cincinnati district of the Ohio State Nurses' Association.
Cincinnati joint board, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Coat, Suit, and Dressmakers' Union, No. 63.
Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority.
Committee on social action, Cincinnati Presbytery.
Cincinnati section of National Council of Jewish Women.
Cincinnati Social Workers' Club.

George W. B. Conrad, attorney, Cincinnati.
Prof. Abraham Cronbach, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati.
Tom Deering, Cincinnati.
District no. 8, State Nurses' Association, Cincinnati.
Dr. Earle Eubank, Cincinnati.
Federation of Churches, Cincinnati.
Garden Club of Clifton, Cincinnati.
Mrs. Simon Kuhn, Cincinnati.
August Marx, Cincinnati.
Plastic Workers' Local Union 20319.
Public Health Federation of Cincinnati.
N. Rauschoff, Inc., Cincinnati.
The Smoke Abatement League, Cincinnati.
Dr. Raymond Walters, University of Cincinnati.
Women's City Club, Cincinnati.
Clifford R. Wright, Cincinnati.
Lorna May Tuttle, Y. W. C. A., Cincinnati.
Cleveland Citizen (editorial).
City Council, Cleveland.
Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority.
Cleveland Settlement Union.
Central Trades Council, Cleveland.
Elizabeth King Tracy, Cleveland.
Mr. George Malone, Cleveland.
International Association of Machinists, Local No. 439, Cleveland.
Women's City Club of Cleveland.
Wood, Wire, and Metal Lathers' International Union, Local No. 18, Cleveland.
Columbus City Council.
Columbus Federation of Labor.
Mayor Myron B. Gessaman, Columbus.
Mr. William Kaufman, Columbus.
Central Labor Union of Dayton.
Perry County Central Trades and Labor Council.
Trades and Labor Assembly of Tuser County.
East Liverpool Trades and Labor Council.
Elyria Central Labor Union.
City Council, Lorain.
Mayor E. A. Brann, Lorain.
Mahoning County Commissioners.
Marion Central Labor Union.
Middletown Trades and Labor Council.
Trades and Labor Assembly of Tuscarawas County, New Philadelphia.
Piqua Central Labor Union.
City Commission, Sandusky.
Jefferson County Trades and Labor Assembly, Steubenville.
Toledo Chapter, American Association of Social Workers.
Charles Bushnell, University of Toledo.
City Council, Toledo.
Mayor Roy C. Start, Toledo.
Central Labor Union, Toledo.
North Toledo Community House.
Federal Labor Union, No. 18565, United Match Workers, Wadsworth.
Clark Kerr, Antioch College, Yellow Springs.
Mayor of Youngstown.
County Commissioners, Youngstown.
City Planning Commission, Youngstown.
Mahoning County Labor Congress, Youngstown.
Metropolitan Housing Authority, Youngstown.
Board of Health, Youngstown.
Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers.
Zanesville Federation of Labor.

OKLAHOMA ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

Central Trades and Labor Council.
Cement Employees Union, Local No. 19239.
George Blumenaur, Enid.
Henryetta Central Labor Union.
Dr. D. W. Hogan, Oklahoma City.
Oklahoma City Building Trades Council.
Operative Plasterers and Cement Finishers, Local No. 170.
Okmulgee Central Labor Union.
Central Labor Union, Ponca City.

OREGON ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

Oregon State Federation of Labor, Portland.
Astoria Central Labor Union.
Common Council of the City of Klamath Falls.
Marshfield Central Labor Council.
Portland Building Trades Council.
Central Labor Council, Portland.
Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union, Local No. 2532, Portland.
Portland Central Labor Union.

PENNSYLVANIA ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

Gov. George H. Earle.
Lt. Gov. Thomas Kennedy.
Pennsylvania Assembly—senate and house.
Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, Harrisburg.
State-wide American Federation of Hosiery Workers.
James L. McDevitt, Social Security Board, Harrisburg.
Blair County A. A. U. W., Altoona.
Blair County Central Labor Union, Altoona.
Central Conference of Central Labor Unions, Altoona.
Legislative Committee, B. C. C. L. U., Altoona.
Bangor Branch, No. 25, American Federation of Labor.
City Council, Bethlehem.
Mayor Robert Pfeifle.
International Hod Carriers' Building and Common Laborers Union of America, Locals 761 and 769, Bethlehem.
Casket Makers Union, No. 19072, Boyertown.
Trades Assembly, Bradford.
United Trades Council, Brownsville.
Dr. Susan M. Kingsbury, Bryn Mawr College.
Central Labor Union, Carbondale.
Delaware County Housing Committee and Tenants' Council, Chester.
Clearfield Central Labor Union.
Central Labor Union of Shenandoah.
City Council, Erie.
Central Labor Union, Erie.
Central Trades Council of Jeannette.
Armstrong County Central Labor Union.
Central Labor Union, Kittanning.
Central Labor Union, Lancaster.
United Mineworkers of America, Local 7226, Mahanoy City.
Barnesboro Central Labor Union.
North Cambria Central Labor Union.
Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, Local 1084, Meadville.
B. & W. Federal Labor Union, Local No. 20186, Nazareth.
Cement Workers' Union, No. 20308, Nazareth.
City Council, New Kensington.
Mayor S. Davis Wilson, Philadelphia.
American Federation of Teachers, No. 474, Philadelphia.
Central Labor Union of Philadelphia and Vicinity.
Association of Philadelphia Settlements.
John Edelman, Philadelphia.
Health Department, Council of Social Agencies, Philadelphia.
John B. Kelly, Philadelphia.
Eastern Regional Conference of Mayors, Philadelphia.
Federal Labor Union, No. 18887, Philadelphia.
International Association of Bridge, Structural, and Ornamental Iron Workers, Reinforced Rod Workers, No. 405, Philadelphia.
Alice F. Kiernan, Philadelphia.
Octavia Hill Association, Philadelphia.
Philadelphia Building Trades Council.
Philadelphia Chapter, American Association of Social Workers.
Philadelphia Housing Association.
Society for Ethical Culture of Philadelphia.
Tenants Organization of South Philadelphia.
United Association of Philadelphia Housing Groups.
City Council, Pittsburgh.
Mayor Cornelius D. Scully, Pittsburgh.
Bricklayers International Union No. 2, Pittsburgh.
Pittsburgh Central Labor Union.
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local No. 5, Pittsburgh.
Pittsburgh Council of Catholic Women.
Soho Improvement League, Pittsburgh.
United Slate, Tile, and Composition Roofers Damp and Waterproof Workers, No. 37.
Central Labor Union of Bucks County, Quakertown.
City Council, Reading.
Mayor J. Henry Stump, Reading.
American Federation of Hosiery Workers, Reading.
Reading Federated Labor Council.
United Mine Workers of America, No. 6561, Smithfield.
Uniontown Trades and Labor Council.
Wayne Advisory Housing Committee.
College Women's Club of Wilkes-Barre.
Wilkes-Barre Central Labor Union.
Mayor Harry B. Austine, York.
York Federation of Trades Unions.

RHODE ISLAND ENDORSEMENT OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

United Textile Workers of America, Providence.

SOUTH CAROLINA ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

South Carolina Federation of Labor.
Central Labor Union, Spartanburg.
Tillman Lodge, No. 649, Charlestown.

SOUTH DAKOTA ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

South Dakota Federation of Labor.
Aberdeen Central Labor Union.
United Carpenters and Joiners Local No. 783, Sioux Falls.

TENNESSEE ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

Tennessee Federation of Labor.
Bristol Central Labor Union.
Davidson County Anti-Tuberculosis Association.
Knoxville Central Labor Union.
Knoxville Housing Authority.
Nashville Building Trades Council.

TEXAS ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

Texas Federation of Labor.
City Commission, Amarillo.
Mayor Ross D. Rogers, Amarillo.
Beaumont Building Trades Council.
Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, Local 89, Denison.
Denison Labor Trades Council.
Mayor R. E. Sherman, El Paso.
Galveston Building Trades Council.

Painters Local Union 585, Galveston.
Houston Building Trades Council.
Houston Labor and Trades Council.
Lubbock Central Labor Union.
International Union of Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers of America, Local No. 23, Lubbock.
International Union Operating Engineers, Local No. 710, Port Arthur.
Board of directors, Bexar County Tuberculosis Association, San Antonio.
International Hod Carriers, Building and Common Labor Union of America No. 93, San Antonio.
League of United Latin American Citizens Council No. 16, San Antonio.
Pecan Shellers Union, San Antonio.
Rabbi Ephraim Frisch, San Antonio.
Mrs. Preston H. Dial, San Antonio.
Presidents Council, San Antonio (including more than 100 civic leaders).

UTAH ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

Utah Federation of Labor.
Federal Labor Union No. 19287, Logan.
Ogden Trades and Labor Council.
United Mine Workers of America, Local No. 6412, Royal.
Building Trades Council of Salt Lake City and vicinity.
Carbon County Central Labor Union.

VERMONT ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

Vermont Federation of Labor.
Central Labor Union, Barre.

VIRGINIA ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Norfolk.
Painters Local Union, No. 1100, Norfolk.
Petersburg-Hopewell Central Labor Union.
Tobacco Workers Union, Richmond.
International Association of Bridge, Structural, and Ornamental Iron Workers, No. 459, Roanoke.

WASHINGTON ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

Washington State Federation of Labor.
Twin City Central Labor Union, Centralia.
Engineers Local Union, No. 776, Kelso.
Longview-Kelso Central Labor Council.
Olympia Trades Council.
Pasco Kennewick Federal Labor Union, No. 19146.
City Council, Seattle.
Gas Workers' Union, Local No. 20222, Seattle.
Shelton Central Trades Council.
Spokane Building Trades Council.
City Council, Tacoma.
Mayor George A. Smitley, Tacoma.
Tacoma Central Labor Union.
Clark County Central Labor Council, Vancouver.
Central Labor Council, Yakima.
Grays Harbor County Central Union, Aberdeen.
Bellingham Building Trades Council.

WEST VIRGINIA ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

Central Labor Union, Clarksburg.
United Mine Workers of America, Local No. 7113, Longacre.
American Federation of Hosiery Workers, Local No. 92, Martinsburg.
Martinsburg Central Labor Union.
Central Labor Union of Fayette County, Montgomery.
Central Labor Union, Morgantown.
Parkersburg Central Trades and Labor Council.
Welch Central Labor Union.
Building Trades Council, Wheeling.
Central Labor Union, Williamson.

WISCONSIN ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

Wisconsin State Federation of Labor.
Appleton Central Body.
United Association of Journeymen Plumbers and Steamfitters, No. 385, Eau Claire.
Green Bay Building Trades Council.
Green Bay Federated Trades Council.
Federal Labor Union of American Brass Employees, No. 19322, Kenosha.
Kenosha Trades and Labor Council.
La Crosse Trades and Labor Council.
American Federation State, County, and Municipal Employees, Madison.
United Association of Journeymen Plumbers and Steamfitters of the United States and Canada, No. 167.
American Association of Social Workers, Milwaukee Chapter.
City Club of Milwaukee.
Coke and Gas Workers' Union, Local No. 18546.
Department of Outdoor Relief, Milwaukee.
Federated Trades Council of Milwaukee.
Mayor Daniel W. Hoan, Milwaukee.
International Union of Operating Engineers, No. 311, Milwaukee.
Milwaukee Building Trades Council, Wisconsin.
Milwaukee Consumers' Association.
Office Workers' Union, No. 16456, Milwaukee.
Wisconsin Chapter, American Institute of Architects.
Neenah Menasha Trades and Labor Council.
Oshkosh Trades and Labor Council.
Trades and Labor Council, Port Washington.
City Council, Racine.
Racine Building Trades Council.
Mayor William J. Swoboda, Racine.
City Council, Sheboygan.
Mayor of Sheboygan.
Central Workers' Auxiliary, Sheboygan.
Federal Labor Council, No. 18545, Sheboygan.
International Boot and Shoe Makers' Union, No. 197, Sheboygan.
Upholsterers' Union, No. 133, Sheboygan.
Workers' Alliance, Sheboygan.
Central Cooperative Wholesale, Superior.
Aluminum Workers' Union, No. 19649, Two Rivers.
Waukesha Trades and Labor Council.
Miss Laura Deitzel, American Association of Social Workers, West Allis.
Milwaukee Urban League.

WYOMING ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WAGNER-STEAGALL BILL

Wyoming State Federation of Labor.
City Council, Casper.
J. F. Cowan, mayor of Casper.
Casper Building Trades Council.

EVA MARKOWITZ—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BAILEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 358) for the relief of Eva Markowitz, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum "$2,500" to insert "$4,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum "$50" to insert "$90"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. W. BAILEY,
PRENTISS M. BROWN,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

AMBROSE J. KENNEDY,
ELMER J. RYAN,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

JOSEPH M. CLAGETT, JR.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BAILEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 730) for the relief of Joseph M. Clagett, Jr., having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 3.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figure "$1,000" contained in the Senate amendment insert "$1,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the language stricken out by the Senate amendment, and at the end thereof, on page 2, line 9, after the word "notwithstanding", insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That for the purpose of calculating the attorney fees allowed under this act the sum of $4,500 shall be taken as the maximum amount of the annuity under the provisions of this act."; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. W. BAILEY,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

AMBROSE J. KENNEDY,
ELMER J. RYAN,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

WALTER T. KARSHNER ET AL.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BAILEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1377) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Walter T. Karshner, Katherine Karshner, Anne M. Karshner, and Mrs. James E. McShane,

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:

On page 1, line 5, of the Senate engrossed amendment, in lieu of the sum "$157.95", insert "$600"; in line 6 of said engrossed amendment, in lieu of the sum "$29.50", insert "$80"; in line 6 of said engrossed amendment, in lieu of the sum "$153.51", insert "$600"; and in line 7 of said amendment, in lieu of the sum "$139.50", to insert "$300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill; and agree to the same.

J. W. BAILEY,
PRENTISS M. BROWN,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
AMBROSE J. KENNEDY,
ELMER J. RYAN,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

VENICE LA PRAD—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BAILEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1945) for the relief of Venice La Prad, 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 sum "$500" to insert "$750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. W. BAILEY,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
AMBROSE J. KENNEDY,
ELMER J. RYAN,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

MR. AND MRS. DAVID STOPPEL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BAILEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two House on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2562) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. David Stoppel, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

J. W. BAILEY,
M. M. LOGAN,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
AMBROSE J. KENNEDY,
ELMER J. RYAN,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

NOAH SPOONER—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BAILEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3634) for the relief of Noah Spooner, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

J. W. BAILEY,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
AMBROSE J. KENNEDY,
ELMER J. RYAN,
FRANK CARLSON,
Munagers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

CABINET GORGE PROJECT, COLUMBIA RIVER—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. POPE submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 114) to provide for studies and plans for the development of a hydroelectric power project at Cabinet Gorge, on the Clark Fork of the Columbia River, for irrigation pumping or other uses, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and concur therein.

J. P. POPE,
CARL A. HATCH,
ALVA B. ADAMS,
J. G. TOWNSEND, Jr.,
PAT MCCARRAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
COMPTON I. WHITE,
J. W. ROBINSON,
PAUL R. GREEVER,
B. W. GEARHART,
J. C. OLIVER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

REDEFINITION OF JURISDICTION OF SPECIAL MEXICAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State recommending the enactment of legislation for the purposes described therein.

The recommendations of the Secretary of State have my approval, and I request the enactment of legislation for the purposes indicated, in order that the difficulty that has arisen in relation to the jurisdiction of the Special Mexican Claims Commission may be overcome.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 28, 1937.*

[Enclosure: Report of the Secretary of State.]

DRAFT CONVENTIONS OF TWENTIETH SESSION OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

The Congress, by a joint resolution approved June 19, 1934, authorized me to accept membership for the Government of the United States in the International Labor Organization. Pursuant to that authorization, I accepted such membership on behalf of the Government of the United States.

Representatives of this Government and of American employers and American labor attended the twentieth session of the International Labor Conference, held at Geneva June 4 to 24, 1936.

That conference adopted three draft conventions and two recommendations, to wit:

The draft convention (no. 50) concerning the regulation of certain special systems of recruiting workers;

The recommendation (no. 46) concerning the progressive elimination of recruiting;

The draft convention (no. 51) concerning the reduction of hours of work on public works;

The draft convention (no. 52) concerning annual holidays with pay;

The recommendation (no. 47) concerning annual holidays with pay.

In becoming a member of the organization and subscribing to its constitution this Government accepted the following undertaking in regard to such draft conventions and recommendations:

Each of the members undertakes that it will, within the period of 1 year at most from the closing of the session of the conference, or if it is impossible owing to exceptional circumstances to do so within the period of 1 year, then at the earliest practicable moment and in no case later than 18 months from the closing of the

session of the conference, bring the recommendation or draft convention before the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies, for the enactment of legislation or other action. (Art. 19 (405), par. 5, Constitution of the International Labor Organization.)

In the case of a federal state, the power of which to enter into conventions on labor matters is subject to limitations, it shall be in the discretion of that government to treat a draft convention to which such limitations apply as a recommendation only, and the provisions of this article with respect to recommendations shall apply in such case. (Art. 19 (405), par. 9, Constitution of the International Labor Organization.)

In accordance with the foregoing undertaking the above-named three draft conventions and two recommendations are herewith submitted to the Congress with the accompanying report of the Secretary of State, and its enclosures, to which the attention of the Congress is invited.

I wish particularly to call to the attention of the Congress the draft convention (no. 51), concerning the reduction of hours of work on public works, and recommend that action be taken by the Congress on this draft convention at its earliest convenience.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 28, 1937.*

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF SUGAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith an international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar and an annexed protocol concerning transitional measures, signed at London on May 6, 1937, by the delegates of the United States of America and certain other countries, to an international conference held for the purpose of considering the problems of such regulation. The agreement and protocol were signed in respect of the Commonwealth of the Philippines by a delegate representing the Commonwealth in the United States delegation.

The instruments have my approval and I request the advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification of the agreement. The agreement is designed to come into force on September 1, 1937, and it is a matter of great practical importance that the Senate give consideration to it at the present session. After the action that the Senate may take on the agreement, action by the Philippine Assembly will be necessary to implement the commitments made thereunder by the Commonwealth before I shall be in a position to ratify the agreement.

The attention of the Senate is invited to the report of the delegate of the United States to the London Conference, which I transmit with the agreement.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 28, 1937.*

[Enclosures: Report of the Secretary of State; International Sugar Agreement; Report of the Delegate of the United States to the Sugar Conference at London.]

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the following nominations:

Frank L. Middleton, of Elko, Nev., to be United States marshal for the district of Nevada, vice Harry C. Gravelle, resigned; and

William A. Holzheimer, of Alaska, to be United States attorney, division no. 1, District of Alaska.

Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Ralph E. Jenney, of California, to be United States district judge for the southern district of California, to fill an existing vacancy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Louis LeBaron, of Hawaii, to be first judge, circuit court, First Circuit of Hawaii, vice Norman D. Godbold, Sr., deceased.

Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of John A. Carver, of Idaho, to be United States attorney for the district of Idaho.

Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of W. Joe Ballard, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the western district of Oklahoma, vice W. C. Geers, whose term expired June 13, 1937.

Mr. McGILL, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Thomas J. Morrissey, of Colorado, to be United States attorney for the district of Colorado.

Mr. HARRISON, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the following nominations:

Arthur A. Quinn, of New Jersey, to be comptroller of customs in customs collection district no. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y. (reappointment);

Passed Assistant Dental Surgeon Allen M. Perkins to be dental surgeon in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from May 29, 1937;

William B. George, of San Diego, Calif., to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 25, with headquarters at San Diego, Calif. (reappointment);

Charles O. Dunbar, of Santa Rosa, Calif., to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 28, with headquarters at San Francisco, Calif. (reappointment); and

Ernest L. Bailey, of West Virginia, to be State director, National Emergency Council, for West Virginia.

Mr. BLACK, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the nomination of Joseph H. Lyons, of Mobile, Ala., to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 19, with headquarters at Mobile, Ala. (Reappointment.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Riley E. Elgen, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission.

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

Mr. KING. Mr. President, we have just confirmed the nomination of Mr. Elgen to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia. His term expires in a couple of days. It is very important that there be no interregnum; and I ask that the President be notified of his confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Glenn William Moore, of South Dakota, to be aide (with relative rank of ensign in the Navy).

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Chisolm Tison, Jr., of South Carolina, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (with relative rank of lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy).

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clarence Robert Reed, of North Dakota, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (with relative rank of lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy).

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Kenneth Surrell Ulm, of Massachusetts, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (with relative rank of lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy).

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank Gerard Johnson, of Massachusetts, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer (with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy).

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

COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask that the nominations in the Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast Guard are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William A. Coates to be postmaster at Arlington, Va.

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

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry W. Witters to be State administrator in the Works Progress Administration for Vermont.

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

CONSIDERATION OF TREATIES

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I ask the attention of Senators for a moment.

A large number of treaties are on the Executive Calendar of the Senate. It is not expected that they shall be taken up this afternoon; but I shall make a motion to proceed to the consideration of the first treaty with a view to having it the unfinished business, so that the Senate may take up the treaties tomorrow.

I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive J, Seventy-first Congress, first session, being the first treaty on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agree to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider Executive J (75th Cong., 1st sess.), the treaty terminating article VIII of the treaty of December 30, 1853, signed by the Secretary of State and the Mexican Ambassador at Washington on April 13, 1937.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Arkansas if it is the purpose to consider the Argentine treaty tomorrow.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is intended probably to bring that treaty forward, among others.

RECESS

Mr. ROBINSON. I now move that, in executive session, the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, it being the intention at that time to give consideration to the various treaties that are on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 29, 1937, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 28 (legislative day of June 15), 1937

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Hugh R. Wilson, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Miss Margaret M. Hanna, of Kansas, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a consul, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Robert Fechner, of Massachusetts, to be Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

Fred G. Healy, of New Mexico, to be State administrator in the Works Progress Administration for New Mexico, vice Lea Rowland.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Maj. Leonard Henderson Sims, Infantry, with rank from October 1, 1935.

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

First Lt. Maddrey Allen Solomon, Infantry, with rank from June 13, 1936.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. William John Miehle, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1937.

Maj. Claude Wiggins Cummings, Medical Corps, from July 5, 1937.

Maj. Robert Henry Lowry, junior, Medical Corps, from July 7, 1937.

Maj. Richard King Cole, Medical Corps, from July 8, 1937.

Maj. William White Southard, Medical Corps, from July 10, 1937.

To be majors

Capt. Douglas Sheldon Kellogg, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1937.

Capt. Loren Donovan Moore, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1937.

Capt. Arthur Brinkley Welsh, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1937.

Capt. Eugene Wycoff Billick, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1937.

Capt. Earle Standlee, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1937.

Capt. Cecil Walker Dingman, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1937.

Capt. William Kraus, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1937.

Capt. Reuel Edward Hewitt, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1937.

Capt. Martin Eugene Griffin, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1937.

Capt. Mack Macon Green, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1937.

Capt. William Edward Shambora, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1937.

Capt. Charles Henderson Beasley, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1937.

Capt. Clifford Albert Best, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1937.

Capt. Alvin Levi Gorby, Medical Corps, from July 4, 1937.

Capt. George Ellis Armstrong, Medical Corps, from July 9, 1937.

To be captains

First Lt. Donald Meyers Ward, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1937.

First Lt. Angvald Vickoren, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1937.
First Lt. William Earl Barry, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1937.
First Lt. Emmert Carl Lentz, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1937.
First Lt. James Leslie Snyder, Medical Corps, from July 2, 1937.
First Lt. Raymond Richard Johanson, Medical Corps, from July 2, 1937.
First Lt. Thair Cozzens Rich, Medical Corps, from July 2, 1937.
First Lt. Frank Hugh Lane, Medical Corps, from July 2, 1937.
First Lt. Byron Glen McKibben, Medical Corps, from July 2, 1937.
First Lt. John DeWitt Morley, Medical Corps, from July 2, 1937.
First Lt. Frederic Ebelhare Cressman, Medical Corps, from July 2, 1937.
First Lt. Robert Tuthill Gants, Medical Corps, from July 2, 1937.
First Lt. Edward Beebe Payne, Medical Corps, from July 2, 1937.
First Lt. George Foster Peer, Medical Corps, from July 2, 1937.
First Lt. Harold Everus Harrison, Medical Corps, from July 2, 1937.
First Lt. Marshall Nelson Jensen, Medical Corps, from July 7, 1937.
First Lt. Stephen Christopher Sitter, Medical Corps, from July 9, 1937.

DENTAL CORPS

To be major

Capt. Mackey Joseph Real, Dental Corps, from July 1, 1937.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be captains

First Lt. William Edwin Jennings, Veterinary Corps, from July 2, 1937.
First Lt. Curtis William Betzold, Veterinary Corps, from July 2, 1937.

CHAPLAIN

To be chaplain with the rank of captain

Chaplain (First Lt.) John Simeon Kelly, United States Army, from July 6, 1937.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Second Lt. Carroll Thompson Newton, Corps of Engineers.
Second Lt. Donald Clinton Clayman, Infantry.
Second Lt. Joseph Warren Sisson, Jr., Infantry.
Second Lt. David Greene Hammond, Corps of Engineers.
Second Lt. Joseph Russel Groves, Infantry.
Second Lt. Robert Whitsett van de Velde, Field Artillery.
Second Lt. Arthur George Christensen, Infantry.
Second Lt. Harry Gantcliffe Benion, Infantry.
Second Lt. Arthur Howland Baker, Jr., Field Artillery.
Second Lt. Arthur Charles Harris, Jr., Infantry.
Second Lt. Linwood Eugene Funchess, Corps of Engineers.
Second Lt. Laurence Clifford Brown, Infantry.
Second Lt. Jesse Mechem, Infantry.
Second Lt. Walter Ward Davis, Infantry.
Second Lt. William Andrew Enemark, Field Artillery.
Second Lt. Merten Kenneth Heimstead, Infantry.
Second Lt. Thaddeus Ronsaville Dulin, Infantry.
Second Lt. Leon John de Penna Rouge, Infantry.
Second Lt. Gaylord Walton Fraser, Infantry.
Second Lt. William Sherbourne McCrea, Infantry.
Second Lt. Donald Frederick Thompson, Infantry.
Second Lt. John Gordon Nelson, Coast Artillery Corps.
Second Lt. Chester Martin Beaver, Infantry.
Second Lt. Edward Wallace McLain, Coast Artillery Corps.
Second Lt. John Unsworth Allen, Corps of Engineers.
Second Lt. Byron William Ladd, Infantry.
Second Lt. Lyman Hodges Ripley, Coast Artillery Corps.
Second Lt. Francis Carlton Truesdale, Infantry.
Second Lt. William Shepherd Humphries, Infantry.
Second Lt. Donald Washington, Infantry.
Second Lt. Charles Robert Etzler, Infantry.
Second Lt. Philip Cochran Tinley, Infantry.
Second Lt. Charles Murray Henley, Infantry.
Second Lt. John Brockway Rippere, Corps of Engineers.
Second Lt. Steve Archie Chappuis, Infantry.
Second Lt. Elmer Bolton Kennedy, Field Artillery.
Second Lt. James Jackson Stewart, Jr., Infantry.
Second Lt. Thomas Brownbridge Simpson, Corps of Engineers.
Second Lt. Paul Thomas Boleyn, Infantry.
Second Lt. Frederick William Nagle, Infantry.
Second Lt. Otho Anthony Moomaw, Coast Artillery Corps.
Second Lt. Jabus Willie Rawls, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
Second Lt. Andrew Buehler Zwaska, Infantry.
Second Lt. Jack Leslie Coan, Corps of Engineers.
Second Lt. Edward Francis Kent, Infantry.
Second Lt. George William Croker, Coast Artillery Corps.
Second Lt. Willard Wright Lazarus, Air Corps.
Second Lt. William Hart Hanson, Infantry.
Second Lt. John Willis Paddock, Infantry.
Second Lt. Joe Stallings Lawrie, Infantry.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

GENERAL OFFICER

Brig. Gen. Charles Blaine Smathers, Pennsylvania National Guard, to be brigadier general, National Guard of the United States.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Commander Olaf M. Hustvedt to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of June 1937.

Commander Harold C. Train to be a captain in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1937.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Laurance F. Safford, February 1, 1937.
Paul R. Glutting, March 1, 1937.
Alexander D. Douglas, June 3, 1937.
Theodore M. Waldschmidt, June 3, 1937.

Lt. Joseph A. Connolly to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 8th day of May 1937.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1937:

Alfred M. Granum
Joel Newsom
Harold A. Carlisle

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Lloyd J. S. Aitkens, June 30, 1936.
Ernest R. Perry, June 30, 1936.
Harry M. Denty, July 1, 1936.
John E. Burke, April 1, 1937.
Stephen N. Tackney, June 1, 1937.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1937:

George K. Huff	Gerald L. Huff
William D. Thomas	William L. Kabler
Samuel C. Anderson	Clayton C. Marcy
Frank M. Adamson	Roy S. Benson

Ensign Julian S. Hatcher, Jr., to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of June 1936.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 29th day of May 1937:

Carl R. Tellefsen	Eugene B. Hayden
Albert G. Pelling	Christopher S. Barker, Jr.
Harold J. Von Weller	Paul D. Duke
Jesse B. Burks	Robert A. Dawes, Jr.
Theodore H. Brittan	Harry S. Atherton

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 31st day of May 1937:

Harley K. Nauman	Curtis H. Hutchings
Brown Taylor	Wilbur H. Cheney, Jr.
Cedric W. Stirling	Robert E. Wheeler
Albert L. Becker	William N. Deragon
Eugene C. Rider	Robert A. Chandler
Ernest E. Christensen	Robert B. Crowell
George E. T. Parsons	Raymond Payne
Harry L. Thompson, Jr.	Edward J. Mulquin
Allyn Cole, Jr.	Francis E. Fleck, Jr.
Lowell S. Price	Thomas W. South, 2d
George M. Clifford	James E. Vose, Jr.
Edgar J. Hailey	John L. Foster
Richard H. O'Kane	Russell B. Allen

The following-named surgeons to be medical inspectors in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 30th day of June 1936:

William D. Davis
Hardy V. Hughens
Henry Charles Weber

The following-named surgeons to be medical inspectors in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 3d day of June 1937:

Roger D. Mackey	Maurice S. Mathis
Paul P. Maher	William W. Hall

Frederick W. Muller

The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 3d day of June 1937:

Clark G. Grazier
Adrian J. Delaney
James A. Price

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 28 (legislative day of June 15), 1937

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS, UNCLASSIFIED, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

W. Stratton Anderson, Jr.	Gordon H. Mattison
William Barnes, 3d	Roy M. Melbourne
Aaron S. Brown	John F. Melby
Harlan B. Clark	Herbert V. Olds
William E. Cole, Jr.	Elim O'Shaughnessy
J. Dixon Edwards	Paul Paddock
Herbert P. Fales	Henry V. Poor
Jule L. Goetzmann	G. Frederick Reinhardt
Edmund A. Gullion	Milton C. Rewinkel
Kingsley W. Hamilton	Walter Smith
Fred Harvey Harrington	Charles W. Thayer
Francis C. Jordan	Ray L. Thurston
G. Wallace LaRue	Evan M. Wilson
Perry Laukhuff	Glen W. Bruner

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Riley E. Elgen to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission.

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

Harry W. Witters to be State administrator in the Works Progress Administration for Vermont.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Glenn William Moore to be aide (with relative rank of ensign in the Navy).

James Chisolm Tison, Jr., to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (with relative rank of lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy).

Clarence Robert Reed to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (with relative rank of lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy).

Kenneth Surrell Ulm to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (with relative rank of lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy).

Frank Gerard Johnson to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer (with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy).

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Whitney M. Prall to be captain (engineering).

Rutherford B. Lank, Jr. to be constructor, with the rank of lieutenant commander.

Dale R. Simonson to be constructor, with the rank of lieutenant commander.

POSTMASTER

VIRGINIA

William A. Coates, Arlington.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 28, 1937

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. E. J. Connelly, pastor of St. Peter's Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

We pray Thee, O God of might, wisdom, and justice, through whom authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted, and judgment decreed, assist with Thy Holy Spirit of counsel and fortitude this House of Representatives of the United States of America.

Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct the deliberations of this honorable legislative body and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government so that they may tend to the preservation of peace, the promotion of national happiness, the increase of industry, sobriety, and useful knowledge, and may perpetuate to us the blessings of equal liberty. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 24, 1937, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 9, 1937:

H. R. 3874. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge and causeway across the water between the mainland at or near Cedar Point and Dauphin Island, Ala.;

H. R. 4706. An act authorizing the State Roads Commission of the State of Maryland and the State Highway Department of the State of Virginia to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Potomac River at or near a point in the vicinity of Point of Rocks in Frederick County and a point near the south end of Loudoun County to take the place of a bridge destroyed by flood in 1936;

H. R. 4801. An act authorizing the county of Wahkiakum, a legal political subdivision of the State of Washington, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Columbia River between Puget Island and the mainland, Cathlamet, State of Washington;

H. R. 5467. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River between St. Louis, Mo., and Stites, Ill.;

H. R. 1232. An act for the relief of John W. Bolin; and

H. R. 6293. An act to adjust the rank of certain Coast Guard officers on the retired list.

On June 10, 1937:

H. R. 5206. An act for the relief of Jacob G. Ackerman;

H. R. 1304. An act for the relief of John E. Sandage;

H. R. 2554. An act for the relief of Frank Cubero; and

H. R. 4809. An act to authorize the Works Progress Administration to land or give World War relics and other property at Fort Eustis, Va., to the American Legion Museum at Newport News, Va.

On June 11, 1937:

H. J. Res. 334. Joint resolution to protect the copyrights and patents of foreign exhibitors at the New York World's Fair, to be held at New York City, N. Y., in 1939;

H. R. 1759. An act for the relief of Minnie D. Hines;

H. R. 3963. An act for the relief of John Zarnick;

H. R. 856. An act for the relief of First Lt. R. G. Cuno;

H. R. 2360. An act for the relief of Carter R. Young;

H. R. 2673. An act for the relief of Howard Hefner;

H. R. 3841. An act for the relief of Col. J. P. Barney; and

H. R. 5136. An act to authorize the acquisition of land for cemeterial purposes in the vicinity of San Francisco, Calif.

On June 14, 1937:

H. J. Res. 350. Joint resolution authorizing a modification in the existing project for the improvement of the Illinois Waterway, Ill., and the abandonment of a portion of the Calumet River;

H. R. 1502. An act to amend Public Law No. 626, Seventy-fourth Congress;

H. R. 1792. An act for the relief of John Kelley;

H. R. 3736. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward J. Pruett;

H. R. 4457. An act for the relief of Naomi Lee Young; and

H. R. 4508. An act for the relief of Margaret Grace and Alice Shriner.

On June 15, 1937:

H. R. 1013. An act for the relief of Irvin Pendleton;

H. R. 545. An act for the relief of Dean Scott;

H. R. 1084. An act for the relief of Samuel Cripps;

H. R. 2042. An act for the relief of Joshua L. Bach;

H. R. 3031. An act to provide for the establishment of Coast Guard stations along the Maine coast;

H. R. 3738. An act for the relief of Clifford Y. Long;

H. R. 3411. An act to amend section 112 of the Judicial Code to provide for the inclusion of Whitman County, Wash., in the northern division of the eastern district of Washington; and

H. R. 4893. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a Coast Guard air station at the San Francisco Airport, to provide for quick rescue facilities on the San Francisco Bay, to strengthen the Immigration and Customs Service patrol, and for other purposes.

On June 16, 1937:

H. R. 5779. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6438. An act to expedite the dispatch of vessels from certain ports of call.

On June 18, 1937:

H. J. Res. 335. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point Olmedo Alfaro, a citizen of Ecuador.

On June 19, 1937:

H. J. Res. 339. Joint resolution granting permission to George E. Ijams, civilian employee of the Veterans' Administration, to accept and wear the decoration bestowed upon him by the Republic of France;

H. R. 2080. An act for the relief of Eleanora S. Richardson;

H. R. 2223. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter B. Johnson and Joy Johnson, a minor;

H. R. 2705. An act to provide for the manner of inflicting the punishment of death;

H. R. 4213. An act to amend the Inland Waterways Corporation Act, approved June 3, 1924, as amended, authorizing the Secretary of War to extend the services and operations of the Inland Waterways Corporation to the Savannah River; and

H. R. 5721. An act to amend the Federal Register Act.

On June 22, 1937:

H. R. 1277. An act for the relief of William Hayes;

H. R. 2924. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war, catastrophes of nature, and other causes; and

H. R. 3203. An act for the relief of Rosalie Rose.

On June 23, 1937:

H. R. 2887. An act to amend the provisions of the pension laws for peacetime service to include Reserve officers and members of the Enlisted Reserves.

On June 24, 1937:

H. R. 3557. An act for the relief of the Coast Fir & Cedar Products Co., Inc.;

H. R. 4575. An act for the relief of A. R. Netterville, Sr.;

H. R. 5880. An act to amend Private Act No. 210, approved August 13, 1935, by substituting as payee therein the Clark Dredging Co. in lieu of the Bowers Southern Dredging Co.; and

H. R. 7519. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a retirement system for employees of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes", approved August 29, 1935.

On June 28, 1937:

H. R. 6551. An act to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. R. 7206. An act to permit the temporary entry into the United States under certain conditions of alien participants and officials of the World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts Silver Jubilee Camp to be held in the United States in 1937; and

H. J. Res. 375. Joint resolution to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5394. An act to provide for the acquisition of certain lands for, and the addition thereof to, the Yosemite National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes.

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

S. 2661. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Maine and New Hampshire for the creation of the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority;

S. 2662. An act authorizing the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Piscataqua River at or near Portsmouth, State of New Hampshire;

S. 2681. An act to authorize the construction of the Colorado-Big Thompson project as a Federal reclamation project; and

S. J. Res. 164. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution establishing the George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission, approved May 23, 1928, as amended.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL MANAGER ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to appoint an additional manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 6692) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the Chair appoint an additional manager on the part of the House on the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 6692).

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] as the additional member of the conference committee, and the Clerk will notify the Senate thereof.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address I delivered on yesterday.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BIGELOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative business, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes following the previous orders heretofore entered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, one of the most shocking incidents that has taken place in some time is the suggestion of the Secretary of Labor to the Governor of Ohio that he use the subpena power of the State to put certain steel industry officials under duress and to close their plants by the State militia and maintain that status until the C. I. O. had extracted from them such contracts as it might desire.

If such an urge had come from any other member of the Cabinet or from any other responsible official of the Government, there would be a dozen resolutions offered here this morning asking for immediate investigation.

While we did not need this statement to know that the Secretary approves of the use of violence under some circumstances, we were not prepared to expect the advocacy of duress and extortion from one standing so high in the service of the Government.

Is it to be understood, Mr. Speaker, that this is an open declaration of war on the constitutional rights of the citizen? Is the Government to join hands with certain lawless labor groups in not only seizing the property of the employer but the person of the employer as well, and holding both until the employer surrenders all rights in having anything to do with the management of his own property? Whence come such doctrines as these? Are they not entirely foreign to our American way of doing things?

Mr. Speaker, this is no time for the suspension of public laws, but it is a time for rigid enforcement if this Government is to survive. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5996) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1938, and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5996) 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, 1938, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 12, 16, 19, 20, 32, 33, 38, 40, 42, 43, 47, 48, 49, 53, 58, 61, 63, 65, 83, 84, 85, 86, 97, 100, 103, 109, 110, 115, 118, 121, 122, 123, 130, 135, 137, 138, 139, 142, and 150.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 36, 37, 39, 41, 44, 46, 50, 51, 52, 57, 59, 60, 64, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 79, 88, 89, 91, 93, 94, 98, 101, 104, 106, 111, 116, 117, 120, 124, 125, 126, 128, 136, 140, 143, 144, 145, 147, and 148, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$221,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$98,060"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$110,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "$403,730"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$180,260"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$22,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amedment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$396,975"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Not exceeding $17,500 for the purchase of land for elementary school purposes in the vicinity of First and Pierce Streets Northwest;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$242,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "the area bounded by Seventh Street on the west and K Street on the south in Southwest Washington"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$442,640"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$29,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The unexpended balance of the appropriation of $100,000 contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1937 for the construction, repair, improvement, and extension of buildings at the National Training School for Girls, in accordance with plans to be approved by the Municipal Architect and the Commissioners; and for additional personnel and maintenance at that institution is hereby continued available during the fiscal year 1938."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$37,760"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 108: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$38,260"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 129: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$54,540"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 131: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "$900,000: *Provided*, That appropriations contained in this

Act for highways, sewers, city refuse, and the water department shall be available for snow removal when specifically and in writing ordered by the Commissioners"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 146: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 146, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$367,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 149: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 149, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "In line 8 of the matter restored strike out '$2,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$2,600' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 9, 21, 22, 23, 34, 35, 55, 56, 76, 78, 87, 90, 92, 95, 96, 112, 113, 114, 119, 132, 133, 134, 141, and 151.

ROSS A. COLLINS,
MILLARD F. CALDWELL,
JOE STARNES,
Managers on the part of the House.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARTER GLASS,
ROYAL S. COPELAND,
WILLIAM H. KING,
GERALD P. NYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5996) 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, 1938, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

On amendment no. 1: Appropriates $121,360, as proposed by the House, instead of $122,860, as proposed by the Senate, for personal services in the building inspection division.

On amendments nos. 2 and 3: Appropriates a total of $43,460, as proposed by the House, instead of $43,960, as proposed by the Senate, for personal services in the plumbing inspection division.

On amendment no. 4: Appropriates $20,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $20,000, as proposed by the House, for smoke and boiler regulation.

On amendment no. 5: Appropriates $96,700, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $99,526, as proposed by the House, for personal services in connection with the care of buildings occupied by the District government.

On amendment no. 6: Appropriates $30,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $37,350, as proposed by the House, for fuel, light, power, etc., in connection with the operation and maintenance of certain buildings occupied by the District government.

On amendment no. 7: Appropriates $221,000 for personal services in the assessor's office, instead of $209,920, as proposed by the House, and $223,500, as proposed by the Senate, $10,080 being provided for the license bureau and an increase of $1,000 above the amount of the bill as originally passed by the House being provided to meet a shortage in the pay roll of this office.

On amendment no. 8: Appropriates $47,900, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $47,020, as proposed by the House, for personal services in the collector's office.

On amendment no. 10: Appropriates $98,060 for the office of the corporation counsel, instead of $113,360, as proposed by the House, and $102,580, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 11: Eliminates, as proposed by the Senate, language inserted by the House fixing the salaries of two inspectors in the field at $2,300 each.

On amendment no. 12: Appropriates $10,600, as proposed by the House, instead of $12,040, as proposed by the Senate, for personal services in the coroner's office.

On amendment no. 13: Appropriates $53,800, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $63,880, as proposed by the House for the office of weights, measures, and markets, the reduction of $10,080 in the bill as passed by the House being accounted for by the transfer of that sum to the assessor's office as provided under amendment no. 7.

On amendment no. 14: Eliminates the word "temporary" as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 15: Appropriates $57,980, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $56,980, as proposed by the House, for personal service in the municipal architect's office.

On amendments nos. 16 and 17: Appropriates $61,500, as proposed by the House, instead of $69,000, as proposed by the Senate, for personal services for the Public Utilities Commission; and appropriates $1,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,000, as proposed by the House, for incidental necessary expenses of the Commission.

On amendment no. 18: Eliminates the House provision authorizing the Public Utilities Commission to make an investigation of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. with a view to ascertaining the reasonableness of existing rates, tolls, charges, and services, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 19: Appropriates $29,220, and provides $4,600 for a fire-insurance rate expert, as proposed by the House, instead of an appropriation of $24,980, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 20; Appropriates $79,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $80,000, as proposed by the Senate, for personal services in the Surveyor's Office.

On amendments nos. 24, 25, 26, and 27, relating to the Department of Vehicles and Traffic: Appropriates $82,440, for personal services, $93,000, for purchase, installation, and modification of electric traffic lights, etc., and $20,000 for the purchase of motor-vehicle identification number plates, as proposed by the Senate in each instance.

On amendment no. 28: Appropriates $74,940, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $73,500, as proposed by the House, for personal services for the Register of Wills.

On amendments nos. 29, 30, and 31, relating to the office of the recorder of deeds: Appropriates $110,000 for personal services, instead of $106,020, as proposed by the House, and $114,580, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $12,500 for contingent expenses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $10,000, as proposed by the House; and appropriates $14,000 for rent of offices of the recorder, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $12,600, as proposed by the House.

On amendments nos. 32 and 33: Appropriates $29,050, as proposed by the House, instead of $29,550, as proposed by the Senate, and eliminates $500 for law books for the office of the corporation counsel, as proposed by the House.

On amendment no. 36: Appropriates $10,296 for allowances for privately owned motor vehicles used in the performance of official duties, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 37: Authorizes the use of $8,900 for transportation of employees on official business, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $10,400, as proposed by the House.

On amendments nos. 38, 39, 40, and 41, relating to the sewer department: Appropriates $180,030, as proposed by the House, instead of $183,000, as proposed by the Senate, for personal services; appropriates $245,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $235,000, as proposed by the House, for cleaning and repairing sewers; appropriates $150,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $175,000, as proposed by the Senate, for suburban sewers; and appropriates $160,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $150,000, as proposed by the House, for operation and maintenance of the sewage-treatment plant.

On amendments nos. 42, 43, 44, 45, and 46, relating to the collection and disposal of refuse: Appropriates $130,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $134,000, as proposed by the Senate, for personal services; eliminates language providing for snow and ice removal from the streets and sidewalks and a related proviso authorizing the use of various funds therefor, as proposed by the House; eliminates $5,620 for the purchase of one street flusher, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates a total of $403,730, instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House and $409,350 as proposed by the Senate, for dust prevention and cleaning of streets; and appropriates $850,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $825,000, as proposed by the House, for the collection and disposal of garbage.

On amendments nos. 47, 48, and 49, relating to appropriations for trees and parkings: Eliminates $26,600 for personal services and $100,000 for contingent expenses, funds therefor being provided under amendments nos. 138 and 139, as proposed by the House.

On amendments nos. 50, 51, and 52, relating to public playgrounds: Appropriates $127,780, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $75,015, as proposed by the House, for personal services; provides $40,800 for general maintenance, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $25,700, as proposed by the House; and appropriates $29,700 for keeping open during the summer months public-school playgrounds, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 53: Appropriates $683,800 for administrative and supervisory officers in the public schools, as proposed by the House, instead of $687,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 54: Appropriates $180,260 for clerks and other employees of the public schools, instead of $175,940, as proposed by the House, and $190,240, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 57: Eliminates the proviso contained in the House bill prohibiting the performance of clerical work other than that necessary to the regular classroom-teaching assignment, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 58: Restores the provision contained in the House bill and eliminated by the Senate regarding the salaries paid librarians in the public schools.

On amendment no. 59: Appropriates $102,180, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $94,180, as proposed by the House, for night schools.

On amendment no. 60: Appropriates $102,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the community center department of the public schools and inserts the language contained in the Senate amendment, instead of $216,565, as proposed by the House.

On amendment no. 61: Appropriates $942,705, as proposed by the House, instead of $949,430, as proposed by the Senate, for personal services in connection with the care of buildings and grounds.

On amendments nos. 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71, relating to miscellaneous items under the public schools: Appropriates $22,500 for transportation of tubercular, crippled, and sight-conservation pupils, instead of $20,000, as proposed by the House, and $25,000, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out $2,000,

inserted by the Senate, for the transportation of pupils in Bradbury Heights; appropriates $64,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $60,000, as proposed by the House, for manual- and vocational-training equipment; appropriates $10,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $14,800, as proposed by the Senate, for furniture for the Phelps vocational school and appropriates a total of $140,000 for contingent expenses, instead of $133,500, as proposed by the House, and $150,600, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $16,400 for apparatus for laboratories in the high, junior high, vocational schools, and teachers' colleges, instead of $15,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $2,400, as proposed by the Senate, for school gardens; appropriates $396,975 for repairs and improvements to school buildings and grounds, instead of $379,000, as proposed by the House, and $414,475, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of $17,975 over the original amount proposed by the House being provided for the replacement of heating plants at the Amidon and Pierce Schools and $975 for the purchase of one motor truck; and appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, $7,000 for equipment of school yards.

On amendments nos. 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 79, 80, 81, and 82, relating to school buildings and grounds: Appropriates $300,000 for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Junior High School and Library, and provides $16,800 for plans and specifications, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $350,000, and provides $28,300 for plans and specifications, as proposed by the Senate; eliminates, as proposed by the Senate, the provision of the House appropriating $8,000 for two portable school buildings in Bradbury Heights; provides for the purchase of land adjoining the site of the old Dennison School; provides not exceeding $17,500 for the purchase of land for school purposes in the vicinity of First and Pierce Streets NW., as proposed by the Senate; and restricts to the area bounded by Seventh Street on the west and K Street on the south, on which the proposed Jefferson Junior High School may be constructed, instead of the restrictions proposed in this connection by the House and the Senate.

On amendments 83, 84, and 85, relating to the Metropolitan Police: Appropriates $3,386,730, as proposed by the House, instead of $3,387,450, as proposed by the Senate; eliminates the language proposed by the Senate authorizing the purchase of horses; and appropriates $68,375, as proposed by the House, instead of $73,175, as proposed by the Senate, for contingent expenses, in denying funds for the purchase and maintenance of horses.

On amendment no. 86: Appropriates $2,211,900, as proposed by the House, instead of $2,225,000, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries, fire department.

On amendments nos. 88 and 89, relating to the tuberculosis sanatoria: Appropriates $325,440, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $304,963, as proposed by the House, for personal services; and appropriates $203,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $177,000, as proposed by the House for supplies, maintenance, etc.

On amendment no. 91: Appropriates $270,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $250,000, as proposed by the House, for maintenance of Gallinger Municipal Hospital.

On amendments nos. 93 and 94, relating to the police court: Appropriates $114,530, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $107,030, as proposed by the House, for personal services; and appropriates $11,600, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,250, as proposed by the House, for supplies, maintenance, etc.

On amendment no. 97: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate that certain percentages of the cost of operation of the district court and the court of appeals shall be paid by the Federal Government.

On amendment no. 98: Appropriates $38,000 for operation of the receiving home, as proposed by the Senate, instead of providing $12,000 for the operation of boarding homes, as proposed by the House.

Amendments nos. 99, 100, 101, and 102 relating to the Workhouse and Reformatory: Appropriates $442,640 for personal services instead of $422,300, as proposed by the House, and $462,980, as proposed by the Senate; restores the language of the House providing for the purchase of one motorbus instead of the language proposed by the Senate; inserts the language proposed by the Senate for the purchase of uniforms and caps for guards; appropriates $437,500 for maintenance and support of inmates, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $414,300, as proposed by the House; and appropriates $29,000 for the replacement of defective wiring, instead of $37,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments nos. 103, 104, and 105, relating to the National Training School for Girls: Appropriates $31,500, as proposed by the House, instead of $33,500, as proposed by the Senate, for personal services; appropriates $30,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $27,500, as proposed by the House, for maintenance; and inserts the proposal of the Senate continuing an unexpended balance for construction, etc.

On amendment no. 106: Appropriates $104,270, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $99,270, as proposed by the House, for personal services at the District training school.

On amendments nos. 107, 108, and 109, relating to the Industrial Home School for Colored Children: Appropriates $38,260 for personal services, instead of $40,300 as proposed by the Senate and $36,470 as proposed by the House; and appropriates $25,500, as proposed by the House, for maintenance, instead of $30,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 110: Appropriates $1,411,500, with a limitation of 10 percent on the amount of funds available for personal services, in connection with public assistance, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,465,000, with a limitation of $200,000 for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 111: Corrects the title of the Needy Blind Act, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 115, 116, and 117, relating to public parks: Appropriates $351,910 for personal services, National Capital Parks, as proposed by the House, instead of $354,490, as proposed by the Senate; removes the limitation on the amount available for placing and maintaining the parks in condition for outdoor sports, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates $382,500 for maintenance of parks, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $373,500, as proposed by the House.

On amendment no. 118: Appropriates $175,470, as proposed by the House, instead of $179,270, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries of Park Police.

On amendments nos. 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, and 142, relating to appropriations from the gasoline-tax fund: Appropriates $251,000 for personal services, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $243,280, as proposed by the House; provides for "per diem services" from miscellaneous street appropriations, as proposed by the House, instead of "personal services", as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $126,600 for trees and parkings, and $150,000 for assessment and permit work under the permit system; as proposed by the House, inserts $24,200 for the paving of Western Avenue, and $6,000 for the paving of Elder Street, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $200,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $175,000, as proposed by the House, for the construction of curbs and gutters; appropriates $450,000 for the surfacing and resurfacing of pavements, instead of $400,000, as proposed by the House and $475,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $54,540, for the construction and maintenance of bridges; restores the language inserted by the House and eliminated by the Senate, providing for snow and ice removal and, in the same paragraph, appropriates $900,000 for the repair of streets, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $800,000, as proposed by the House; strikes out the item inserted by the Senate appropriating $325,000 for beginning construction of the Pennsylvania Avenue Bridge; provides that appropriations for the purchase of land for widening streets, etc., shall remain available until June 30, 1939; and eliminates the appropriation for the purchase and installation of traffic lights, which has been provided for under amendment no. 26.

On amendments nos. 143, 144, 145, 146, and 147, relating to the water department: Appropriates $540,000 for the Washington aqueduct, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $470,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $367,800, for maintenance of the water department distribution system, instead of $366,000, as proposed by the House and $372,300, as proposed by the Senate; and authorizes the Treasurer of the United States to invest certain funds of the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 148: Eliminates the provision of the House requiring that per-diem employees be paid only for time actually worked, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 149: Restores the provision of the House prohibiting the reallocation of the positions of employees and raises the limitations of $2,000 fixed in the House bill to $2,600.

On amendment no. 150: Restores the limitation on the issuance of congressional tags as provided in the House bill.

The committee of conference report in disagreement the following amendments of the Senate:

On amendment no. 9: Relating to the appropriation for the auditor's office.

On amendments nos. 21, 22, and 23: Relating to appropriations for the Minimum Wage Board.

On amendments nos. 34 and 35: Relating to advertising in newspapers.

On amendments nos. 55 and 56: Relating to health and physical education teachers and the appropriation for teachers and librarians in the public schools.

On amendments nos. 76 and 78: Relating to the appropriation for the Banneker Junior High School.

On amendment no. 87: Relating to the transfer of certain hospitals to the Health Department.

On amendment no. 90: Relating to the appropriation for personal services, Gallinger Municipal Hospital.

On amendment no. 92: Relating to the appropriation for construction of a health center.

On amendments nos. 95 and 96: Relating to the appointment of a marshal for the Court of Appeals.

On amendment no. 112: Relating to the appropriation for the Columbia Polytechnic Institute.

On amendments nos. 113 and 114: Relating to the appropriation for the relief of the poor.

On amendment no. 119: Authorizing the purchase of supplies and services by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission without advertising when such purchase does not exceed $50.

On amendment no. 132: Relating to the purchase of a municipal asphalt plant.

On amendments nos. 133 and 134: Relating to the replacement of Chain Bridge.

On amendment no. 141: Correcting a total.

On amendment no. 151: Authorizing that credit be allowed in the accounts of the District of Columbia for certain disbursements made from the appropriation "Refund of erroneously paid taxes, District of Columbia."

ROSS A. COLLINS,
MILLARD F. CALDWELL,
JOE STARNES,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

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

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. RICH. What is the total amount of this bill to date, after the report of the conferees?

Mr. COLLINS. The amount of the bill as agreed to by the conferees is $45,915,641, which is $680,000 below the Budget.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman realizes that is about $700,000 more than the bill carried when it passed the House.

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; about $700,000.

Mr. RICH. As the bill passed the House it was $45,228,224, and if it carries $45,915,641 now, it shows an increase of about $700,000.

Mr. COLLINS. The Senate increased it $1,513,000, and the House decreased the Senate figures by $689,000.

Mr. RICH. The fact of the matter is that it is an increase over what it was when the bill left the House.

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; it is about a 50-50 division.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States says that we are going to economize on the 1938 Budget. I call the attention of the gentleman and Members of the House to what the status of the Treasury is now and to the appropriations for 1938, to show that they are in excess of what they were for 1937. The receipts up to June 23 this year have been $5,192,836,572, while the expenditures have been $7,967,861,267. Up to June 23 of this year you have spent $2,775,024,694 more than you have received as per Treasury statement. This does not take into effect the revolving funds spent this year not accounted for in the Treasury statement amounting to over $998,000,000, which makes the deficit on the year of over $3,770,000,000. Your appropriations for 1938 are in excess of your appropriations for 1937. If you talk about trying to economize, and if you figure you are going to get a balanced Budget, you are never going to get them and do the things you are now doing.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the Members want to hear this.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman refuses to yield further.

Mr. RICH. The House ought to get this information; they need it, and they do not like to hear it because it makes them feel bad; would that they would take it to heart. Where will they get the money?

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi to agree to the conference report.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 8, strike out "$136,700, of which $10,000 shall be available immediately for examination of estimates of appropriations, and for other purposes."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COLLINS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "$131,700, of which $5,000 shall be available without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and civil-service requirements for examination of estimates of appropriations and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 21: Page 8, line 21, insert "Minimum Wage Board."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COLLINS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 21, and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 22: Page 8, after line 21, insert: "For personal services in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, $12,170."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COLLINS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"For personal services, including not to exceed $2,500 for the secretary of the Board, $8,040."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

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

Mr. COLLINS. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Is this an increase in salary for some official of the Government?

Mr. COLLINS. No; the Senate proposed certain salaries in the Minimum Wage Board, including a clerk and stenographer and secretary, and so on. The House conferees insisted that the figures were too high, and they were reduced by about one-half.

Mr. RICH. Did the conferees on the part of the House agree to all proposals that the gentleman is submitting here?

Mr. COLLINS. Every proposal incorporated in this report is the unanimous report of the Senate and House conferees.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 23: Page 8, after line 23, insert: "For contingent and miscellaneous expenses, including purchase of equipment, printing and binding, office equipment, telephone rental, postage, and other necessary items, $2,150."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment no. 23 and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COLLINS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 23 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"For equipment, transportation, and other necessary expenses, $575."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 34: Page 13, line 14, insert: "*Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for the payment of advertising in newspapers published outside of the District of Columbia, notwithstanding the requirement for such advertising provided by existing law."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 34: Page 13, after line 22, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for the payment of advertising the delinquent tax list for more than once a week for 2 weeks in the regular issue of one

morning or one evening newspaper published in the District of Columbia, notwithstanding the provisions of existing law."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 55: Page 25, after the word "twelve", in line 24, insert "and including $10,000 for health and physical education teachers to supervise play in schools of the central area, bounded by North Capitol Street on the east, Florida Avenue on the north, the Mall on the south, and Twelfth Street on the west."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 56: Page 26, line 5, strike out "$7,157,820" and insert "$7,223,220."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 56, and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COLLINS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment no. 56 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$7,165,820."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 76: Page 36, after line 15, insert the following:

"For the erection of a junior high school building on a portion of the site of the existing Banneker Playground, $200,000, of which sum $15,217 shall be available for the preparation of plans, specifications, and administration, and the Commissioners are authorized to enter into contract or contracts for such building at a cost not to exceed $724,650."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 78: Page 37, line 5, strike out "$1,548,000" and insert "$1,540,000."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 87: Page 48, line 13, after the word "sanatoria", insert the following: "which, on and after July 1, 1937, shall be under the direction and control of the health department of the District of Columbia and subject to the supervision of the Board of Commissioners."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 90: Page 49, line 5, strike out "$423,380" and insert "$455,560."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment no. 90 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$468,560, of which $13,000 shall be available for out-patient relief of the poor, including medical and surgical supplies, artificial limbs, and pay of physicians."

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COLLINS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 90 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by such amendment insert the following: "$468,560, of which $13,000 shall be available for out-patient relief of the poor, including medical and surgical supplies, artificial limbs, and pay of physicians."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 92: Page 50, after line 7, strike out all of lines 8 to 14, inclusive, and insert the following:

"Health center: For the construction on the site of the Jones Elementary School, at First and L Streets NW., of a building for a health center, including necessary fixed equipment therefor, $165,000, of which sum $7,000 shall be available for preparation of plans and specifications, administration, and inspection, including the employment of personal services without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 92 and concur in the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COLLINS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 92 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"Health center: For the construction on the site of the Jones Elementary School, at First and L Streets NW., of a building for health center, including necessary fixed equipment therefor, $165,000, of which sum $7,000 shall be available for preparation of plans and specifications, administration, and inspection, including the employment of personal services without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That all buildings belonging to the District of Columbia shall be under the jurisdiction and control of the Commissioners of the said District."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 95: Page 54, after line 17, insert "marshal, $3,600, whose appointment is hereby authorized."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from is disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 95 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 96: Page 54, line 22, strike out "$111,800" and insert in lieu thereof "$115,400."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 96 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 112: Page 69, line 1, insert:

"COLUMBIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE

"To aid the Columbia Polytechnic Institute for the Blind, located at 1808 H Street NW., to be expended under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, $3,000."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from is disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 112 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 113: Page 70, line 4, after the word "poor", insert "at $1,200 each per annum."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 113 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 114: Page 70, line 5, strike out "$13,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$18,760."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 114, and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 114: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the matter inserted and stricken out by said amendment, and on page 63 of the bill, strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 119: Page 75, line 3, after $40,150 insert: *Provided*, That the Commission may procure supplies and services without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5), when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $50: *Provided further*, That a statement of expenditures from this appropriation shall be reported to Congress in the annual Budget.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 119, and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 132: Page 83, after line 2, after the figures "$900,000", insert: "*Provided*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, should they deem such action to be to the advantage of the District of Columbia, are hereby authorized to purchase a municipal asphalt plant at a cost not to exceed $30,000."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COLLINS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 132, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "*Provided further*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, should they deem such action to be to the advantage of the District of Columbia, are hereby authorized to purchase a municipal asphalt plant at a cost not to exceed $30,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 133: Page 84, line 1, strike out "$100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$143,000."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 133, and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 134: Page 84, line 1, after "$143,000", add the following: "and the Commissioners are authorized to enter into contract or contracts for the completion of said bridge at a cost not to exceed $393,000."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 134 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no 141: Page 87, in line 19, strike out "$2,769,140" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,957,740."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I sent to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COLLINS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 141 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,894,340."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 151: Page 99, after line 22, insert:

"SEC. 7. Credit is allowed in the accounts of the District of Columbia for disbursements made from the permanent and indefinite appropriation, 'Refund of erroneously paid taxes, District of Columbia', amounting to $3,229.90, covered by audit numbers 33,568, 37,304, 45,549, 53,546, 63,399, and 70,165, and General Accounting Office certificate no. F-5872-DC, dated July 24, 1933."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COLLINS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 151, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 1 of the matter proposed strike out "7" and insert in lieu thereof "9."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a motion to reconsider the various motions will be laid upon the table.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a general statement by me as to the District appropriation bill.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

District appropriation bill, 1938

Amount of 1938 appropriations	$45,915,641
Amount of 1937 appropriations	43,712,910
Increase over 1937	2,202,731
Amount of regular and supplemental estimates	46,605,605
Amount of bill as agreed to by conferees	45,915,641
Decrease under Budget estimates	689,964
Amount of House recessions in conference	799,057
Amount of Senate recessions in conference	714,140
Amount of 1938 bill as passed Senate	46,629,781
Amount of 1938 bill as passed House	45,116,584
Amount added above House bill by Senate	1,513,197

NOTE.—The above comparisons show the net figure in each instance.

Status of general fund appropriations, 1938

Amount of bill as agreed to by conferees	$45,915,641
Amount of gas and water funds	5,189,815
Total from general fund	40,725,826
Total collections, 1938	28,997,625
Deficit	11,728,201
Less Federal contribution	5,000,000
Net deficit	6,728,201

Status of gasoline tax fund appropriations, 1938

Amount in bill as agreed to by conferees	$3,145,340
Total available in fund	3,113,280
Deficit, 1938	32,060

Status of water fund appropriations, 1938

Total available in fund	$2,729,475
Amount in bill as agreed to by conferees	2,044,475
Surplus, 1938	685,000

NOTE.—The above figures are estimates prepared on the basis of data submitted to the committee during hearings on the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRAY of Indiana and Mr. HIGGINS of Massachusetts asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

FISHERIES OF ALASKA

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5860) making further provision for the fisheries of Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this bill is on the Consent Calendar. Why is there any particular reason for it being called up at this time?

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, this is an emergency matter, because the fishing season is at hand and the House must pass the bill immediately to do any good this year.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Just what does this bill do?

Mr. DIMOND. It is for the benefit of the natives of one part of Alaska. It limits fishing by set nets to the residents of that region and it gives the residents, particularly the Indians and Eskimos, a chance to make a little needed money.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act approved June 6, 1924, entitled "An act for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes" (43 Stat. 464), as amended, is further amended by inserting in said section at the end of the first proviso thereof another proviso to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That in the area embracing Bristol Bay and the arms and tributaries thereof, no person shall at any time fish for or take salmon with a stake net or set net, for commercial purposes, unless such person shall have theretofore continuously resided for the period of at least 5 years within a radius of 30 miles of the place where such net is staked or set."

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

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, Bristol Bay is a large bay indenting the southwestern side of the Territory of Alaska and opening into Bering Sea. It is the site of what is probably the greatest red-salmon fishery in the world and produces annually approximately 1,200,000 cases of red salmon containing 48 pounds to the case.

As I have heretofore indicated this bill is designed to provide a larger opportunity for the residents of the Bristol Bay region, and particularly for the native residents of that district, to earn a living in the great salmon fishery there carried on.

Two methods of fishing are employed to catch the Bristol Bay salmon: one involves the use of drift nets operated by boats and not attached to the shore; and the other involves the use of stake or set nets, one end of each of which is tied to the shore and thence extends out at right angles to the shore into the shallow tidal waters of the bay but not beyond the low-water mark therein. Under present regulations no stake or set net may be longer than 50 fathoms and stake or set nets may not be set within 450 feet of each other. During the year 1936 approximately 410 stake nets were operated in the Bristol Bay region and they caught about 3½ percent of all of the salmon taken in the district—the remaining 96½ percent having been caught by drift nets. The operation of stake or set nets is a simple one and can readily be performed by elderly people or even by women who are unable to undertake the more laborious and hazardous method of fishing with drift nets. For many of the residents of the region fishing by stake or set nets is the only way for them of making a living.

More than 1,000 fishermen from the United States go to Bristol Bay each year to engage in salmon fishing and they return to the States at the end of the short salmon fishing season. Some of the fishermen from the States, being more aggressive than the natives, have tended in recent years more and more to drive the natives from stake- or set-net fishing. While the income derived from the operation of any stake or set net is very small, the fishermen from the States frequently locate stake or set nets and then hire someone to operate the same while they personally engage in the more lucrative drift-net fishing. The operator of a stake net will probably not earn more than $250 in a season, while the average fisherman using a drift net is likely to earn at least five times that amount.

This legislation is highly desirable for the subsistence of some of the residents of the Bristol Bay region, and particularly for the native residents thereof. Without an opportunity to engage in fishing by stake or set nets some of these people have no method whatever of earning sufficient money to provide themselves with food and clothing. The bill under consideration is in harmony with the policy and purpose of the Government in promoting and aiding in the education, medical relief, and economic well-being of the natives of Alaska and in assisting in the establishment of permanent homes in the Territory.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN LANDS FOR THE YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5394) to provide for the acquisition of certain lands for, and the addition thereof to, the Yosemite National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. DEROUEN, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution recently adopted by the United Government employees on the death of our late beloved and distinguished colleague, William P. Connery, Jr.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, during the 20 years I have been a Member of this body this is the first time I have ever asked unanimous consent to address the House. I want to break that record this morning and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—I am not going to object to my colleague on the Rules Committee speaking this morning, because he makes the request so seldom, but I intend to object to any other similar request this morning, because we have important legislation to consider.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time that I may call to the attention of the Congress and the country, and especially to the notice of the Department of Justice a certain unusual and disgraceful species of racketeering that has been going on recently in Tennessee, and doubtless similar hijacking has been and is being practiced throughout the country.

According to a story printed under bold headlines on the front page of the Nashville Banner, a Democratic newspaper, in its issue of June 17 last, one Col. Lester F. Kimbrell, "blew" into Nashville week before last and proceeded to call to his hotel a number of Nashville businessmen who had furnished material to or had obtained contracts from the W. P. A. or other Government agencies. After being naively reminded of the business they had received from the W. P. A. and other Federal alleged relief agencies, and also

significantly informed that there would soon be additional funds for Federal distribution, these businessmen were told that as a representative of the President, Mr. Farley, and the Democratic National Committee, he had been commissioned to contact them, as beneficiaries of Federal relief funds, and take their orders for the "Democratic handbook", to be autographed by no less a personage than the President of the United States, at the "insignificant" price of $250 apiece. These businessmen were informed that their names were on a list which was "on the desk of the President and in the hands of Mr. Farley." Thereupon the suave colonel politely told them that their quota of books was in proportion to the Government business each had enjoyed, ranging from two to eight books, or from $500 to $2,000.

According to the Banner, the urbane colonel told each of those he contacted that if they would sign on the dotted line, he "would be of service to them in the matter of future favor." The Banner also stated that only persons and concerns that had done business with the W. P. A. and other Federal facilities were contacted.

It is not known just how much money the ingenious colonel extracted or, rather, extorted, from Nashville businessmen, but he carried on his nefarious racket in Tennessee's capital city for a week, when he departed for Memphis to shear other innocent lambs.

On his way to Nashville the colonel, or one of his accomplices, stopped over in Knoxville, where the same tactics were employed in an attempt to hijack a number of Knoxville businessmen who had had Government contracts or furnished Federal projects material. I have it on unimpeachable authority that this Knoxville hijacker stopped at the Andrew Johnson Hotel, where he summoned by telephone those whom he was sent there to fleece. His demands in Knoxville ranged from $500 to $1,500 per person. In Knoxville, after the usual reminder of the business he had received through the beneficent instrumentality of W. P. A. and other Federal facilities, and after the tempting picture of future favors were dangled before him, the victim was informed of the amount he was assessed and expected to contribute. To verify his identity and authority, the "colonel" suggested that they could call a certain number in Washington. This was done, I understand, and the Washington "number" promptly replied that "the colonel" was duly and fully authorized.

Mr. Speaker, such dastardly skullduggery as I have described is not only the very essence of villainy but is a clear violation of both the letter and the spirit of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. Of course, this campaign book pretext is not even a clever subterfuge. A political campaign book at this time would be just about as valuable and interesting as a last year's Barker's Almanac.

Mr. Speaker, I denounce this conduct as downright immoral and utterly reprehensible. It is cold-blooded graft of the purest ray serene. Of course, the so-called colonel is only a tool of the higher-ups who deserve the contempt and execoration of all decent people. Al Capone in his palmiest days would have scorned to condescend to such arrant, cowardly, and contemptible conduct; and Jesse James would have considered it unworthy of his code of ethics and a reflection on his sense of sportsmanship.

Mr. Speaker, if conduct such as this is to go unchallenged, justice becomes a mockery and graft masquerades under the cloak of manly virtue. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the great Democratic Party has not degenerated to so low a state that it finds it necessary to resort to methods of coercion and extortion to raise funds to carry on and meet its financial obligations.

Here and now, I call upon the Department of Justice to investigate this outrageous and scandalous practice; and if requested to do so, I shall be glad to furnish the Attorney General's office with pertinent information bearing on this shameful and unsavory affair. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD my own remarks on the same subject on two separate occasions.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, 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. 6523) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5394) entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of certain lands for, and the addition thereof to, the Yosemite National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes", disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ADAMS, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. ASHURST, Mr. WAGNER, and Mr. NYE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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 joint resolution (H. J. Res. 361) entitled "Joint resolution making appropriations for relief purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 563. An act for the relief of E. W. Garrison;

H. R. 607. An act for the relief of Dorothy McCourt;

H. R. 1235. An act for the relief of John Brennan;

H. R. 1310. An act for the relief of Clifford R. George and Mabel D. George;

H. R. 1406. An act for the relief of Frank S. Walker;

H. R. 1689. An act for the relief of Dominga Pardo;

H. R. 1731. An act for the relief of Angelo and Auro Cattaneo;

H. R. 1761. An act for the relief of Paul J. Francis;

H. R. 1851. An act for the relief of W. D. Davis;

H. R. 2404. An act for the relief of James Philip Coyle;

H. R. 2482. An act for the relief of Lonnie O. Ledford;

H. R. 2703. An act to provide for the representation of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia on the annual conference of senior circuit judges;

H. R. 2757. An act to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of the Morse Dry Dock & Repair Co.;

H. R. 2774. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Division of Investigation, Department of the Interior, and certain disbursing officers of the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 2934. An act for the relief of Raymond E. Payne and Anna R. Payne;

H. R. 2983. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Porter;

H. R. 3002. An act for the relief of Timothy Joseph McCarthy;

H. R. 3075. An act for the relief of E. P. Lewis;

H. R. 3123. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lease to Old Fort Niagara Association, Inc., portions of the Fort Niagara Military Reservation, N. Y.;

H. R. 3262. An act for the relief of John H. Wykle;

H. R. 3284. An act to transfer Crawford County, Iowa, from the southern judicial district of Iowa to the northern judicial district of Iowa;

H. R. 3339. An act for the relief of Allie Rankin;

H. R. 3565. An act for the relief of the Northwestern Ohio Mutual Rodded Fire Insurance Co.;

H. R. 3809. An act for the relief of H. E. Wingard;

H. R. 3967. An act for the relief of Adele Fowlkes;

H. R. 4623. An act for the relief of C. O. Eastman;

H. R. 4679. An act for the relief of John L. Summers, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department; and Frank White, G. F. Allen, H. T. Tate, and W. O. Woods, former Treasurers of the United States;

H. R. 4682. An act for the relief of W. R. Fuchs;

H. R. 4711. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Puget Sound at or near a point commonly known as The Narrows in the State of Washington;

H. R. 4942. An act for the relief of A. L. Mallery;

H. R. 5102. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Muzio;

H. R. 5258. An act for the relief of the Jackson Casket & Manufacturing Co.;

H. R. 5337. An act for the relief of Charles B. Murphy;

H. R. 5438. An act for the relief of Richard T. Edwards;

H. R. 5496. An act for the relief of Willard Webster;

H. R. 5652. An act for the relief of Frank A. Smith;

H. R. 5848. An act to extend times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Wabash River at or near Merom, Sullivan County, Ind.;

H. R. 6049. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act;

H. R. 6144. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code;

H. R. 6230. An act for the relief of certain former disbursing officers of the Veterans' Administration and of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, Federal Board for Vocational Education, and the United States Veterans' Bureau (now Veterans' Administration);

H. R. 6285. An act authorizing the State Roads Commission of the State of Maryland and the State Road Commission of the State of West Virginia to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Potomac River in Washington County, Md., at or near a point opposite Shepherdstown, W. Va., and a point at or near Shepherdstown, Jefferson County, W. Va., to take the place of a bridge destroyed by flood;

H. R. 6286. An act authorizing the State Roads Commission of the State of Maryland and the State Road Commission of the State of West Virginia to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Potomac River at or near a point in the vicinity of Hancock, in Washington County, Md., and a point near the north end of Morgan County, W. Va., to take the place of a bridge destroyed by flood;

H. R. 6292. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Niobrara, Nebr.;

H. R. 6436. An act authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Panama Canal not coming within the provisions of the Canal Zone Retirement Act;

H. R. 6494. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Snake River between Clarkston, Wash., and Lewiston, Idaho;

H. R. 7021. An act validating and confirming certain mineral patents issued for lands situated in township 5 south, range 15 east, Montana principal meridian, in the State of Montana;

H. R. 7589. An act to levy an excise tax upon carriers and certain other employers and an income tax upon their employees, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution authorizing the disposal of certain lands held by the Panama Railroad Co. on Manzanillo Island, Republic of Panama; and

H. J. Res. 349. Joint resolution authorizing certain retired officers or employees of the United States to accept such decorations, orders, medals, or presents as have been tendered them by foreign Governments.

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. 5996) entitled "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, 1938, and for other purposes", and agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate nos. 9, 22, 23, 56, 90, 92, 114, 132, 141, and 151 to said bill.

FARM-TENANCY BILL

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 261 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 261

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 7562, a bill to encourage and promote the ownership of farm homes and to make the possession of such homes more secure, to provide for the general welfare of the United States, to provide additional credit facilities for agricultural development, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half the time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a rule for the consideration of the farm-tenancy bill. It is an open rule, providing for 3 hours of general debate, to be confined to the bill, and providing for amendment. All points of order are waived by the rule.

In the consideration of this bill we are beginning, I believe, the solution of one of the serious problems of our country. This is another bill providing for social security for a class of men and women who live upon our farms. The measure provides for the lending of money to farm tenants, to sharecroppers, and to laborers on farms, preference being given to married people, for the purchase of homes under a 30-year amortization plan at 3-percent interest.

This is another bill looking to the relief of the underprivileged, people who have not had the opportunity many of us believe they should have. The measure provides an authorization for the first year of $10,000,000, for the second year of $25,000,000, and for the third year of $50,000,000. There may be many people who believe we should start at a larger figure, and this amount, of course, is a very small appropriation with which to undertake the solution of such a large problem. However, the committee worked faithfully on this proposed legislation, and believed it proper to start with a modest amount and proceed cautiously and carefully in the program, which, to begin with, is more or less experimental. If at the end of that time we find that relief has been brought to the people on the farms in the purchase of homes, I feel sure we will have started a long-distance program which future Congresses will maintain.

Somewhere I received statistics to the effect that there are 6,288,000 farms in America, with a population of more than 32,000,000 people. Slightly less than one-half the people on these farms live on tenant farms. Every State of the Union has such a problem. Maine has 4½ percent of its farms cultivated by tenants. Mississippi has 72 percent. It is claimed the State of Iowa has the highest percentage of its farm lands in cultivation, yet in Iowa slightly less than one-half, about 49 percent, of the farms are cultivated by tenant farmers, sharecroppers, or hired hands.

This measure is to relieve the problem of farm tenancy, which is Nation-wide. The committee believes, and the idea was conveyed in the message of the President of the United States to Congress, that the problem could not be solved by any single State, but is a national problem. I believe in this proposed legislation we are beginning a long-distance program which will help to build future security for

the men and women who live on the farms, by enabling them to own their own homes.

We have, through the Federal land banks, assisted farmers who were in debt and subject to foreclosure to save their farms. We have, through the Home Owners' Corporation, assisted the home owners in the cities and towns to save their homes. This measure goes one step further, and is intended to assist people who have not owned land but have been engaged in cultivating land and in helping to produce the food of the Nation and the raw materials which clothe the Nation. Through this measure we seek to assist the underprivileged people who have not had an opportunity, because of the depression or perhaps for other reasons, to own their farm homes. We want to assist them in this humble way in the beginning, but look to a long-distance program where more of the farms of our Nation can be owned by the men and women who cultivate them.

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. Yes, I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the amount of money paid by these tenant farmers during the years the bill is in effect be less or greater than the amount they are now paying for the same farms?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I have not figured that out, but if the payments are the same and this contributes to the ownership of the farms by the men and women who cultivate them, I think it is a very helpful proposition.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am in sympathy with the proposition, but my idea is that if the farmers cannot pay the rent now as tenant farmers, how could they pay greater amounts if they owned the farms?

Mr. GREENWOOD. We are not assuming they cannot pay the rent. All sharecroppers have to pay the rent, because the landlord takes his part. Of course, they pay the rent.

In a democracy like this we believe in private ownership of property, which is the opposite of communism and socialism. This measure looks toward a true American democracy and the establishment of a standard of individual home ownership. I believe the future of our Nation and the destiny of our Nation hang on the decision we make here today with respect to the future ownership of farms.

The men and women working on these farms are worthy people. They produce the food and the raw material of our Nation. They create the wealth of the Nation, but they have not always shared in a proper way in the distribution of this wealth. This measure is to assist them in owning the land which they cultivate.

We should begin now to right this wrong and give these faithful working people an opportunity to own their homes. Besides, the fertility of the soil of the Nation is being destroyed by the sharecropper and by following the rental method, because every year they attempt to pull from the soil the largest crop that is possible because next year they do not know whether they will be located there or somewhere else.

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. HARLAN. To what extent will this bill provide funds for helping tenant farmers in the various districts; in other words, how many of them will be helped by this measure?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Not very many in the beginning, although I have not figured that out. As I have said, this is a humble or modest beginning. We should proceed cautiously as the program unfolds, with $10,000,000 the first year, $25,000,000 the second year, and $50,000,000 the third year. There can be no limitation on the future, and if Congress finds the program is working out satisfactorily, the amount can be increased from time to time.

Title II of the bill continues the rehabilitation program. Since the President is to allot money from relief funds for the rehabilitation and resettlement program, we may assume that the present program will be continued, and that the present unexpended balances in the fund will be used for the purpose of lending the farmers money to purchase livestock and equipment, to provide family subsistence, and help them compose their debts or refinance their debts, so they may continue to live on the farms and support their families. This title of the bill continues a relief that I believe has been of great advantage to the poorer class of farmers, those who cannot receive credit through regular channels.

Title III provides an authorization of $10,000,000 the first year, $20,000,000 the second year, and $20,000,000 the third year, or $50,000,000 in all, for the purchase and retirement of submarginal land, to take it out of cultivation, to build up a soil-conservation and reforestation program and mitigate floods and help preserve the wildlife, which program is now under way.

Mr. HILL of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. HILL of Oklahoma. The gentleman has not touched upon what is in my own mind. Does this bill provide for the establishment of a new agency to administer these particular functions?

Mr. GREENWOOD. It does not provide for the establishment of a new agency. This will be under the Secretary of Agriculture, and the allotting of these loans will be done by a local committee, practically without any expense.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. It seems to me that, in view of the fact the land-retirement program has been going on or has been set up for the past 3 years, there ought to be a larger amount, at least, appropriated for this purpose in order to get this land out of alleged cultivation as rapidly as possible.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I agree with the gentleman that this is a very important program; but the gentleman from Colorado understands that there are great demands being made upon the administration and the Federal Government, not only along this line but along many others, including one billion and a half dollars for relief; and for this reason these appropriations, I am sure, are not quite as large as some of us would like to see them.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I understand that, and I appreciate all that has been done; but I believe they might get rid of some of their burdens if they would spend more of the money retiring the land from alleged cultivation.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I agree with the gentleman, and I am in sympathy with that program.

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. COLDEN. There are already agencies of the Government buying submarginal land. Does this bill supersede those agencies or will this work be done in conjunction with them? I do not quite understand the relationship.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I think the work will be done in conjunction with the existing agencies, but the chairman of the committee can give the gentleman that information.

Mr. JONES. The agency referred to is established by Executive order and that order automatically expires on June 30.

Mr. HILL of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. HILL of Oklahoma. In relation to the question I asked a moment ago, I notice under title IV, the Secretary of Agriculture is to establish in the Department of Agriculture a Farm Security Administration to assist him in the exercise of the powers and the carrying out of the duties imposed by this act. I thought perhaps that was a provision for setting up some new agencies and alloting some administrative expenses to such agencies.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I take it the old agencies that have been administering title II and title III will be merged under

the Secretary of Agriculture with any new agency that may be established. I do not contemplate this bill will be any more expensive in the future than it has been in the past.

Mr. HILL of Oklahoma. I should like to state to the gentleman that the theory of the proposition as laid out in this bill sounds all right to me, but I do not want us to build up some other bureau in order to do the work, because I think we have a sufficient number of such organizations now.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I agree with the gentleman. I want to see as much of the appropriation as possible go to the farm tenants and croppers.

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The first four lines of subsection (b), page 2, challenged my attention, because I notice that only aid is to be given to those who recently obtained the major portion of their income from farming operations. I wonder if the Committee took into consideration how recently or how long a person had to be so engaged?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Would the gentleman mind propounding that question to the Chairman of the Committee after we go into Committee of the Whole? He can tell the gentleman how far the Committee considered that matter.

Mr. DONDERO. If the gentleman will permit one further question, was any consideration given to the question of whether a man had been a success or a failure throughout the years of his tenancy?

Mr. GREENWOOD. That is to be handled by the local committees set up in each county and passing upon the responsibility and worthiness of each applicant who asks for a loan.

Mr. Speaker, I think this program will appeal to everyone, even in the city, who likes to see the ownership of homes by the people of America. I voted for every one of the measures that would loan money to the home owners to help save their homes from foreclosure. I am very heartily in favor of this legislation which will set up an agency to help more people to own their homes—people who are worthy, passed upon by local committees—to obtain assistance over a long period of time, to help build up and strengthen the security of the home.

The soil is the foundation of this Nation, as it is of every nation, and when the soil is destroyed and the men and women who cultivate the soil reach a stage of peasantry, of peonage, or of servitude, I have never found any precedent in history where that nation is not started on a decline when that situation prevails. Home ownership then makes for the security of our Nation, makes for contentment, for the confidence of the people. Home ownership is the sweetest and most cherished privilege of the human family. The future of our Nation must be built upon our homes.

In conclusion I want to give you a thought that was written by a very distinguished poet a few decades ago. The farmers of England formerly lived in villages and went out and farmed their land. This sweet singer, Oliver Goldsmith, left his old home and went to other parts, and later came back and found that the old homes had been deserted by his old neighbors, friends, and relatives. It touched his heart, and he wrote that magnificent poem called the Deserted Village. He expressed it so beautifully that I want to give you a few lines of that poem:

> Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
> Where wealth accumulates, and men decay.
> Princes and lords may flourish or may fade—
> A breath can make them, as a breath has made;
> But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
> When once destroy'd, can never be supplied.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will help to preserve the homes on the farms and will help to build a future civilization of home owners, and while it is a modest beginning, I think it is a move in the right direction, and I believe the rule should be adopted and the bill passed. [Applause.]

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to myself, and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, no one can quarrel with the splendid idealism which prompts the advocacy of this measure. The plight of the tenant farmer cannot fail to arouse the sympathy of anyone genuinely interested in the welfare of the so-called "under dog." No one would like to aid him any more than would I, if there were a real chance to do so.

It is disturbing when you realize there are 2,800,000 tenant farmers in the country, or 42.1 percent of the entire farming population. It is disturbing when you learn the tenant farmers are increasing at the rate of 40,000 every year. Happily, the percentage of tenant farmers in my section, New England, is not so large. In Massachusetts it is only 6.2, the smallest ratio of any State in the Union; in Rhode Island it is 13.8; Maine, 6.9; Connecticut, 7.3; New Hampshire, 7.3; and Vermont, 10.9.

There is a real tenant-farmer problem. That fact cannot be disputed. However, we must be careful not to hold forth a glistening mirage to these unfortunate men and women which cannot become a reality. A disappointment would be cruel and leave permanently behind an embittered population which would be easy prey for the radical agitator.

The question is, Will this legislation eventually bring permanent improvement to these unfortunate people, or will it simply be the bailing out of some farm owners with political pull at the cost of a heavy drain upon the Treasury? Everyone knows the conditions in the agricultural industry; billions of dollars have been expended by the Government to keep the industry alive.

I am wondering if because of this fact we would be doing anyone any good to put him in a business which is as bad off as the agricultural industry without adequate resources. Might it not mean simply the Government being obliged to take over huge tracts of farming land? I hope that phase will be given some consideration in discussing the bill.

That the experiment is to be launched on a modest scale is admitted. The appropriation the first year will be $10,000,000. If the new agency to be created is to be as expensive as the Resettlement Bureau, there is not going to be very much left for the tenant farmer. The bulk will go for political jobs, as I note the civil-service requirement is carefully omitted. Even if by some miracle the administration costs are modest, there is going to be very little available.

There are about 3,000 counties in the country. A little arithmetic reveals, with administration cost held down to 10 percent—almost unbelievable—this would mean $3,000 for each county. Any farm which would provide a decent living for a family would cost $5,000.

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. The average cost of the farms set up by the Resettlement Administration was between $7,000 and $7,500.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That makes it a little worse, as I have worked out my arithmetic on the basis of $5,000. So at least half the counties in the country must go without if the other counties get one farm each. A $100,000,000 annual appropriation would take care of only 20,000 tenant farmers and you will recall there are 2,800,000.

Frankly, I am wondering if this means any real help; if it means only disappointment to the impoverished tenant farmer, who will be told in glowing language of the great help he is to receive from his Government. The average tenant farmer has as much chance of getting aid as the average purchaser of a ticket to win the English Sweepstakes.

Of course I understand the reason for the small amount to be authorized. The Treasury is in no condition to embark upon new expenditures of billions as this will require before any material good will be done.

The President last April in one of his rare economy moments; that is, when he talks of economy, said: "No expansion of Government activities should be authorized unless the necessity for such expansion has been definitely determined and funds are available to defray the costs." These words of Mr. Roosevelt unquestionably meant it was sound policy to provide the revenue for new expenditures.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DIES. I should like to call the gentleman's attention to what I consider a very unjust provision in this bill. This permits the Secretary to buy land subject to any reservation, any outstanding estate, any interest, or easement. In my congressional district the Government is buying land and permitting the landowner to reserve all mineral rights. That is all he wants. A few years ago they were willing to give away the surface rights if they could retain the mineral rights and escape taxation. Does not the gentleman believe that when the Government buys land, the Government should have the mineral rights as well as the surface rights?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is no question about that. The mineral rights should go to the Government, because I think if the gentleman will look up the purchases in his district he will find the Government paid twice as much as originally paid by the lumber company for the land.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield for another question at that point?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DIES. Also the Government buys this land and the local taxing units lose the source of revenue necessary to operate their schools and their local government. How are we helping the people when we take away from them the means of taxation to support their schools and their local government?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman is stating a problem that is causing a great deal of worry these days, and it will be an increasing problem in the years ahead.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JONES. On the question of reservation of mineral rights, I should like to call attention to section 44, which stipulates that the Government shall retain not less than one-half of the mineral rights when it disposes of any land.

Mr. DIES. But that is when the Government disposes of the land. What they are doing now is buying the land that people are glad to get rid of and paying three or four dollars an acre, and then the individual retains all the mineral rights; and it is absolutely wrong and it is wrong from the Government's point.

Mr. JONES. That is not the purpose.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If my memory serves me right, the President vetoed the soldiers' bonus-payment bill because the bill did not provide for the revenue to finance the same. However, consistency is not particularly a great virtue and he may decide differently in this instance.

Unquestionably this experiment will eventually cost the taxpayer billions of dollars. Could not the money be better expended in some way which would lift up the entire agricultural industry? Make the industry prosperous and the worth-while tenant farmer will have the opportunity of becoming a landowner. It would appear to me we must first rehabilitate the industry and then we can more easily with reasonable cost devote ourselves to lifting the individual.

In other words, I question if it is practical to spend the money at a time when failure is almost certain. I should like to see this great social experiment attempted, and I am quite sympathetic toward it in due time when there is a reasonable chance for success. I seriously question if this is the propitious time.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLDEN. Does not the gentleman believe that the limitation to only farm tenants and farm laborers and sharecroppers is a discrimination against the man who has left the farm and is now working in industry and would like to go back to the farm?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It might readily be the energetic man who left the farm and went to the city might, if financed, make a much better risk than the man who stays on the farm and has not had the initiative to get ahead in life.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think it is admitted that the most recent statistics from the Department of Agriculture show that there has been a tremendous decrease in the farm population during the last 12 or 15 months, caused primarily by increasing production and increasing wages in industry. If this is to continue, there will be few people left who will want to go back to the farm, especially when wages of $10, $15, and $20 a day are now being paid for factory workers.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am not one of those men who subscribe to any idealistic theory to the effect that farm tenancy can ever be completely abolished, because of fundamental differences in the capabilities of human beings and the physical conditions of the various sections of our Nation. Even though we may not be able to abolish farm tenancy in the United States, this bill is a step in the right direction. Nor am I one of those men who are alarmed about the cost, because, if you will read title I of this bill—and that is the important feature of the bill, in my opinion, as supplemented by the subsequent sections—you will see that if the tenant has that stability of character, that permanency of purpose, that approved integrity that the local committee finds and which are absolutely necessary for any man to possess to be able to own a farm and to conduct a farm successfully, the ultimate cost to the Government will be negligible, because the money loaned will be repaid. The bill does open the door of hope to those who earnestly desire to purchase a home. It is the establishment of a policy of helpfulness to a class of citizens who need help and who will make good if given the chance.

It is true that we are providing only $10,000,000 as an initial expenditure, but may I call attention to the history of Denmark. In 1899 Denmark launched a modest program of farm tenancy, but that nation today has a good comprehensive program that is fast eliminating farm tenancy. We should do likewise; we should feel our way and profit by experience. The President, in his message of February 16, 1937, said:

> It will be wise to start the permanent program on a scale commensurate with our resources and experience, with the purpose of later expanding the program to a scale commensurate with the magnitude of the problem as rapidly as our experience and resources will permit.

Title I of this bill gives to that worthy tenant some ray of hope that the Government is willing to lend its credit to him to help him become a farm owner in this Nation. The fight that is confronting the House today, the fight that is confronting this Nation—and that is the reason why I am in favor of title I—is to prevent the further regimentation of agriculture. [Applause.]

There are those, of course, who believe, and who are conscientious in the belief, that the Government should in the first instance purchase the land, that the Government should exercise some kind of surveillance or some kind of supervision over these tenants, that the Government should place them on probation. I am opposed to such a program. The citizen should be permitted as much freedom as possible. The loan should be given him as a free man and not as an indentured workman. Give him a chance to make good. Let him exercise his own individuality and independence of thought and he will become not only a better citizen but he will meet his obligation and become in fact a home owner. The county committee provided for in the

bill will know which man is entitled from the standpoint of character, integrity, ability, and permanency of purpose and desire to be aided. In this way the program can be successfully carried out.

I do not want to see title I amended. Just as far as I can I want to take out of our agricultural program supervision by the bureaucrats of Washington. I am perfectly willing to admit that there has been an increase in farm tenancy in recent years but this increase is not directly caused by inability or the lack of desire on the part of the men to own land, it has been brought about because of depressing times and financial conditions, but pass this bill, establish the principle and continue the legislation giving to the producers of agricultural products a reasonable economic protection under the law, and farm tenancy will decrease as the years go by.

The President further said in his message of February 16, 1937:

> The attack on the problem of farm tenancy and farm security is a logical continuation of the agricultural program this administration has been developing since March 4, 1933. Necessarily, whatever program the Congress devises will have to be closely integrated with existing activities for maintaining farm income and for conserving and improving our agricultural resources.

The landowners have benefited greatly by the agricultural program which the Congress under the leadership of our great President has heretofore enacted, but the benefits received by the tenants have not at all times been commensurate with their real interest or in accord with equitable principles. The launching of this program by our Government, if it can be kept free from speculation in land values and domination by book farmers and theorists residing in Washington and living in musty libraries, will be and does constitute the dawning of a new day for that great class of citizens who have within them the desire to create and own a home.

I realize that this bill differs from the Senate bill, but there is danger in the Senate bill. It will tend to place the man who desires to avail himself of the benefits of the bill under the domination and control of a class of people that have done enough injury to agriculture already. I know many farm tenants in my own district who are more capable of operating a farm successfully than are the bureaucrats. I should like for those tenants to have an opportunity to obtain a loan and to buy a farm and I do not want them to be humiliated by the dictatorial requirements that might be made under a bill such as the Senate bill or under amendments that will be proposed to this bill. The real friend of agriculture and of the farm tenants in this country will vote against any effort or proposed amendment that materially changes title I of the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this legislation apparently is a compromise that will do very little good for the farmers except in a few sections of the South. It only carries an authorization for $10,000,000. If we were actually going to do something for the tenant farmers throughout the country it would require anywhere from one billion to fifteen billion dollars. If we were to solve the farm-tenancy problem, it would cost many billions of dollars.

I do not propose to oppose this bill because in principle I think it is correct and it probably makes a small start along the avenue of trial and error and there may be something to it. I want to point out, however, that here we are with this sort of half-baked compromise bill affecting a major problem which has to do with the welfare of two million tenant farmers of America. It seems to me this is a very valid reason why the Members of the Congress should begin to make up their minds that we are approaching the time for the adjournment of the Congress.

If we are to proceed with this kind of legislation, compromise, and half-baked measures, carrying out partially just a few of the promises that were made, we should quit now. It seems to me this applies to all legislation that will come before this Congress in the closing days of the session, whether it is the reorganization bill, the hours-and-wages bill, the compromise Court bill, or other great issues. For one, I believe it is to the interest of the country—in this case the farmers, who want something more than one-tenth of a loaf—and it is of interest to those favoring the enactment of constructive legislation and the Members themselves that we adjourn before we are swamped with partial, inadequate, and badly considered legislation.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. McFARLANE. If the gentleman were writing the farm-tenancy legislation, will he point out in his remarks just what changes he would make in this bill?

Mr. FISH. I only have 5 minutes, which is not sufficient even to make observations.

Mr. McFARLANE. Anyone can criticize, but it takes brains to make a better article.

Mr. FISH. I want to know from the gentleman whether this bill covers the tenant farmers up in my district in Dutchess County, N. Y. I have a very distinguished absentee landlord who owns a farm at Hyde Park, N. Y., and I should like to know what my farmer constituents in Dutchess County will get out of this bill, because I know what you are going to get out of it in the Southern States. This bill is for the southern tenant farmers. I want to know whether it is going to take care of the tenant farmers in my district, particularly at Hyde Park.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. No. I am not going to take up the remaining minutes of my time on that, although I could do it and do it pretty well, if I cared to discuss the farm operations of a certain estate in Hyde Park, N. Y., which is being run at a loss according to the tax returns.

Mr. McFARLANE. The gentleman asked a question. Let me answer it.

Mr. FISH. I want to know, under the provisions of this bill, whether we are going to be taken care of up North and whether the tenant farmers of Dutchess County will receive an equal treatment with those of Arkansas and Texas.

Mr. McFARLANE. This bill applies to all sections of the country alike, even to the farm of Franklin D. Roosevelt's mother, to which the gentleman referred in his remarks a few days ago.

Mr. FISH. I also want to know what an absentee landlord is? I want to know whether a man is an absentee landlord if he is away from his farm for 6 months. I see no definition of an absentee owner or absentee landlord in this bill. How can you apply it? The purpose of this bill is to take care of tenant farmers, but I do not see how you can apply any rule unless you define an absentee landlord or absentee owner.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman let me answer that question?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman could not answer it.

Mr. McFARLANE. I think perhaps we better keep the gentleman down here.

Mr. FISH. I might help you on the bill if I was assured that my tenant farmers would also be benefited.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Members have just returned from a revival meeting at Jefferson Island, where they have got religion.

Mr. MILLS. Salvation, the gentleman means.

Mr. FISH. I want to know when the President will permit us to adjourn this Congress and whether we will have to continue to vote on half-baked legislation of this kind, that actually carries out no promises to anybody, before we will be allowed to adjourn.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Or whether we are going to stay here until Labor Day to vote for more compromise and half-baked legislation. Why not adjourn within the next 30 days and put the committees to work next December on reorganization, hours and labor, housing, and other important bills, so that

we will have real legislation before us when we meet next January? If this bill is typical of what is coming from now until adjournment, I suggest we adjourn within the next 30 days, or by July 31.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman asked the question as to when we were going to adjourn.

Mr. FISH. That is right.

Mr. WALTER. We will adjourn just as soon as the legislative program that the gentleman is trying so hard to obstruct is enacted into law.

Mr. FISH. Evidently the gentleman is for the Court bill. May I say to the gentleman I should like to have a vote in this House on the Court bill and put some of you Members, like the gentleman who has just spoken, on record as to whether you want to commit political suicide or not. [Applause.]

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. McFARLANE. What is the gentleman hollering about? He is going to have plenty of opportunity to be put on record.

Mr. FISH. This bill is a sham.

Mr. McFARLANE. In what particular is it a sham?

Mr. FISH. It provides $10,000,000 to solve a problem that would require at least $10,000,000,000 to adequately solve.

Mr. McFARLANE. Point out wherein the bill is a sham.

Mr. FISH. I am going to vote for this sham bill. [Laughter and applause.] I am going to vote for this sham bill because there is no other bill before the House and because of the assurances given by the gentleman from Texas that it will enable the tenant farmers of Dutchess County and Hyde Park to buy the farms they now rent. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]; and may I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] to yield the gentleman from Texas 5 minutes?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas 5 minutes.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, after I had asked for this time I found that my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] had given thorough and exhaustive study to this question; so, with the permission of the House, I am going to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do not claim to be an expert on the question of farm tenancy, but I have given some study to it, and I thank my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me at this moment.

The Committee on Agriculture, which has no superior in the House, is to be congratulated for bringing in a farm-tenancy bill. I have the highest regard for the committee, and my admiration for the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from my home State [Mr. JONES], knows no bounds.

It is difficult to prepare a satisfactory bill on the subject. The members of the committee will not claim that this is a perfect bill, and I agree with them. There is nothing which I favor more strongly than an adequate farm-tenancy bill, and my object in opposing certain features of this bill is to try to improve the plan proposed and make it available to more tenants. In the first place, this bill provides for no limit on the loans which shall be made to any one farmer. The sky is the limit. Under the H. O. L. C. there is a limit; under the system of emergency crop loans there is a limit; and under the Federal land bank commissioner loans there is a limit. This practice, in my judgment, is sound government and financial policy. Therefore, I propose that we amend this bill, and I have drawn up an amendment which provides that no loan to any one applicant under this bill shall be in excess of $6,000.

In the next place, this bill provides that a loan to a tenant or other accepted applicants shall be made to the extent of 100 percent of the value of the land to be purchased. This, I think, is a mistake in beginning this program, as we wish to start out very cautiously in order to insure the success of the program. If we start this program upon an unsound basis, we will do the tenant farmers of this country irreparable injury. If the program under this bill should collapse, we would place a stumbling block in the way of farm-ownership legislation and retard progress along this line for years. I think in this bill we ought to provide that the borrower, in order to take advantage of the aid offered in the bill, must put up at least 5 percent of the purchase price of the farm he buys, which would be $250 on a $5,000 farm. In other words, we would not lend more than 95 percent of the value of the farm. This would not be too restrictive for the tenant and would be better policy for the Government. I believe the tenant would be better satisfied with an initial equity in the farm purchased. It would give him a pride of ownership in his own right. Otherwise, he might feel that he was on a semirelief basis and a client of the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON of Texas. If the gentleman will pardon me for just a minute, I shall yield later.

The most serious objection I have to the bill in the form in which it is drawn, and it can be corrected by amendment, is that it turns over this great proposed farm-credit program to the Department of Agriculture. I do not mean to imply any lack of admiration for the Department of Agriculture. I mean that the Department of Agriculture is not the proper agency to administer the act. I point out that under the able leadership of the Committee on Agriculture and its chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES], the Farm Credit Administration was set up in 1933, and has lent more than $4,360,000,000 on a sound, businesslike basis. Prior to 1933 we had no credit structure which was adapted to the farmer. Ordinary bank credits had not operated so well for the average farmer and the coming of the Farm Credit Administration with its various divisions was a great thing for agriculture. We must realize that we are not able to give farms to tenants. Moreover, the tenant farmer does not want to be given a farm. He wants an opportunity to buy one under such circumstances that he can eventually pay for it. So we must understand at the outset that the tenants are going to buy the farms and are going to pay for them, because we cannot appropriate $12,000,000,000 and give it to the farmers of the Nation to buy farms. This is the amount that would be required to purchase an average-priced farm for the 2,865,000 tenant farmers of the Nation.

Therefore the key to this bill, if it is to be successful, is a good credit structure. The Farm Credit Administration, through the Federal land banks and the Land Bank Commissioner, has already lent on real estate in this country more than $3,000,000,000, and more than $2,800,000,000 is now outstanding. Of the Federal land-bank loans 87 percent are now in good standing. I can see no reason under heaven for turning over the administration of this farm-credit bill—and that is all the measure is, a farm-credit bill for tenants—to the inexperienced hands of the Department of Agriculture, insofar as credit on real estate is concerned, and turning our backs upon the Farm Credit Administration, which in the first 3 months of 1937 lent $5,000,000 to 1,000 tenants who were able to pay at least 25 percent of the value of their farms as an initial payment. If we keep this up the Farm Credit Administration, through the Federal land banks during this year, will lend $20,000,000 to 4,000 tenants for the purpose of assisting them in purchasing farm homes. You will understand that under the present laws and rules and regulations as to the Federal land banks and Land Bank Commissioner an approved applicant is permitted to borrow 75 percent of the value of a farm.

What we need is to supplement, strengthen, and liberalize the loan program now existing with regard to the Farm Credit Administration so that a man who must now put up

25 percent in order to get the benefit of credit on a farm purchase can put up a lesser percentage. This would apply only to applicants covered in this farm tenancy bill. I suggest 5 percent, and I have drawn an amendment to this effect.

I hope the House will agree with me in the opinion that this bill ought to be administered by the Farm Credit Administration, which has been in the farm-saving business, in the business of saving tenant farmers and landowners, for lo, these many years. No Member of the House can estimate how many hundreds of farmers have had their homes saved during the last 4 years by the Farm Credit Administration through the Federal land banks, Land Bank Commissioner, emergency crop loans, drought loans, production-credit loans, all of which operate under the Farm Credit Administration. Without the Farm Credit Administration during the last 4 years farm ownership in many sections would have reached the vanishing point. Three million American farmers during the last 4 years have been financed by this organization, which we are about to forsake in this bill for the Department of Agriculture. The Department is skilled in its field, but it is not skilled in the field of lending money on real estate and farm land. This work is outside the field of the Department of Agriculture. The Department has paid out in A. A. A. benefits nearly $2,000,000,000, but giving away money when it is appropriated is a different problem from lending money on a sound business basis thereby promoting home ownership and protecting the taxpayers of this Nation. [Applause.]

Further, if the administration of this bill is turned over to the Farm Credit Administration, it can start to work tomorrow in all of the 3,059 agricultural counties of the Nation. There will be no delay and there will be no tremendous overhead and great expense in setting up a new organization. There is today a National Farm Loan Association functioning in every agricultural county in the United States. These associations have a secretary-treasurer and at least five directors. These men are elected by the membership of the local farm-loan associations. The democracy of this policy cannot be questioned. But in the bill before the House the local committees in the various counties are to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture in Washington. Wherever possible, I believe in preserving the democratic principle of local responsibility of government.

These officers of the national farm-loan associations know how to appraise lands. They are familiar with local conditions and they know something about farm credit; they know how to cooperate with the Farm Credit Administration and the trained appraisers of the 12 Federal land bank regions. They have made their mistakes and have learned by trial and error. They are doing a grand job within the limitations now surrounding them. If we give them a little more rope, so they can select other borrowers who cannot comply with present regulations, as provided for in the amendment which I propose to offer, then many other deserving farmers can utilize Government credit in buying a home. Then we shall have really written into law a bill for which we shall not have to apologize when we go back home and confront the farmers of our districts.

Perhaps in the administration of this program we must in the beginning limit these loans to tenants who are best able financially to avail themselves of the opportunities offered by this act. As our experience increases and the farm-ownership program improves we can make the benefits of the act available to tenants who are less able financially. Eventually by this program we hope almost to obliterate farm tenancy in America. There are now many thousands of tenant farmers who, with a little assistance and encouragement, could take advantage of such a program and start on the happy, even though arduous, road to home ownership.

The Farm Credit Administration gets its money for financing Land Bank Commissioner loans through the Fedtral Farm Mortgage Corporation. In an amendment which I propose to offer I provide that we merely authorize the Farm Credit Administration through the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to issue bonds to the extent to some $50,000,000 for the first year and a greater sum in following years in order to finance the purpose of this bill. No direct appropriation is necessary. These bonds are guaranteed by the United States Government. By this method we will avoid an appropriation and increase from $10,000,000 to $50,000,000 the amount of money available to promote a farm-ownership program. This is the way we have financed land banks. Why should we not finance this program in the same manner, through the same successful channels as are now being employed by the Farm Credit Administration? Therefore, it seems to me we ought to amend the first title of the bill and say simply that we will turn over the administration of this bill to the Farm Credit Administration, rather than to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. MAHON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. MAHON of Texas. I know the gentleman is a member, and a very distinguished member, of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I have been a member of the committee for a good many years, and I may state that if the gentleman will talk to Dr. Myers, of the Farm Credit Administration, for 10 or 15 minutes, the gentleman may possibly find out why the administration of this bill has not been turned over to him.

Mr. MAHON of Texas. I know about the attitude of Dr. Myers, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, a distinguished member of this Administration. The fact that he opposes undertaking the administration of this measure is no reason why the great Congress of the United States should not place the responsibility where the responsibility belongs, because often the gentleman and I have to shoulder responsibilities that are not always pleasant. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAHON of Texas. With the unanimous consent of the House I here insert in the RECORD the amendments which I expect to offer when this bill, H. R. 7562, is read for amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out the following: "The Secretary of Agriculture hereinafter referred to as the Secretary", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The Farm Credit Administration."

AMENDMENT NO. 2

On page 2, section 1, line 7, after the word "title" and the comma, strike out all of the remainder of the sentence and insert the following: "No person shall receive a loan in excess of $6,000, nor shall he receive a loan in excess of 95 percent of the normal and reasonable value of the farm acquired by him under this title. The Farm Credit Administration shall give preference in making loans under this title to worthy and thrifty persons who appear to be good credit risks and who are married, or who have dependent families or who are owners of livestock and farming equipment necessary to successfully carry on farming operations. No person shall receive a loan for the purchase of a farm under this title who is able to finance such a purchase through the now existng laws, rules, and regulations of the Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner."

I expect to rephrase and to divide into several amendments the provisions of amendment no. 2 rather than offer it as here written.

AMENDMENT NO. 3

On page 5, beginning with line 13, strike out all of section 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "To carry out the provisions of this title the Farm Credit Administration through the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation is authorized to issue bonds under the rules and regulations as now prescribed in the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act of January 31, 1934, as amended, not to exceed $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and not to exceed $100,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1939, and June 30, 1940."

AMENDMENT NO. 4

In section 42, page 13, line 42, strike out all of paragraph (a) and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The directors and the secretary-treasurer of the National Farm Loan Association (who

are hereinafter called the committee) in each county in which activities are carried on under title 1 shall act in the several counties as the representative of the Farm Credit Administration in making loans under title 1."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to hear so much fuss about nothing. If ever a mountain labored and produced a mouse, this bill is it. We have heard a lot of lip service that we are going to make farm tenants farm owners. In the light of that lip service, this bill is a joke and a camouflage.

According to the statements of the gentlemen who preceded me and according to statistics, there are some 16,000,000 people who live on farms as farm tenants, counting members of their families. The total amount that will be appropriated under this bill for 3 years is $85,000,000, or just $5.31 for each of the 16,000,000 persons who live on farms as tenants.

There seems to be some difference as to whether the Department of Agriculture or the Farm Credit Administration should administer this law. I do not think it makes much difference to the tenants which Department administers it. There is this advantage in the Farm Credit Administration. The Farm Credit Administration, unless it changes its present course, would make about 20 tenants by mortgage foreclosures for every tenant that it would turn into a farm owner.

If we are sincere, and if this Congress is not to be accused of insincerity, why do we not go up to the Speaker's desk and sign petition no. 3 to bring up the Frazier-Lemke refinance bill? This bill will take care of any tenant who has operated a farm for 2 years by making him a loan up to $10,000, and, in addition, it will take care of the farmers who still own their farms, all at 1½ percent interest and 1½ percent principal on the amortization plan. It will take care of the farmers and the tenants of this Nation, not by issuing more tax-exempt interest-bearing bonds but by issuing a little more currency, which we ought to do in place of going further into the red.

Now, let us see the necessity of protecting the farmers who still own their farms as well as making tenants farm owners. In the first place, I am going to vote for this bill, because it is a toehold, in spite of the fact that it is camouflage and make-believe legislation. It will at least put the farm tenant in a position where he can ask for more help and keep on reminding this Administration, "You promised to make me a home owner, but you have not yet done so. Please do so now." I am sure future Congresses will have sufficient intelligence and will know enough to realize that the home is the foundation of this Nation and that they will ultimately pass intelligent legislation to save these homes.

Under this bill you have this situation. The Farm Credit Administration has taken 30,000 homes away from the farmers in a little more than 2 years by foreclosures. It has made 30,000 tenants, and under the provisions of this bill you cannot again make farm owners out of more than 8,000 in 3 years of these 30,000. Remember that the Farm Credit Administration is just one of the agencies which has made tenants. Hundreds and thousands of tenants are made each year by others foreclosing mortgages.

Again, the Farm Credit Administration, prior to the time that we guaranteed the interest on the $2,000,000,000 bonds with which it bailed out insurance companies and other mortgagees, handled about 11 percent of the farm mortgages. When we gave them that $2,000,000,000 with which to bail out the insurance companies, it did such a good job saving the insurance companies that now the Farm Credit Administration has 26.4 percent of the farm mortgages of this Nation.

Now that the insurance companies have been taken care of, the Federal land banks refuse to make loans to any farmer who really needs help. The only farmer who can get a loan through the Farm Credit Administration is the farmer who does not need it to save his farm, who can get it elsewhere. It is true, if he can get it from the Farm Credit Administration, he will get it for less interest. In my own State the Farm Credit Administration has withdrawn, and I believe they have withdrawn from other States. In place of eulogizing the Farm Credit Administration, let us get the facts straight. We should know the truth, even though the truth is not just what some would like to have.

Now, let us take a look at the home owners in the cities and towns. Nobody has talked about them. Again, petition no. 4 at the Speaker's desk will save their homes. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation to date has foreclosed on 99,937 homes. Get these figures and then get busy and do something for these home owners.

Let us save the homes of America. I may say that when we voted for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and for the $2,000,000,000 appropriation I knew and every Member of Congress knew that we would lose a lot of money. A home is a nonproductive place, and if the poor man did not have a job at the time he made the loan and has not had a job since, how can you expect him to pay?

Yet I feel the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the $2,000,000,000 was the best investment this Government has ever made. We need more home owners and then there will not be so many sit-down strikes. A person who has a home to protect will not want to destroy anything, and a person who has lost his home is ready to do a little destroying if necessary. Yet in spite of this fact we have foreclosed on 99,937 homes under the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Is this all that we are going to do for the home owners?

The number of farms changing ownership per thousand of all farms, by delinquent taxes, is 5.9; foreclosures and bankruptcy sales, 20.3, making a total of 26.2. The total number of farms in the United States, 6,812,350. Average size of the farms, 154 acres. Average value per farm, $4,823.

Applying the ratio of 26.2 per thousand farms lost through indebtedness in the year 1936 to 6,812,350 farms, we find the total number of farms lost through indebtedness in 1936 amounts to 178,483, involving approximately 26,486,382 acres and having a value of approximately $860,645,026, or about one-ninth of the total encumbered farms were lost through mortgage foreclosure and tax sales in 1936. This number is so staggering that we feel it should shock the conscience of every real American.

A few examples of mortgage foreclosures during the years 1935 and 1936

Oregon (estimated)	4,000
Delaware	626
Iowa:	
Sept. 1, 1936, to Mar. 1, 1937, farm foreclosures	1,032
Jan. 1, 1932, to Sept. 1, 1936, farm foreclosures	14,487
Maryland (estimated)	3,400
Indiana	9,484
Wyoming	714
Wisconsin:	
Farm foreclosures up to May 18, 1937	10,569
City and town foreclosures up to May 18, 1937	10,527
Arizona:	
Maricopa County	751
Estimate for entire State	2,500
New Jersey:	
Mortgage foreclosures	26,378
Tax foreclosures	4,895
Vermont	679
New Hampshire	753
Minnesota	8,349

In Chicago the Home Owners' Loan Corporation has foreclosed, up to last March, on 5,350 homes.

The time has arrived that this Congress must assume the responsibility of doing something real for agriculture. No amount of lip service, camouflage, and deception will fool the farmer forever. We have reached the point where we import practically 20 percent of our agricultural products and substitutes. The time has come when we must encourage agriculture and not discourage it, that we expand it and not restrict it. We must again make the former farmers, now tenants because of mortgage foreclosures,

home owners, otherwise our agricultural market will go to foreign nations.

The following agricultural commodities and substitutes were imported during the month of April 1937:

Animal and animal products (edible)	$10,137,280
Animal and animal products (inedible)	23,975,142
Vegetables, food products, and beverages	80,813,390
Vegetable products (inedible)	39,487,825
Textiles, fibers, and manufactures	47,846,004

Among others these imports consist of:

Cattle	head	56,015
Sheep and goats	do	3,186
Live hogs	pounds	556,931
Meat products	do	18,702,960
Pork	do	1,578,187
Canned beef	do	10,445,667
Hams, shoulders, and bacon	do	3,228,638
Pickled pork	do	427,052
Animal oils and fats	do	3,692,765
Dairy products		$1,480,252
Butter	pounds	1,130,167
Cheese	do	5,364,841
Fish	do	30,642,691

Yet our friends from Massachusetts have asked and received help from the Government to dispose of their fish.

Hides and skins	pounds	33,627,511
Barley	bushels	1,990,676
Corn	do	6,210,612

Also large quantities of rice and wheat.

The best way to accomplish this is for Members of Congress to go to the Speaker's desk and sign petitions nos. 2, 3, and 4. These petitions will bring up legislation that will protect the homes of the farmers and people in cities and towns and will give to the farmers the cost of production. May I ask the Members of Congress to sign these petitions now, because ultimately Congress will have to meet this situation intelligently.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this bill because it establishes a policy. This country is about 150 years old and this is the first time in the history of the country that an effort has been made by the National Congress to establish a policy for the benefit of the tenant farmers, and I am very pleased to support the legislation.

NOT CURE-ALL

I do not claim that this bill is a cure-all, it merely approaches the problem from one angle. To my mind it can be approached in a more substantial and effective way from a different angle. This bill merely gives the tenant farmer who receives such a loan an opportunity to get a start. In order for this new home owner, the former tenant, to be successful, he must receive a fair price for what he produces.

PRICE MAIN THING

There are several factors which must be considered in connection with the farm problem. The real cause of farm tenancy is the extremely low prices which farmers have been forced to accept. They have been forced to sell at the world's price in competition with the cheapest labor in the world, and have been forced to buy in the protected market and pay a high price. It is my belief that the time has come when it is the Government's duty to force higher prices for farm products. Farmers should receive at least 20 cents a pound for cotton and a dollar a bushel for corn, with other prices in proportion. If they were to receive such prices, I doubt that it would be necessary for the Government to assist them in purchasing homes, as they would doubtless be able to borrow money locally at a reasonable rate of interest and purchase a home of their own choice without the necessity of troubling the Government in any way. With a good price, the farmers do not need much help; without a good price it is doubtful that they can pay for any kind of a home on any kind of terms which may be furnished by the Government. No class in America works as hard and gets as little for it as the farmers.

PROBLEM ALSO APPROACHED FROM ANOTHER ANGLE

While we are endeavoring to assist the tenant farmer in owning a home, we are not stopping there; other legislation has been enacted and new legislation is being proposed, having for its purpose better prices for the farmers, so the problem is really being approached from both angles, the angle of easier money for home ownership, easier from the standpoint of long-term money with low interest rates to make home ownership possible, and from the standpoint of better prices, which will enable the new home owners to pay for their homes and enjoy economic security.

IF FARMERS ARE PROSPEROUS, COUNTRY IS PROSPEROUS

Ever since I have been in Congress I have insisted that we must give the farmers a fair price or the problem could not be solved. Price is the main thing. There are 36,000,000 people in this Nation who are dependent upon farming for a living. This number includes the farm owners, tenants, sharecroppers, their wives and children, and the hired hands and their wives and children. If these 36,000,000 people receive a fair price, they have money to buy what other people produce in other sections of the country as well as their own. They can buy what other classes and groups have manufactured and are desirous of selling. The farmers represent enough of the American market to cause this country to be prosperous if they are prosperous, and to cause it to suffer if they suffer. In every speech that I have made in this Nation—to business groups and members of different organizations—I have brought out the point that other classes and groups must realize that the farmers must be made prosperous before they themselves can be assured of remaining prosperous. This was done to cultivate sentiment in favor of the farmer. Other classes and groups are dependent upon the farmers and they must be made to realize it.

FARMERS NOT SUFFICIENTLY HELPED

Although much has been done during the past 4 years in the direction of helping the farmer by a better price, and in other ways, we have not done enough. The kind of help the farmer needs the most is protection from greedy interests, equality of opportunity, and a fair price, all of which are in the public interest. After the hand of greed and special privilege is taken from the farmer's throat he will have an opportunity to better work and earn a living for himself and family. Then, with a fair price, the farmers will be helped and the Nation will be helped. It is one of the first duties of government to protect the weak against the strong. If other classes, interests, and groups were not assisted and there were no monopolies or trusts, there would be little or no demand for farm relief.

TWENTY-FOUR TO FORTY PERCENT INTEREST

When I was a tenant farmer it was the custom in the community where I lived for farmers to pay 10 percent interest for a whole year, although they used the money borrowed for a short time. Those who extended the loans did not become rich making them, as such loans were very risky, and losses tremendous. Misfortunes overtook many, and they could not pay. Nevertheless, farmers contracted to pay in many instances from 24 to 40 percent interest. The 2 years that I was a tenant farmer I paid 24 percent interest myself. Since I have been a Member of Congress it has been my pleasure to assist in the formation of governmental agencies that have forced down the rate of interest. Feed and seed loans are an example. The farmer, through this organization, pays about $2 for the use of $100 during the crop season instead of $10 as under the old system. The production credit associations have assisted materially in reducing interest rates. The Federal land banks, assisted by the Farm Credit Administration which was created by this administration, during the past few years have permitted the farmer borrowers to enjoy the lowest rate of interest that the farmers of any nation in the world have ever enjoyed in the history of the world; interest rates must continue low. All these things are great accomplishments, but, after all, the farmer can pay a good rate of interest if he gets a fair price, and he cannot pay even a low rate of interest if he does not get a good price, so price is more important to the farmer than anything else.

ELECTRIFYING THE FARM

Rural electrification is being encouraged by this administration. The program has expanded rapidly in certain areas

where low-priced electricity is available. Over a long period the farmers are going to be helped tremendously in this way. Electricity is one of the greatest blessings of mankind; low-priced electricity will remove much of the drudgery from the farm and will especially take many of the back-breaking duties from the housewife. The Denison Dam will, in all probability, be constructed on Red River near Denison, Tex. When it is completed, low-priced electricity will be available to all the farmers in the district that I have the honor to represent. This is interesting information and looks good for the future, but at the present time our farmers need a good price—not an unreasonable price—they are not asking for that; just enough to allow them to make a decent living, educate their children, provide comforts and conveniences for themselves and their families, and fair assurance of an opportunity to enjoy economic security in the future.

LOANS NOT AS IMPORTANT AS PRICE

Cotton is the principal money crop in the district I represent. When the farmer picks his cotton, he carries it to a gin to have the lint separated from the seed, and to have the cotton baled in order that he may sell it. The cotton gin usually charges a fair price for ginning and baling the cotton. If all the cotton gins were in distress and needed help, we could not cure their problem by extending loans over long terms at a low rate of interest. It would be necessary to give them a better price for ginning in order to entirely solve their problem; the loan would be helpful, but without a sufficient price for ginning they could not pay the loan or the interest. With a good price they probably would not need the loan and could pay a better rate of interest. The farmers are in the same situation; although the loans at a low rate will be helpful they will not solve their problem. The ginners with few exceptions receive a fair price and for that reason there is no demand from them for help, and if there were such a demand I am sure that it would be a demand for better prices for ginning instead of loans at low rates of interest.

RAILROADS RECEIVE HIGH RATES FOR TRANSPORTING FARMERS' PRODUCTS

When the farmer sells his cotton, the cost of transporting it to the markets of the world is taken into consideration in the price that the farmer receives. In other words, the transportation companies, including railroads, steamships, barges, and trucks must have a fair price for transporting the cotton. When the railroads need help, when they are not making a fair return, it is not loans providing a low rate of interest that they clamor for but it is higher freight rates. If the railroads receive freight rates sufficiently high, they can obtain their own loans, and are able to pay the interest rate required, but if they do not receive a fair rate it will be difficult for them to pay back any kind of a loan providing no interest rate at all.

OTHERS HANDLING FARMERS' PRODUCTS RECEIVE FAIR PRICE

Many farmers produce perishables for the market. They are compelled to pay not only a fair return to the telegraph and telephone companies, whose facilities they must use in order to find a market at the best price for their products, but they must also pay a fair return to the railroad company for transporting such products. The Government, through its different agencies, and through the Federal courts of this country compels the people to pay a fair price for services to telephone, telegraph, and railroad companies. Any electric light company, water company, telephone company, or gas company can go into any Federal court in this Nation and obtain an order that will force the people to pay a fair price for their services to guarantee them a fair return.

FARMERS PROVIDE PROFIT TO OTHERS

Since the Government has been so kind to such corporations, it occurs to me that it is time for our Government to make sure that the original producers of our Nation receive a fair price. They should not be compelled to destroy themselves by hard labor and receive nothing for it in order merely to provide business and profit for those who handle what they produce.

WAGE EARNERS' PROBLEM NOT SOLVED BY LOANS

The one who works and produces on the farm, on the ranch, in the orchard, or in the dairy makes a real contribution toward the success and prosperity of our entire Nation. The raw materials usually must be processed or manufactured in some way and, in practically all cases, must be transported and distributed.

There are about 40,000,000 people, including families, dependent upon wage earning for a livelihood. Much has been done in the direction of giving these wage earners a fair wage. It is right that they should receive a fair wage. By receiving fair wages they have purchasing power which they can use to pay the farmers, original producers, and other classes and groups fair prices. At the same time our Government has done so much in the direction of forcing higher wages, I am not convinced that the same efforts have been put forth to give the farmers and other producers a fair price. When wage earners need help, it is not long-term loans providing for a low rate of interest that they want; it is better wages. With good wages they can usually obtain their own loans locally and pay the rate of interest required. With insufficient wages it would be difficult for them to pay any kind of a loan providing for any kind of interest or no interest. The way to help the wage earners is to give them fair and sufficient wages. The best way to help the farmers, including tenants, is to give them fair prices. Practically all other problems will disappear with fair prices and fair wages.

FIXED PRICES FOR OTHERS, BUT NOT FOR FARMERS

Distributors of finished products receive, with exceptions of course, a fair price for distributing the products to the ultimate consumer. The consumer is required to pay the set and fixed prices exacted by the railroad, telegraph, telephone, electric, gas, and water companies which enter into the price of the finished article, and to pay distribution costs which in many cases are fixed and in other cases competitive, and such price as the original producer is permitted to receive. If the retailers and other distributors in our country were complaining because they were not making enough money and were demanding relief from the Government, they would not want long-time loans with low rates of interest without also receiving assistance in the form of better returns for their services. While long-term loans with low interest rates are always desirable, fair prices and fair wages are more desirable.

SELLS IN WORLD MARKET, BUYS IN PROTECTED MARKET

In addition to all these fixed and set charges, the farmer sells his produce in competition with the produce grown in other countries with cheap coolie and peon labor in the markets of the world at the world price. When the farmer buys finished products, he pays an increased price by reason of the tariff. Selling in a world market and buying in a protected market is very detrimental to farmers' interest.

FARMERS RECEIVE 5 CENTS AND 10 CENTS AN HOUR

The farmer is the steel manufacturer's best customer. The Government has assisted in the formulation of policies that recently increased wages to workmen in the steel mills. By reason of this increase in wages steel was increased in price $6 a ton. The Government also has a tariff on the importation of steel, which permits the steel companies to profit by a higher price. In this case the Government has forced a higher and fixed price on one of the principal commodities needed by the farmer by causing increased fixed wages and providing a tariff duty on steel. Therefore the Government should either assist the farmer in receiving a fair price or fixed prices and fixed wages for others through the help of the Government should be abandoned; monopolies, trusts, and price-fixing eliminated; and the farmer privileged to benefit through competition caused thereby. If it were possible to repeal all laws and abandon all policies, which give special privileges, fixed prices, and special benefits and prevent all monopolies and trusts, possibly that would be a better approach to the problem than the Government assisting the farmers with a higher price, but we know that is not prob-

able. So, the easiest approach to the problem is to assist the farmer in obtaining a fair price in order that he may be placed on a parity with industry.

Workers in certain lines of work are receiving as much as $20 a day or $2 an hour. Wage earners generally are receiving from 70 cents to $2 an hour. Contrast this with 10 cents an hour on the farm and I believe that a substantial number of our farm hired hands and small farmers, if the work of their wives and children is considered, do not make 5 cents an hour, and with that 5 cents an hour they must clothe and feed themselves and families. This is a shame. It is a disgrace. It should be corrected immediately.

FARM HOME OWNERSHIP DESIRABLE

This bill, providing long terms at a low rate of interest, will be helpful to many worthy and deserving tenant farmers. For that reason I am supporting it, but it is not a solution of the farmers' problems. The increase in farm tenancy is alarming, and we cannot solve it by loans and interest rates alone. Ownership makes better citizenship. We must do everything in our power to afford every American citizen an opportunity to own a home. To grant him a loan at a low-interest rate is one way to start, but he cannot remain a home owner unless he receives a fair price. With home ownership waste is discouraged and the soil is conserved, and the Nation is thereby helped. If farmers receive a fair price, loan agencies all over this Nation will quickly clamor for the opportunity of extending loans to the farmers for all purposes that they need loans.

PRICE FIXING FOR FARMERS

During more than 8 years that I have served in Congress I have worked unceasingly in behalf of a program that will permit a farm family which is farming for a livelihood to receive a sufficient price to permit a fair minimum income. I believe that the price of cotton should be fixed at least 20 cents a pound, wheat at least $1.50 a bushel, and corn at a dollar, and other commodities in proportion, to the farmers who are working on a farm and are dependent upon a farm for a livelihood, in order to enable them to earn a minimum of a thousand dollars a year at these prices. If it is right for the Government to force fair minimum wages for the workers, it is also right, and equally right, that a fair minimum annual return be allowed a farmer if he actually produces a sufficient amount at a fair price to earn it.

For instance, if a farmer produced 10 bales of cotton, 500 pounds to a bale, at 20 cents a pound, he would receive a thousand dollars. Regardless of the price of cotton, the Government would protect him to that amount. If he only produced 1 bale, he would receive 20 cents a pound, or $100, and no more. The same plan could be used for other products. There would be no protection above that amount, and there would be no protection to one who was growing cotton for speculation or for profit only, and who was not actually engaged in working on the farm, unless he profited as a farm owner. Under this plan there would be a demand for tenants, as the landlords would get better rent. Those who wanted to sell land would have plenty of buyers whose credit would be good. During this time I have appeared before congressional committees advocating this proposal. I have visited officials of our Government on numerous occasions and discussed this program at length. I have worked with national and local farm leaders who had the interest of the farmer at heart. The only dinner that I know of that was ever given for the farmers of this country in their name and for their benefit in the Capitol of the United States I gave about 2 months ago to the members of the Committee on Agriculture in the House, agricultural leaders who were in Washington, and to officials of the Department of Agriculture, for the sole and only purpose of having an opportunity to discuss with all of them at the same time the seriousness of the farm problem, and the absolute necessity of permitting every farm family to receive a fair price for what is produced up to a fair annual income, which should certainly not be less than $1,000. I have insisted upon a family allotment. At these meetings and conferences much encouragement has been received, and I believe that we are making headway, but our gains have been slow. Oftentimes it has appeared discouraging. The fight will continue, so far as I am concerned, until the farmer gets a square deal. I cannot understand the reasoning of a person who insists that every corporation and individual that handles what the farmer produces or has anything to do with what he produces should receive protection from the Government to the extent of minimum wages, maximum hours, fair rates of interest, and guaranteed profits, but who is not in favor of providing for a minimum annual income for a farm family where that farm family actually produces a sufficient amount to justify it if fair and decent prices are paid.

CONSIDERATION DIFFICULT TO GET

A Member of Congress, in order to be effective in the advocacy of any proposal that he believes will be helpful, must spend considerable time and effort building up sentiment in favor of the proposal before there is a committee hearing and before it reaches the floor of the House or Senate in the form of a bill. With 15,000 bills usually pending in Congress, it is a difficult matter to get consideration of any one proposal.

Last month, in order to get the attention of a large number of Members of Congress on farm legislation and issues helpful to the farmer, I sponsored a boat trip on the Potomac River. The trip lasted all day and on a boat, we were away from everything that would be calculated to disturb us. Attending the meeting on the boat there were more than 100 Members of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate; all except one of the southern commissioners of agriculture; officials of the Department of Agriculture; high officials of the W. P. A.; other such recognized farm leaders as the Honorable Lawrence Westbrook, of Texas, and such unselfish citizens who have demonstrated their interest in the farmer as ex-United States Senator Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma, framer of the Federal Reserve Act; the Honorable Robert Hemphill, financial writer for magazines and daily newspapers, and for 25 years credit manager of the Federal Reserve bank at Atlanta, Ga.; Prof. Irving Fisher, of Yale University; and another one of the finest characters I have ever known, Mr. Dale Carnegie, who is the author of America's best book seller, How to Win Friends and Influence People. We spent the entire day with short talks and discussions. In this way the importance of the farmers' problem and the extreme necessity for it to be solved at an early date in order to help the entire country was emphasized. The money question, as it relates to the farmers' welfare, was especially discussed. The following resolution, which is self-explanatory, was later forwarded to me:

Meeting at Washington, D. C., June 6–8, 1937.

Presiding: Harry D. Wilson, Commissioner of Agriculture, Baton Rouge, La.

"Whereas Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, has rendered great and valuable service in giving our people monetary relief through his patriotic efforts to restore to the Congress their constitutional right to coin and regulate the value of money:

"*Be it resolved*, That the southern commissioners of agriculture in behalf of the southern farmers and agriculture express our sincere and deep appreciation for this service rendered by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN.

"*Be it further resolved*, That the secretary be authorized to deliver a copy of this resolution to Congressman PATMAN."

I hereby certify that this is a true copy of the resolution passed by the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture at a meeting held in Washington, D. C., June 8, 1937.

C. C. HANSON, *Secretary*.

In order for the farmer to get the protection he is entitled to receive, Members of Congress and the people generally must be sold on the fact that his cause is just and that the entire Nation will be benefited by helping the farmer.

With public sentiment for the farmers they will be successful in their fight, but without public sentiment success is improbable.

LANDLORDS

The tenants are not the only farmers who are in need of price protection. There is another class of farmers that has suffered greatly, and especially during the depression.

That is the class that owns their land or that holds title to their land although they owe for it. During the worst years of the depression, the landlords were required to pay taxes and pay interest on the debt, make principal payments, to keep up the fences, the houses, and make other necessary improvements. The tenants, although they suffered along with the landlords by reason of the low prices, they were privileged to occupy the houses of the landlords and use their improvements, and if a crop was made, the tenant received his share, but if it was not made, the tenant did not lose anything on the land, buildings, or improvements, and was not compelled to pay interest or taxes.

FARMER'S CREDIT NOT GOOD WITHOUT PRICE ASSURANCE

If the Government will adopt a policy of allowing a fair price for a sufficient amount of farm products to each farm family to allow that farm family to earn a thousand dollars a year at a fair price, which will entitle them to it, then the landlord will be benefited not only as an owner but by higher rent, and if the landlord desires to sell a part of his land, the tenant will be in a position to buy it. If the tenant knows what he is going to receive if he works and earns it, his credit, according to his standing in the community, will become valuable. If the farmer's credit is restored, landlords will be wanting tenants, and farm owners will be wanting to sell land to them. As long, however, as the farmer has no assurance of what he is going to receive, his credit will not be good, his earning power very limited as it is now, landlords will prefer machinery to tenants, and the tenants cannot buy and pay for farm homes.

WORK AND KNOWLEDGE REQUIRED OF FARMERS

In order for one to operate a farm he must be a hard worker. He must get up early in the morning and work until late at night. The hardest kind of manual labor is involved. He must keep up with the weather and have a fair knowledge of soil, fertilizer, germination of seeds, cultivation of crops, extermination of the many different kinds of pests and insects, and proper handling and marketing of the matured production. This requires considerable knowledge as well as work. It is my belief that workers in industry, who receive a dollar an hour and more, are not required to have the knowledge and information that farmers are required to possess, and they are not required to do anything like the hard work that farmers are required to do. A farmer can work hard all the year, and a few minutes' hail, or a flood, or a few weeks' drought will destroy all of his labor. The death of livestock, or illness in his family, or any one of many other misfortunes may take everything that he makes during the whole year. No class or group works so hard, must possess so much information and knowledge, must run so many risks and receive so little for it, with no assurance of any income whatsoever, as the farmers of this country. Yet they feed and clothe the world. Without them the health, happiness, and prosperity of all the other people in the Nation would be endangered if not destroyed. Our Government has helped practically every other class, group, interest, or business, but to that great class or group to whom we are so greatly indebted as a Nation and who has been thereby placed at a disadvantage, so little has been done.

TAXES AND INTEREST

Lower taxes will help the farmer; so has lower interest rates helped the farmer. But a fair price will help him more than anything. If he did not have to pay interest at all or any taxes at all, if he does not receive a better price than he has in the past, he would not be earning a livelihood. If all of the farmers in this Nation used the cost-accounting methods that industry uses, I doubt that a half dozen farms in America would make a net profit, and all the farms combined would have a several hundred million dollar loss each year.

PRESENT ADMINISTRATION HELPED

In connection with what this administration has done to help the farmer, it is interesting to note that in 1932 it required two bales of cotton for a farmer to pay the interest on a thousand-dollar loan, whereas in 1936 it required only one-half bale to pay the interest on a thousand-dollar loan. It required 160 bushels of corn to pay the interest on a thousand-dollar loan in 1932, but only 40 bushels in 1936; it required 140 bushels of wheat in 1932, but only 50 bushels of wheat in 1936; it required a 1,200-pound beef to pay the interest in 1932, but only a 600-pound beef would pay the same interest in 1936. This administration has helped the farmer substantially, and is now sponsoring other measures calculated to be of great and lasting benefit to all farmers, tenants, and farm owners.

SURPLUS

Much has been said about the surplus cotton and surplus farm products. I am not so sure about other products, but I am reasonably certain that if all of the people in America could buy the cotton products that are needed and that could be used for desirable and not wasteful purposes, we would not have a cotton surplus. I recall that when every third row of cotton was plowed up, Negroes were seen clad only in a jute rag, which was wrapped around them, plowing up this cotton. Jute is produced in India and not in America.

PROUD PEOPLE ON FARM

People who live on the farm are proud people. They have pride; they take interest in the building and the development of the home, the church, and the school. Half of the people in this Nation would be in tears if they only knew how hard the farmers and their families work and how little they can possibly accomplish in proportion to their efforts. Home-demonstration agents and county agents are very helpful. They have assisted the farmers in many ways, and their wives are assisted in the preservation and canning of fruits, vegetables, and meats necessary and desirable for home consumption. These savings are very beneficial; but, after all, the farmers need more than something to eat; they need other comforts the same as other people. They want to educate their children; they want to enjoy conveniences that other people enjoy. They are entitled to these privileges and benefits and they are possible only with a fair price for what they produce. I have visited the homes of some of the poorest tenant farmers. I will describe one that I visited.

The floor of the house was as clean as it could be kept; there were beautiful flowers in the yard; the house was tidy and just as nice as it was possible to make it. No electricity, no gas for fuel, no running water. It was evidently a cold place in the winter and a hot place in the summer. Although the furniture was crude and old, and there were no rugs on the floor, no tablecloths on the table, and no towels except what they had made from sacks in which they bought things from the stores and used in making towels, it was a real home, like one of the thousands of such homes where some of the best people in the Nation reside; and from such humble homes some of our greatest men and women were born and reared. Too much cannot be said in praise of the good, enterprising farm wife who accomplished wonders under such adverse circumstances. It seems a shame to me that these people who work so hard and grow cotton are not permitted to actually buy a sufficient amount of the products that are made from cotton to furnish them with the simple comforts of life. This, to my mind, is partly caused by a fallacious monetary system. If it is corrected, the farmers will get a better price. Money is a vehicle which is just as necessary to transport goods to consumers as boxcars. If the amount of money, including bank deposits, is increased, everything the farmers produce is increased in proportion. If money becomes dear, everything else becomes cheap. I will not discuss the money question further than to say that much can be done in the direction of helping the farmers by giving them a better price by perfecting the monetary system.

CONCLUSION

I submit the following for consideration:

First. The Government should, if necessary, arbitrarily fix the prices of the basic farm commodities at a price that

will allow a farm family to earn a decent living if they produce a sufficient quantity of such products at such fair price to justify it.

Second. Taxes and interest should be made just as low on the farmers as possible until at least they are in a position to enjoy economic security by reason of good prices and on a parity with industry.

Third. Good prices and good wages are both necessary and desirable, since it is only through good prices and good wages that the American people pay their debts. If wages and prices are reduced 50 percent, the debt and tax burden of the people, in what they have to pay with, will be increased 100 percent, and vice versa.

Fourth. The 12 Federal Reserve banks should be owned by the Government and operated in the interest of all the people, banks, industry, and commerce instead of being owned by private banking corporations as at present.

Fifth. So many tax-exempt interest-bearing bonds have been issued that the rich are becoming richer and the poor are becoming poorer. The poor people of the Nation are being compelled to pay taxes upon what they owe and upon what they consume to support the different governments from local to Federal. No more interest-bearing tax-exempt bonds should be issued.

Sixth. We must place a noose where there is now a loophole in our tax laws. It appears that corporations are entitled to more rights than citizens, since citizens are incorporating to escape taxes. It appears that foreign corporations are entitled to more rights than even an American citizen or American corporation, since foreign corporations are being used to escape taxes. Holding companies are unnecessary. They do not serve a useful or constructive purpose. They are merely used to avoid taxes, shirk responsibility, and mislead the investing public, and they should be abolished.

Seventh. It is idiotic and imbecillic for the Government to pay interest on its own credit. If this is corrected, the Government will save almost a billion dollars a year, and it can be corrected if the Government should purchase the stock and own and operate the 12 Federal Reserve banks.

Eighth. Monopolies and trusts should be broken up. The Department of Justice has recently commenced action to dissolve the Aluminum Trust. A judge, appointed by President Harding, evidently approved by the "Ohio gang" and admittedly had the endorsement of Andrew W. Mellon, has granted an injunction restraining our United States Attorney General, something that never happened before in this country, from bringing any suit against Mellon and the Aluminum Co., except in his court to be presided over by himself. Mr. Robert H. Jackson, Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, says that a judicial monopoly is sought, as well as the aluminum monopoly.

Ninth. Independent business, locally owned and owner operated, should be encouraged instead of absentee ownership. The boys and girls of the future should not be denied an opportunity because they do not have sufficient acquaintance or pull with some New York banker, who owns or controls the local business. The Department of Agriculture has recently had to go into the market with Government funds and buy potatoes because a few large national concerns handling potatoes had so depressed the market that the farmers were being robbed. Corporations should not have so much power, as they will certainly abuse it; other similar instances could be cited.

FIGHT WILL CONTINUE

My family has been attached to the soil of America for more than 300 years. John Patman, my ancestor, came from England on the ship *Peter Bonaventure*, landed near Jamestown, Va., in 1635. Ever since that time our family has owned and worked on land. Therefore, by reason of having been a farmer myself, my father was a farmer, my grandfather was a farmer, and my family for more than 300 years having been attached to the soil of this great country, I have inherited a loyalty and affection for the farm and the problems of the farmer. I am hoping that I can make a substantial contribution toward solving the major problems of the farmer. If I can assist in giving to that great class of public-spirited, patriotic people, the farmers, who help to build and sustain our country in time of peace and who help to save our country in time of war, that measure of justice they should receive from a grateful Government, I shall feel that my service in Congress has not been in vain. My efforts in that direction will continue.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1938—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6523) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri calls up a conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6523) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 33, 34, 36, 39, 41, 44, 49, 51, 58, 60, 68, 74, 77, 79, 80, 82, 83, 84, 87, 89, 93, 96, 97, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 110, 112, 114, 115, 118, 121, 122, 123, 128, 129, 135, and 136.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 15, 32, 35, 40, 42, 46, 47, 48, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 62, 65, 67, 70, 71, 72, 75, 76, 92, 94, 95, 107, 108, 109, 111, 113, 120, 127, 130, and 133, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$887,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,254,130"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,232,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,463,546"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,342,870"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,190,179"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,703,049"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$633,199"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$703,694"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter

stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "including not exceeding $80,000 for acquisition of additional land, notwithstanding the limitations of said act of March 4, 1927,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$122,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,833,048"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$638,403"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$14,116,596"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$18,892,182"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$196,243"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,425,431"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$460,860"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,711,398"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$171,149"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,127,840"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$48,785"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$423,169"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$460,769"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,162,698"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,212,698"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$190,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$22,175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$24,390,780"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 125: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 125, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *And provided further,* That the funds provided by section 32 of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes', approved August 24, 1935 (U. S. C., Supp. II, title 7, sec. 612c), shall be available during the fiscal year 1938 for administrative expenses in such sums as the President may direct in carrying out the provisions of said section, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to the employment of persons and means by Agricultural Adjustment Administration"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 131: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$12,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 132: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$7,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 88, 124, 126, and 134.

CLARENCE CANNON,
M. C. TARVER,
WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD,
WILLIAM R. THOM,
CHARLES H. LEAVY,
W. D. MCFARLANE,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL, JR.,
CARL HAYDEN,
ROYAL S. COPELAND,
E. D. SMITH,
GERALD P. NYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6523) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Correction of totals, allocations, etc.

The following amendments relate to the corrections of totals, allocations, transfers, clarifications of the text, etc.:

Amendments nos. 4, 5, 8, 11, 13, 17, 19, 24, 27, 31, 32, 38, 40, 42, 50, 53, 59, 61, 63, 66, 70, 78, 83, 84, 85, 86, 91, 92, 98, 100, 103, 104, 106, 108, 109, 117, 118, 119, 120, and 132.

"Other necessary expenses"

The following amendments relate to the action of the Senate in striking out the words "other necessary expenses" or words of similar import in the several paragraphs to which the amendments apply. As to each and all of these amendments the Senate has receded. The amendments are:

Amendments nos. 3, 6, 9, 14, 18, 25, 26, 28, 33, 34, 36, 39, 44, 51, 77, 79, 87, 89, 93, 97, 99, 101, 114, 115, 121, 128, 129, 135, and 136.

Office of the Secretary

On amendment no. 1, salaries: Appropriates $452,700, as proposed by the House, instead of $442,700, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 2, spray residue investigations: Retains the Senate provision that no part of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used for laboratory investigations to determine the possible harmful effect on human beings of spray insecticides on fruits and vegetables.

Office of the Solicitor

On amendment no. 7, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $194,160, as proposed by the House, instead of $195,780, as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Information

On amendment no. 10, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $366,480, as proposed by the House, instead of $363,282, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 12, printing and binding: Appropriates $887,650, instead of $894,250, as proposed by the House, and $864,250, as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Experiment Stations

On amendment no. 15, payments to Hawaii: Appropriates $50,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $60,000, as proposed by the House.

On amendment no. 16, payments to States under Bankhead-Jones Act: Appropriates $1,800,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Special research fund

On amendment no. 20: Appropriates $1,200,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Extension Service

On amendment no. 21, supplementary cooperative extension work: Appropriates $790,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,185,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 22, extension work under Bankhead-Jones Act: Appropriates $10,000,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $9,800,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 23, additional cooperative extension work: Appropriates $500,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $750,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Weather Bureau

On amendment no. 29, general weather service and research: Retains the Senate increases of $23,920 for flood-warning service in the Pittsburgh, Pa., region, $10,000 for restoration of weather station at Dayton, Ohio, and $10,000 for restoration of weather station at Greenville, S. C. Eliminates the Senate increase of $5,000 above an increase of the same amount granted by the House for additional weather service to citrus growers of California.

On amendment no. 30, aerology: Eliminates the Senate increases of $35,000 for the substitution of a numeral code for the present word code and of $57,771 for the replacement of Army airplane flights by contract flights at five Army airfields in connection with daily observations of upper air conditions. Retains the remaining $501,090 of the Senate increase for general improvement and strengthening of the airways weather service.

Bureau of Animal Industry

On amendment no. 35, marketing agreements with respect to hog cholera virus and serum: Retains the Senate amendment making $30,000 of Agricultural Adjustment Administration funds available for effecting such agreements.

Bureau of Dairy Industry

On amendment no. 37, dairy investigations: Retains the Senate increase of $6,600 for the development of commercial sources for the utilization of skim milk, buttermilk, and whey, and for the commercial introduction of processes for manufacturing milk products. Eliminates the remaining Senate increase of $14,801.

Bureau of Plant Industry

On amendment no. 41, forest pathology: Appropriates $259,592, as provided by the House, instead of $252,092, as provided by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 43 and 45, National Aboretum: Provides an increase of $80,000, instead of $90,000, as proposed by the House, and restores the language of the House, stricken out by the Senate, amended to read as follows: "Including not exceeding $80,000 for acquisition of additional land, notwithstanding the limitations of said act of March 4, 1927."

On amendment no. 46, nematology: Includes the Senate increase of $5,000 for work on nematodes in narcissus and other bulbs.

On amendment no. 47, rubber and other tropical plants: Appropriates $46,749, as provided by the Senate, instead of $40,000, as provided by the House.

On amendment no. 48, seed investigations: Appropriates $72,293, as provided by the Senate, instead of $67,293, as provided by the House.

On amendment no 49, sugar-plant investigations: Retains the House increase of $16,700 for establishment of sugar-plant-experiment station in Mississippi.

Forest Service

On amendment no. 52, National Forest Administration: Retains the Senate increase of $10,000 for recreation and special land use developments.

On amendment no. 54, forest management: Retains the Senate increases of $9,909 for pinion-juniper and other woodland types of the Southwest and of $7,500 for conversion of brush fields in northern California into valuable timber stands. Eliminates the Senate increase of $7,500 for planting and reforestation studies in the Central States.

On amendment no. 55, range investigations: Retains the Senate increase of $10,000 for studies in the control of shrub invasions on semidesert ranges of the Southwest.

On amendment no. 56, forest products: Retains the Senate increases of $10,000 for studies in the utilization of new woods for paper making, and of $10,000 for studies in chemical seasoning of wood.

On amendment no. 57, forest economics: Retains the Senate increase of $15,000 for range economics investigations in the intermountain region.

On amendment no. 58, forest influences: Restores the House increase of $10,000.

On amendment no. 60, acquisition of lands for national forests: Appropriates $3,000,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $2,500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 62, acquisition of lands for national forests: Eliminates the House provision that $1,000,000 of the sum appropriated shall be available only for purchase of lands in purchase units where as much as 20 percent of the lands within such purchase units have not heretofore been acquired.

Bureau of Chemistry and Soils

On amendment no. 64, industrial utilization of farm products and byproducts: Provides an increase of $10,000 for plastic investigations, instead of the increase of $20,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 65, naval stores investigations: Retains the Senate increase of $2,159 for the employment of two night watchmen at the experiment station at Olustee, Fla.

Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine

On amendments no. 67 and no. 68, Japanese beetle control: Retains the Senate increase of $25,000 in this appropriation and eliminates the Senate provision that $40,000 of the total appropriation shall only be available for cooperation with the State of Maryland.

On amendment no. 69, sweetpotato weevil: Appropriates $75,000, instead of $50,000 as provided by the House and $100,000 as provided by the Senate.

On amendments no. 71 and no. 72, forest insects: Retains the Senate increase of $39,738 in this appropriation and the Senate provision that $40,000 of the appropriation shall only be available for expenditure when matched by State funds:

On amendment no. 73, Dutch elm disease: Appropriates $460,860, instead of $421,720 as proposed by the House and $500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 74, insects affecting man and animals: Retains the House increase of $10,000 for ticks in the vicinity of Martha's Vineyard Island, Mass.

On amendment no. 75, transit inspection: Appropriates $44,059, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $36,559, as proposed by the House.

On amendment no. 76, foreign plant quarantines: Appropriates $680,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $661,728, as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Biological Survey

On amendment no. 80, food habits of birds and animals: Appropriates $68,140, as proposed by the House, instead of $75,640, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 81, biological investigations: Retains $18,000 of the House increase of $42,000 for the establishment of three new regional stations for cooperative studies of wildlife.

On amendment no. 82, control of predatory animals and injurious rodents: Retains the House increase of $12,000 for work on rodents harmful to orchard trees in the northeastern States.

Bureau of Agricultural Engineering

On amendment no. 90, agricultural engineering investigations: Appropriates $423,169, instead of $415,669 as proposed by the House and $430,669 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics

On amendment no. 94, farm management and practice: Appropriates $376,580, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $386,580, as proposed by the House.

On amendment no. 95, marketing and distributing farm products: Retains the Senate increase of $7,500 for studies of Federal, State, and local regulations affecting trade in agricultural products.

On amendment no. 96, Tobacco Inspection Act: Retains the House increase of $25,000.

Bureau of Home Economics

On amendment no. 102, home economics investigations: Appropriates $213,350, as proposed by the House, instead of $188,350, as proposed by the Senate.

Enforcement of the Commodity Exchange Act

On amendment no. 105, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $500,000, instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House and $590,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Food and Drug Administration

An amendment no. 107, enforcement of the Food and Drugs Act: Appropriates $1,750,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,700,000, as proposed by the House.

Soil Conservation Service

On amendment no. 110, cost of buildings: Retains the House limitation of $15,000, instead of the Senate limitation of $10,000, upon the cost of not to exceed 20 buildings.

On amendment no. 111, construction of buildings: Retains the Senate provision prohibiting the erection of buildings on land not owned by the Government.

On amendment no. 112, general administrative expenses: Appropriates $675,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $600,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 113: Retains the Senate provision that no part of the appropriation for administrative expenses shall be available if any emergency or other appropriations are made available for administrative expenses in administering the funds provided in regular appropriations to the Soil Conservation Service.

On amendment no. 116, soil and moisture demonstrations: Appropriates $22,175,000, instead of $22,225,000 as proposed by the House and $22,125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Crop benefit payments for soil-conserving practices

On amendments nos. 122 and 123, conservation and use of agricultural land resources: Appropriates $500,000,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $440,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 125, administrative expenses in carrying out section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes": Restores the language stricken out by the Senate, amended to read as follows: ": *And provided further*, That the funds provided by section 32 of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes', approved August 24, 1935 (U. S. C., Supp. II, title 7, sec. 612c), shall be available during the fiscal year 1938 for administrative expenses in such sums as the President may direct in carrying out the provisions of said section, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to the employment of persons and means by Agricultural Adjustment Administration."

Beltsville Research Center

On amendment no. 127: Appropriates $75,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $85,000, as proposed by the House.

Elimination of Diseased Cattle

On amendment no. 130: Retains the Senate provision that $2,000,000 of the funds for elimination of diseased cattle may be used only in those States which have made appropriations for indemnifying the owners of cattle reacting to the test for Bang's disease.

Forest Roads and Trails

On amendment no. 131: Appropriates $12,500,000, instead of $11,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $14,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 133: Eliminates the House provision that total expenditures for forest roads and trails on account of any State or Territory shall at no time exceed its authorized apportionment as provided by section 23 of the Federal Highway Act.

Disagreements

The committee of conference report in disagreement the following amendments of the Senate:

On amendment no. 88, Federal-aid highway system: Strikes out the House provision that the appropriation be available for the purchase of medical supplies and services and other assistance necessary for the immediate relief of employees engaged on hazardous work of the Bureau and inserts language providing that $450,000 of administrative funds, in addition to sums heretofore authorized (making in all $1,360,000), may be used for the construction (including the cost of a site already acquired) of a laboratory for permanent quarters for the testing and research work of the Bureau of Public Roads.

On amendment no. 124: Making the appropriation for domestic allotments available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, or any other farming materials and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary of Agriculture in the 1937 programs, for the reimbursement of the Tennessee Valley Authority for fertilizers heretofore or hereafter furnished by it to the Secretary of Agriculture for such purpose, and for the payment of expenses in connection with the making of such grants.

On amendment no. 126, interchange of appropriations: Authorizing transfers within bureaus of 10 percent of the amounts appropriated for the respective activities within the respective bureaus.

On amendment no. 134, forest roads and trails: Fixing the apportionment of the Territory of Alaska for the fiscal years 1938 and 1939 at $350,000 for each of said years and providing that the remainder of the sums that would be otherwise apportioned to said Territory shall be reapportioned in the same manner and on the same basis as provided in the second paragraph of section 23 (a) of the Federal Highway Act among those States whose forest highway apportionments for the fiscal years 1938 and 1939 otherwise would be less than 1 percent of the entire apportionment for forest highways.

CLARENCE CANNON,
M. C. TARVER,
WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD,
WILLIAM R. THOM,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
W. D. MCFARLANE,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this report covers all matters in disagreement between the two Houses, with the exception of four routine amendments which we expect to take up on disposition of the report, and on which there is no controversy. The bill as perfected in the report is a conservative bill, and is more than $3,000,000 below the Budget estimate. Comparative statistics on the bill may be summarized as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1938

Comparing the total of the bill as agreed to in conference with the total of appropriations for 1937, the Budget estimates for 1938, and the bill as it passed the House and as it passed the Senate		
Total, 1937 appropriations, including reappropriations of $54,364,000		$668,921,606
Total, 1938 Budget estimates, including reappropriations of $75,864,000		809,248,290
Budget increase over 1937 (see analysis below)	$140,326,684	
Comparing the total of the bill as agreed to in conference with the total of appropriations for 1937, the Budget estimates for 1938, and the bill as it passed the House and as it passed the Senate—Continued		
Total, as passed House, including reappropriations of $175,864,000		$804,193,231
House reduction under Budget estimates		5,055,059
Total, as passed Senate, including reappropriations of $175,864,000		747,125,242
Total, as passed Senate, plus restoration of $60,000,000 Senate cut in soil-conserving crop benefit payments		807,125,242
Total, agreed to in conference, including reappropriation of $175,864,000		806,245,208
Conference total is:		
Below the Budget by		$3,003,082
Above the House total by		2,051,977
Above the actual Senate total by		59,119,966
Below the Senate total after restoration of $60,000,000 for soil-conserving benefit payments by		880,034
The above totals include $4,000,000 for the Farm Credit Administration, the remainder being for the Department of Agriculture.		
The reappropriations, totaling $175,864,000, breakdown as follows:		
Soil-conserving benefit payments		$160,000,000
Elimination of diseased cattle		15,864,000
Total		175,864,000
In addition to the above appropriations, the bill authorizes for administrative expenses of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, $15,000,000 of the existing appropriation for that agency.		
Analysis of the Budget increase over 1937 of		$140,326,684
Specific increases:		
Roads, including Federal-aid highways, forest roads and trails, public-lands highways, etc.		110,500,000
Soil-conserving benefit payments		30,000,000
Airways weather service		747,861
Experiment station and agricultural extension work		1,391,500
Meat inspection and indemnities for eradication of tuberculosis in cattle		277,806
Forest Service, including $1,000,000 for Fulmer Act		1,756,177
Commodity Exchange Administration		393,500
Sundry other increases and decreases, giving a net Budget increase over 1937 of $140,326,684, as shown above.		
PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS		
Permanent appropriations, not carried in the bill, but providing funds for the Department of Agriculture for 1938 over and above those in the bill, total		$127,228,665
Appropriations, including reappropriations, carried in the bill for the Department of Agriculture, as finally agreed to in conference		802,245,208
Grand total, permanent and regular annual appropriations, Department of Agriculture		929,473,873
Regular annual appropriation for the Farm Credit Administration		4,000,000
Grand total, regular annual and permanent appropriations, Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration		933,473,873

Permanent annual appropriations, special and trust funds, Department of Agriculture

Item	Appropriation for 1937	Estimates for 1938	Increase (+) or decrease (−) 1938 estimates compared with 1937 appropriations
Extension Service: Cooperative agricultural extension work (Smith-Lever Act)	$4,696,096	$4,701,165	+$5,069
Forest Service:			
Payments to States and Territories (national-forest fund)	995,891	1,100,000	+104,109
Payments to school funds, Arizona and New Mexico (national-forest fund)	31,685	20,000	−11,685
Roads and trails for States (national-forest fund)	350,000	400,000	+50,000
Cooperative work (contributed funds)	2,000,000	1,000,000	−1,000,000
Biological Survey: Payments to counties under Migratory Bird Conservation Act	6,500	7,500	+1,000
Agricultural Adjustment Administration: To carry into effect the provisions of sec. 32, act of Aug. 24, 1935, relating to the exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities	[1] 109,139,621	[1] 120,000,000	+10,860,379
Total	117,219,793	127,228,665	+10,008,872

[1] $110,000,000 of this appropriation for 1937 and 1938 is made available in the accompanying bill for "conservation and use of agricultural land resources."

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the committee has brought in a conference report indicating an agreeemnt upon a figure which is $2,050,000 above what the bill was when it passed the House, and about $59,100,000 more than it was when it passed the Senate. I have been over the matters in difference as to amounts, and roughly, as far as I have been able to determine, the low figure of either House was agreed to 5 times out of 44 times, and the high figure or one in between, 39 times out of 44 times. Frankly, I must say, if we are going to economize, we must get more of economy than this report indicates.

M. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman's suggestion, this bill is more than $3,000,000 below the Budget estimate. The Senate made a formal cut of $60,000,000 in the soil conservation and domestic allotment item, but the Government has made a proposition to the farmers of the Nation, and after the farmers have accepted the proposal and carried out their part of the agreement, the United States Government must redeem its pledge and provide money to pay the farmer the amount to which he is entitled under the law of contracts.

Eliminating this amendment the bill is $1,880 below the Senate bill and is an economical bill notwithstanding the fact that it provides in a large measure items which are not purely agricultural in nature. For example, the difference between the Budget estimate this year and the amount of the bill last year is $140,000, and out of that amount $110,000 is for highways, a matter which is of interest to the country generally and in no sense a purely agricultural appropriation.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it not a fact that this bill is the biggest bill for the Agricultural Department that has ever been enacted in the history of the country?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Not when you eliminate the items not directly chargeable to agriculture. And such increases as have been made are in response to the mandate of Congress as expressed in legislation which this House has enacted in the last 2 years. Practically every addition to this bill and every increase in the amounts it carries have been made in response to legislation passed by the Congress since the last bill was adopted.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas, the ranking minority member on the subcommittee.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Is not every agricultural bill and every bill this year of every subcommittee larger than any preceding one ever was, except possibly the legislative bill? I see representatives of the other subcommittees in the Chamber and I see the gentleman from North Carolina rising.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I thought it had been stated so many times that it was now known by all Members of the House that the naval appropriation bill was not only under the amount appropriated last year, but was $37,000,000 below the Budget estimate. I therefore do not understand why it is that my good friend from Kansas, and many others in the House, still insist that there was no reduction in the naval appropriation bill. The record should be correctly stated.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM].

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, this appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture contains an allocation of $3,000,000 to continue the purchase of land for forest reserves. Those purchases are made under the auspices of the National Forest Reservation Commission. A program has been laid out under which new national forests are to be established in a number of the Middle and Southern States which heretofore have never had such benefits.

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

Mr. THOM. I yield.

Mr. BIERMANN. Do those national forests include the forest in southern Iowa?

Mr. THOM. Yes.

Mr. BIERMANN. We will actually get that, then, will we?

Mr. THOM. I am coming to that.

About a year or two ago the National Forest Reservation Commission set up a rule that no further purchases should be made in any units that have been located unless there have been already 20 percent of the lands in those respective units purchased.

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

Mr. THOM. I prefer to wait until I state the proposition and then I will yield to the gentleman.

Now, the effect of that rule as set up by the National Forest Reservation Commission was simply this, that in many of the various forest units progress has stopped. In many of those units that have been located, options have been secured on behalf of the National Forest Reservation Commission, and it was naturally expected that land would be duly purchased under those options. Then came this rule of the National Forest Reservation Commission which stopped all purchases unless 20 percent of the unit had already been procured and the title was in the name of the United States Government.

This bill contains this provision:

> That $1,000,000 of the $3,000,000 appropriated shall be available only for purchase of lands in purchase units where as much as 20 percent of the lands within such purchase units have not heretofore been acquired.

In other words, the rule of the National Forest Reservation Commission was to be lifted so far as $1,000,000 of the appropriation in this bill is concerned. I reluctantly agreed in conference that this provision should go out, so that we have for the next year the same provision standing, that no purchase shall be made in any unit unless 20 percent heretofore has been acquired.

Now, the point I want to make is this: Representatives of Iowa, Indiana, Missouri, and Ohio—I think nine States in all—are dissatisfied and feel that they have been discriminated against for the reason that their forest units are not being added to, and the work on them has practically stopped.

Without any further discussion, this is just a subtle hint to the National Forest Reservation Commission that if something is not done about this 20-percent rule, in the next session of the House of Representatives they are going to find Representatives from such States as Iowa, Missouri, and Ohio opposing any further purchase of land for forest purposes. That is the situation in a nutshell. I simply want it in the RECORD so that the National Forest Reservation Commission will be forewarned when this appropriation bill comes up next year.

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

Mr. THOM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio yielding to me and I do not desire to prolong this discussion, but since the gentleman has given a gentle hint to the National Forest Reservation Commission, of which I am proud to be a member—and the membership of that Commission is composed of three Cabinet members, two Senators, and two Members of the House—I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM] if he thinks that Commission, with a measly sum of $3,000,000 can do anything worth while toward the acquisition of any forest lands, whether it is in those units where there has been 20 percent or less of the land purchased, or anywhere else. For the information of the gentleman, I want to tell him that the National Forest Reservation Commission adopted this policy of not purchasing any lands in units established where the purchase had not been 20 percent or more of the total number of acres supposed to be purchased; but it was not because of any desire on the part of the Commission. It was purely for the reason that we had no money with which to function. We have something like 60 forest units in the United States, throughout the various States in the Union, where they have a set-up that is going, and a great percentage of the acreage in the units have been purchased, because the States have complied and cooperated in many ways, and they began back under the Clarke-McNary Act.

States like Ohio, Iowa, Indiana, Missouri, and those other States mentioned, have just come into the picture because they have just become forest-minded with reference to the solicitation of Federal aid, and have passed State laws whereby they could come in. We do not have the money to develop these units, although we have established these units. We desired to go into those States and establish and develop national-forest units. We established them and did take some options. But our money ran out and we just had to do the best we could. I am one member of that Commission. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is also a member; Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, and Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, are members. The Secretary of War is chairman, and the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior are members. Our Commission has no desire to adopt just any kind of a policy, but on account of lack of funds we had to determine how best to spend our limited funds. I ask the gentlemen who are interested, and the distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations if he thinks that $3,000,000 could do anything toward satisfying those States, like Indiana, Ohio, Iowa, and the other States, which would in any way comply with the request or the gentle hint that the gentleman has given?

If this Congress will appropriate the money, our Commission will spend it, and I may say we will get value for what we spend. The record of our Commission speaks for itself and I know, and I feel you gentlemen know, that what money we have spent has been spent well and wisely. We have made our money go as far as possible. The work of the Forest Service and of the National Forest Reservation Commission in my judgment is outstanding. If the money is provided by Congress, we can purchase land in these units. If we do not have the money, we can give little relief to our interested friends, whom we would like to help if we had the money.

I do not know whether the Commission is going to lift this policy or not, but I do know that $3,000,000 is not going to be a drop in the bucket toward acquiring additional land in any of the eighty-some-odd forest units in the United States. Nobody wants to cooperate more than I, but it is a question of money available and not desire. May I, in my turn, hint to Congress that the National Forest Commission cannot buy lands if they do not have money. If $3,000,000 is all the money we are to have, we shall use discretion and our best judgment and make it go as far as we can. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. THOM. I hope that the National Forest Commission puts into effect—and it has the power to—this provision eliminated from the bill now permitting $1,000,000 to be used in those sections where there have not been purchased lands aggregating 20 percent of the unit proposed.

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

Mr. THOM. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would remind the gentleman from Ohio that the same situation that he states obtains in Ohio obtains likewise in other sections of the country, especially in the State of Mississippi and that part of the State wherein my district lies. I believe that the remedy is not so much the giving of direction to the Commission as it is the giving to them of additional appropriations to purchase new land.

Mr. THOM. It ought to be divided equitably between the States.

Mr. DOXEY. May I ask the gentleman from Ohio if he thinks that even if all of this $1,000,000 were used in the way he suggests—and I do not know whether it will be so used or not—would it aid in any way to substantially relieve the condition that now exists in Ohio and Iowa and some other States?

Mr. THOM. It would to the extent of $1,000,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, with the disposition of this conference report we shall have made material progress in the enactment of the supply bills for the coming fiscal year. When the House adjourned last week there were still six bills undisposed of—the Agricultural bill, the District bill, the relief bill, the two War bills, and the Interior bill. We have just agreed to the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill. The conference report on the relief bill will be ready for report to the House this afternoon. And with the disposition of this conference report, only the War Department bills and the Interior Department appropriation bill remain. The conferees on the War Department bill are in session at this time and hope to reach an agreement before they adjourn tonight. The Interior Department bill is in the Senate, and we hope to be able to send it to conference not later than tomorrow; so, barring unforeseen delay, we expect to be able to secure enactment of the supply bills before the end of the fiscal year, day after tomorrow.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me we are fast reaching a critical situation in the purchase of timberland. We are fast reaching the point where we must put a stop to this competition between the States to sell land to the Government and then have the Government build roads through it and clean it up. Unless we call a halt to this program it is going to prove to be an endless outlet for Government expenditure. I think it is creating an alarming situation and that Congress must meet the situation and stop the purchase of forest land before it gets too wildly extravagant.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, that is a matter of opinion. The committee has been severely criticized, for instance, because it failed to report out the full authorization of $14,000,000 for the acquisition of land, which passed the House last session. The appropriation carried in this bill for the acquisition of lands, generally, is the minimum and

is relatively unimportant in comparison with the real agricultural issues the gentleman might have discussed this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, agriculture was the first to suffer when prices dropped in 1920 and the last to recover. Even under the Agricultural Adjustment Act recovery was disproportionate and farm prices lagged far behind industrial prices and union wage scales. When this session convened no pledge to the country was more emphasized than the pledge to stabilize agricultural prices and give the farmer his fair share of the natural income.

The need for legislation was intensified by the decision of the Supreme Court nullifying the A. A. A. and by legislation which has widened the disparity between agriculture on one hand and labor and industry on the other. Laws have been enacted by this Congress artificially increasing the farmer's cost of living and raising the price of practically every item entering into his cost of production. Up to this time the relief Congress was pledged to provide has not materialized. Now that harvest is approaching wheat has dropped approximately 30 cents per bushel. For the last 2 months the price of hogs and cattle has been going down while the price of beef and pork has been going up. The farmer's share of the national income is steadily decreasing. Instead of relieving the farmer, this Congress is adding to his burdens. We have passed laws adding to the price of his coal and his fuel oil, legislation increasing his costs of transportation, legislation raising the price of every manufactured article he buys. All this legislation has the approval of the farmer. He believes in high wages, short hours, liberal returns on invested capital, and a high standard for living for both labor and industry. But he also is entitled to a fair wage for his labor, an honest price for his products, and an adequate return on his own investments in land and equipment.

This Congress has ignored his rights, forgotten its pledges, and utterly failed up to this time to take any steps to bring about the long-promised parity for agriculture. The gentleman from Kansas might have discussed this situation. He might have urged legislation to meet the situation. Time is short. We are nearing the end of the session. If we expect to enact farm legislation it must be done promptly. I trust the gentleman from Kansas and all other Members who are interested in carrying out the pledges made by all political parties over the last 10 years to bring agriculture up to a plane of economic equality with labor and industry will join in urging consideration of a farm bill at this session of Congress.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as no Member desires to be heard on the conference report I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was adopted.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 88: Page 74, line 18, after the colon strike out the balance of line 18 and all of lines 19, 20, 21, and 22, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That not to exceed $450,000 from the administrative funds authorized by the act approved November 9, 1921, and acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto, in addition to the amount remaining available under the authorizations contained in the Agricultural Appropriation Acts approved May 27, 1930, May 17, 1935, and June 4, 1936, shall be available, in the total amount of $1,360,000, for the construction (including the cost of a site already acquired) of a laboratory for permanent quarters for the testing and research work of the Bureau of Public Roads."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 88 and agree to the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 124: Page 97, line 2, after the word "item" insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, or any other farming materials and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary of Agriculture in the 1937 programs, for the reimbursement of the Tennessee Valley Authority for fertilizers heretofore or hereafter furnished by it to the Secretary of Agriculture for such purpose, and for the payment of all expenses necessary in making such grants including all or part of the costs incident to the delivery thereof."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 124 and agree to the same.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I always supposed that the Tennessee Authority was granted funds by the Deficiency Committee for the fertilizer experiments they were conducting. Does this not give them funds from another source out of the Public Treasury?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this allocation has been in effect for a number of years. Seed and fertilizing material have been supplied by the T. V. A. for experimental purposes without special authorization. But the General Accounting Office has now raised the question of authorization, and in order to place the allocation beyond question, this provision is included in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 126: Page 98, after line 8, insert:

"INTERCHANGE OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Not to exceed 10 percent of the foregoing amounts for the miscellaneous expenses of the work of any bureau, division, or office herein provided for shall be available interchangeably for expenditures on the objects included within the general expenses of such bureau, division, or office, but no more than 10 percent shall be added to any one item of appropriation except in cases of extraordinary emergency, and then only upon the written order of the Secretary of Agriculture: *Provided*, That a statement of any transfers of appropriations made hereunder shall be included in the annual Budget."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this is the provision with reference to the transfer of not to exceed 10 percent of the amount of money which has been appropriated.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this provides for interchange within bureaus only, and does not permit interchange as between bureaus of departments. This provision has been carried in the annual bill for 15 or 20 years, and was included in this year's bill, but was stricken out on a point of order, as the gentleman will recall, because we added a provision that a statement of such transfers be included in the annual Budget.

I know the gentleman will agree that the annual Budget should show all transfers of this character, but the inclusion of that additional matter made it subject to a point of order, which was sustained. The Senate restored the item and now we propose to agree to the Senate amendment.

Mr. TABER. Does not this give the Bureau the opportunity to spend a lot of money that otherwise might be recovered?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No. It is the same item we have been carrying for many years and merely provides for an interchange within a given bureau.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 134: Page 103, strike out lines 9, 10, and 11, and insert the following:

"That for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1938, and June 30, 1939, the apportionment for forest highways in Alaska

shall be $350,000 and the remainder of the sums which otherwise would be apportioned and prorated to Alaska for said fiscal years shall be reapportioned in the same manner and on the same basis as provided in the second paragraph of section 23 (a) of the Federal Highway Act among those States whose forest highway apportionments for the fiscal years 1938 and 1939 otherwise would be less than 1 percent of the entire apportionment for forest highways."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a motion to reconsider each of the motions will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

FARM TENANCY BILL

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7562, to encourage and promote the ownership of farm homes and to make the possession of such homes more secure, to provide for the general welfare of the United States, to provide additional credit facilities for agricultural development, and for other purposes, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, in order to save time, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7562, with Mr. DRIVER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

THE TENANT PROBLEM

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the time limitation and the great demand for the privilege of speaking by those who are interested in this bill, I am going to request the Members not to ask me to yield for questions at this time. I hope they will defer any questions they may wish to ask me until the measure is taken up under the 5-minute rule.

I have handled many measures for this administration. In fact, it has been my privilege to handle practically all of the farm legislation. During this period there has been no problem that presented as many difficulties as that of farm tenancy.

We had rather extensive hearings. There were many witnesses. No two of these witnesses agreed as to all of the details of the program. When the hearings had been finished, no two members of the committee were in complete accord on all phases of the subject.

THE PROBLEM OF THE LAND

The problem of the land is as old as history. Contact with the soil is as essential as sunlight and air. There can be no life either in the vegetable or the animal kingdom without the products of the land. All life gets its sustenance from the soil.

It is not surprising, then, that disagreements and disputes should arise in reference to any general land policies. In Biblical days disputes arose between Abraham and Lot in reference to access to the land, and this compelled a separation. Throughout all history disputes have arisen as to land and land policies.

To permit the private ownership of land as a basis for a home and at the same time to prevent too great an accumulation of land in the hands of a few is a problem that practically all countries have been compelled to meet face to face.

INCREASE IN TENANCY

Fifty years ago less than one farmer in four was a tenant. There has been a gradual increase through each decade until now about 42 percent of the tillers of the soil are tenants.

That it is very desirable to check this increase and reverse the trend every thinking person must admit. There are approximately 2,800,000 tenants in continental United States. Practically all of them would like to be home owners. But to accomplish this purpose is another question. It cannot be solved by the waving of a magic wand or the expressing of a wish. It cannot be solved by an appeal to the emotions or a display of sentiment. These have been indulged in for more than a generation. At the same time land ownership has grown less and less, and land tenancy more and more.

THE STARTING POINT

As a basis for beginning, two things are necessary. First, it must be made financially profitable to own a small farm home. Second, a way must be found to finance the purchase of small farm homes by owner-operators on long-time payments at low interest rates.

MAKING FARM OWNERSHIP PROFITABLE

Several steps are necessary in order to make farm ownership profitable. The prime essential is to maintain a fair price for farm products. This price is the most important single element in the whole question.

We have already made much progress along this line through the operation of the Farm Act and the farm-credit system.

I hope and expect that farm legislation of a general character will be passed just as soon as it can be properly worked out and perfected. Then there is also the question of interest rates. We have gone a long way with those in the Farm Credit Administration, but there are still some phases which have not been covered.

I agree with the remarks made today about the fine work of the Farm Credit Administration. I think Governor Myers is one of the best administrators in this Government. [Applause.] However, Governor Myers handles a business institution. He fears—and I think there is some ground for his fear—that if the bill partakes not only of business but also of some social features, although it concerns a real problem, some of those who buy the obligations of the institution may get the two phases mixed, and it may hurt the sale of obligations and injure the fine results which are being achieved by the Farm Credit Administration. Governor Myers prefers that we handle the matter in this way, and I think he has good ground for that preference. My first inclination was to follow the other route, but I came to the conclusion after study that this was the better method.

WHAT IS BEHIND THE PROBLEM?

In reality tenancy is not the problem. It is but a manifestation or a breaking out of the problem.

Neither the landlord nor the tenant has had a fair share of the national income. Behind the tenant question is the problem of price and income.

As a matter of fact, the percentage of tenancy for the Nation as a whole has not increased since 1933, but it has only been checked and has not been decreased, and it therefore remains an appalling problem. Further provision is necessary in the direction of price maintenance and in financing the purchase of family-sized farms if the problem is to be solved.

TAXES

Then, too, the question of State, county, and district taxes is extremely important. In most of the States an undue share of the taxes has been borne by the small farmers. The farm cannot get away. It is easily found. Frequently the small tract of land, both in the town and in the country, has borne a larger pro-rata share of the taxes than the larger tracts of land. Besides both the larger and the smaller tracts of land have borne an undue share of State and local taxes.

STATE COOPERATION

Much assistance can be rendered by States and subdivisions if they will cooperate in the program. It seems to me that on small tracts the taxation should be limited either by providing a small exemption or by providing a maximum total ad valorem property tax that can be levied against

small tracts. Some of the States have already taken steps in this direction. As a part of the effort to solve this situation, steps should be taken to secure State and local cooperation all along the line. Under the system now prevailing in many of the States a full property levy is made by both State, county, and district units against all lands, regardless of whether there is a crop failure or any form of income from the land. The program will be greatly handicapped in any section where this condition prevails.

In many States and localities, a portion of these taxes could well be shifted to other forms of income and property. This added inducement would go far to make any steps taken by the Federal Government in financing such a program successful. With the cooperation of the State and subdivisions, the Government could well afford to finance the purchase for worthy and ambitious tenants of a small farm home, to be paid for on long-time amortization payments at a low rate of interest. These payments could thus be made on a basis that would not cause an undue burden on the purchaser. In practically every community in America there are worthy tenants who would like to own a home and who would work hard to pay out a home if it could be purchased under such conditions as to give them an opportunity to see daylight.

A TREMENDOUS PROBLEM

The problem is tremendous and far reaching. It cannot be solved overnight. The cost would run into billions of dollars. It is necessary to start gradually and endeavor to keep on a sound basis. The problem is so difficult as to be almost discouraging at times, but this makes it all the more important that it be tackled. It is the hope that by beginning and carefully working it out progress may be made and that cooperation by the States, as well as by individuals, may be stimulated.

THREE METHODS OF APPROACH

For the time being the committee has recommended a three-wing approach to the question.

First, a provision for financing tenants in the purchase of small farm homes.

Second, rehabilitation loans for temporary aid to tenants and distressed landowners who need immediate assistance.

Third, the purchase of submarginal or other lands not primarily suited to cultivation, and the utilizing of such land for various public purposes.

Under the first provision—that is, for the financing of the purchase of small farm homes—we provide a fund of $10,000,000 for the first year, twenty-five million the second, and fifty million the third year to be apportioned among the various States on the basis of farm population and prevalence of tenancy.

The measure provides that loans may be made not in excess of the appraised value of single unit farms to worthy tenants who will obligate themselves to repay the purchase price over a 30-year period, with interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum.

The Committee on Agriculture has provided that in each county where the program is to be put into effect, a committee of three resident farmers who are familiar with local conditions shall assist in administering the act.

It is further provided that application shall be made through such local committee and that no farm shall be selected and no tenant shall be financed except with the approval of the local committee. In this way the tenant will be consulted in the purchase of the farm, the price to be paid and the details of the transaction. It is hoped that by this select method on the part of the local committee, the program will be given its greatest opportunity to succeed.

SPECULATION

In order to avoid speculation it is provided that no purchaser shall be permitted to sell the land to other than a resident home owner who is approved by the Secretary of Agriculture until the entire obligation to the Government has been paid. In other words, the purchaser will not be able to make an unauthorized sale of his property until he has met all the terms of his obligation. This method is adopted in order to prevent speculation in land, which has frequently been the curse both of the farmer and the home owner.

TITLE II

Title II of the measure provides for the making of rehabilitation loans to cover equipment, livestock, essential supplies, and financing.

The Resettlement Administration is abolished, effective June 30, 1937. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish the Farm Security Administration, which would administer the provisions of the pending measure.

The Resettlement Administration not only inherited the old subsistence homesteads provisions, but also was called upon to administer relief funds, which were transferred from the Relief and Public Works lump sum appropriation to the Resettlement Administration for administering this program as it pertained to the needs of the farm population.

Under the terms of that transfer, the Resettlement Administration made both loans and grants to people in the country.

We authorize the Administration to utilize any funds that may be transferred by Executive order from Relief and Public Works appropriations for such purpose.

The Resettlement Administration cared for more than 300,000 farm families through loans and grants. We have recommended the broadening of the base of these loans in order to make all those who are unable to secure credit elsewhere eligible for these loans. It is hoped that through this method many individuals may be placed in such a position as to enable them to purchase small homes through private sources.

TITLE III

Under title 3 an appropriation of $10,000,000 is authorized to be made available for the first year and $20,000,000 for each of the 2 succeeding years for the purchase of lands not primarily suitable for tillage. These lands may be used for any public purpose, such as parks, game preserves, recreation centers, forest reserves, or for any other public purpose.

The needs for such a program are manifest and are well known to those who are familiar with conditions which prevail, especially in certain sections of our country.

AN OLD QUESTION

The tenant problem is age old. Far back in the history of our race, in times less complex than our own, we find the farmer tilling land that did not belong to him. He did a share of the work in the agricultural village and received a part of what was produced. Such relationships between tenant and landowner are found in various ages and various types of government.

It is only natural that the idea of tenancy should reach our shores early in our own history. We know from writings of colonial days that tenancy existed at a very early date. There were many large landed estates and gentlemen farmers. Our long period of westward expansion and the opening of free land, however, delayed the development of tenancy as a problem. We were still developing, still growing. Opportunities lay always ahead. Then, with the closing of our frontiers, we settled down and began to grow as a nation.

The development of the tenancy problem has taken place largely in the last 50 years, and today we find tenancy existing in every State in the Union. It is more acute in the South, perhaps, than in any other section. This is due largely to the fact that after the War between the States there was very little money in the South, and most of the financing necessarily came from the outside. This caused interest-rate payments to flow out of that great section of the country. A money crop was necessary. The logical development was the one-crop system of cotton, because it was the single one that would produce the returns necessary to replenish the section for the outflow of money and high interest rates.

NOT LIMITED TO ONE SECTION

The rapid increase in tenancy, however, has developed into a problem in many other sections of our country. This has been due in the main to land speculation. The boom

years threw land into speculation and into mortgages. The depression years caused difficulties and foreclosures and consequent changes in ownership. Thus the number who were compelled to rent land was increased.

Any attack on the problem, therefore, must be Nation-wide in scope and not limited to any particular area. It is truly a national problem and the remedy must apply equally to all sections.

AN ESSENTIAL OF GOVERNMENT

In working to solve the tenancy problem, we are endeavoring to add strength to one of the most essential parts of every free government. We are seeking to perpetuate the home.

As long as it is possible for a man to return to his home after a day of labor in the office or in the field, and find awaiting him all the things that home means, we will have a substantial and patriotic citizenship. It is the home that is the first unit of all organized society. It is the starting point of training, the place where character building is begun. The future of our form of government depends on maintenance of the American home. That is why the tenancy measure, directed toward turning the trend back toward farm home ownership, is important.

Regardless of the merits of any other essentials of government, there can be no difference of opinion about the desirability of home ownership. To stop the trend away from home ownership and throw the tendency back in the other direction is the purpose of this measure.

The first thought of the pioneers who founded this country was to own a piece of land. The first step of practically all of them was to secure title to a small part of the land in the new America. This desire to own the land was responsible for the ring of the ax that made possible access to the land. It was responsible for the creak of the western-bound prairie wagon as the early settlers made their way to western homesteads.

THE FINEST STEP WE COULD TAKE

Unfortunately in the complex economic structure that has developed within the last few decades, much of this contact has been lost. In my judgment the Government could take no finer step than to make possible the ownership of small farm homes and to take the further step of formulating policies that would make those homes secure.

There is something in the contact with the soil that tends to build character. The Republic is anchored in its homes. The threats of those who do not at heart believe in our system of government and who wish to tear down its institutions cannot get far among a home-owning and liberty-loving people. Every man in America, whether he lives North, South, East, or West, is vitally interested in stimulating home ownership both in the country and in the city. Such a course will tend toward a stronger government and national security for all. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the Speaker of the House.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the indulgence of my colleagues for at least a portion of the time that has been so generously allotted to me by the chairman of the committee to present for your consideration and for your thoughtful meditation, not the details of the proposed legislation, but I shall undertake to draw for you a broad picture of this so-called tenant-farming situation.

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] has so well said, I regard it as a problem of tremendous importance. I may be pardoned for making a personal reference, maybe, to explain my inherited interest in all farming problems. My direct ancestors on both sides of my house for 150 years in this country have, without exception, until my generation, been tillers of the soil; and if there is anything in the theory of inherited predilections, I imagine that may account in some measure for my deep interest in all agricultural problems, aside from their grave economic manifestations.

Now, it has been said that the Congress of the United States in the last few years has been particularly solicitous of and generous to all of our farm problems, and I think this is true. I think that we men who represent largely agricultural districts are under a debt of everlasting gratitude to the Members of Congress from the great industrial centers, and particularly from the great cities of the United States, for the consistent and uniform support they have so ungrudgingly given to these great measures for agricultural relief [applause], because, Mr. Chairman, to any thoughtful man, whether he lives in a great city, whether he abides in an area of congested population, upon reflection, must know the absolute indispensability to life and to society and to progress of the products of the farm. The clothes that you wear, the shoes with which you are shod, the food which you consume to continue your life, the shelter that is over you to protect you from the vicissitudes and inclemencies of the elements all directly are remotely come from the good earth; and farms are operated by men, and it is the present condition of a large segment of the agricultural population that has particularly appealed to our consideration and has afforded the basis for this legislation—the farm-tenant class of our population.

A little later, if I have the time, I shall incorporate in the RECORD for your study some statistics as to the number of farm tenants in the country, according to the census of 1935, the number of operating farm tenants, and the number of their families. It is a rather staggering thing to contemplate that, today, practically one-third of our entire farm population is in the class for whose interest we are undertaking to legislate today; and one of the disturbing factors in a study of the whole problem is the increasing, the constantly increasing, number of farm tenants in some sections of our country; not particularly in the South, because our farm-tenancy situation in the last few years has been, in a way, diminishing, but in the great wheat and corn and cattle sections of the country there has been a tremendous increase, which is a challenge to us to undertake to meet and master, if we may, this acute economic problem.

But what about this man I am talking about—this tenant farmer? Oh, it has been said, and argued with some reason, that if a farmer is of any value, if he has any initiative, if he has any backing and capacity, if he has any ability, he can get along, he can borrow money, he can make his way without any governmental assistance; but those of us, Mr. Chairman, who are intimately familiar with this problem, know that that is not always true. I may call your attention to the fact that down in my section of the country, and especially in the hill sections of the South, some of these poor tenant farmers, by descent, are of the best blood of this Republic, sons of the Cavaliers and of the Huguenots, who moved into that section of the country, and decade after decade, because of disadvantages to which they were subjected, which I shall not have the time now fully to enumerate, from generation to generation they have gone from bad to worse in their efforts to sustain themselves according to the traditions and standards of their ancestors; but the very system and environment by which they have been surrounded has made it absolutely impossible.

I am going to be perfectly frank about this thing. I do not know conditions in other sections, but I wish that some of you could visit some of the tenant farms in my section of the country, both white and colored, and see the desperate and hopeless situation by which they have been submerged, I claim, not entirely in all cases because of their own incapacity, but by reason of these circumstances to which I have referred, lack of credit facilities, poor prices year after year for their products, the isolation of their families from contact with their neighbors, their inability to form cooperative associations and to assemble themselves into unions as

those in the industrial centers have done for the protection of their interests.

And there stands a desolate, hopeless, dejected man, working some other man's property, pillaging it, despoiling its rich resources by virtue of the fact that it is not his, but some other man's, and at the end of the year, when they cast up the account, this man who has worked in season and out of season during the whole crop season finds himself with no profit with which to go through the winter, with nothing with which to buy magazines, medicines, or comforts for his family. It is a rather pathetic picture, and as a man representing that section of the country I am ashamed, almost, to describe it here before my colleagues, but God's truth is the God's truth wherever we stand face to face with it. I do not know that the allegory applies all along the line, and some of you may think that it is a fanciful description, but I tell you that the condition of the farm tenant in some sections of the country does not fall far short of that great allegorical poem, The Man With the Hoe, because he is in large measure the forgotten man of agriculture—the man with the hoe—as described by Edwin Markham:

Bowed by the weight of centuries he leans
Upon his hoe and gazes on the ground,
The emptiness of ages in his face,
And on his back the burden of the world.
Who made him dead to rapture and despair,
A thing that grieves not and that never hopes,
Stolid and stunned a brother to the ox?
Who loosed and let down this brutal jaw?
Whose was the hand that slanted back this brow?
Whose breath blew out the light within this brain?
Is this the thing the Lord God made and gave
To have dominion over sea and land;
To trace the stars and search the heavens for power;
To feel the passion of eternity?
Is this the dream He dreamed who shaped the suns
And pillared the blue firmament with light?

* * * * * *

Slave of the wheel of labor, what to him
Are Plato and the swing of Pleiades?
What the long reaches of the peaks of song,
The rift of dawn, the reddening of the rose?
Through this dread shape the suffering ages look;
Time's tragedy is in that aching stoop;
Through this dread shape humanity betrayed,
Plundered, profaned, and disinherited,
Cries protest to the judges of the world—

And we here in the Congress of the United States are his temporal judges this day, my friends. [Applause.] As the chairman of this great committee has so well said, "It is a challenge not only to our humanity, but to our economic judgment." What is the ultimate success of farming in this country? The purchasing power in the aggregate of the producers of the country. And when you deprive a man, as has been suggested, of the impulse and the passion to succeed, that is generated by the consciousness that he is working on his own acres, as the gentleman from Texas so well said, "You hasten tragedy, for there is something in the very thought and sentiment of ownership that seems to give some type of almost divine afflatus to the efforts of a man, no matter how humble he may be." Do you own a farm, do you own a lot in the city, have you fee-simple title to your own property? Subconsciously the satisfaction is great to go out on your own acres, on your own land, put your foot down upon it, look up into the sky and say this, thank God, this little bit is mine. [Applause.] But not so with these drifters, these unhappy, these distressed men. And they are the men—there are 3,000,000 of them in the United States of America out of our total farm population—whom we are seeking in this very limited approach to undertake ultimately to salvage and save and "rebuild in them the music and the dream", to give to them as far as possible that feeling of ownership, of their own, which I have so feebly undertaken to express.

Oh, it is candidly admitted that this bill does not go very far. I heard the strictures of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] with reference to the inadequacy of this bill. It is admittedly only capable of reaching a very negligible percentage of those who need this assistance, but it is the establishment by the Congress of the United States of a policy, as suggested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] in his short statement this morning. A great many other useful things that have taken deep root in our governmental enterprises started as experiments. I very well recall when my honorable father was pioneering here in Congress for Federal aid for the improvement of our national highways. It was regarded as a dream, as unconstitutional, and never possible of accomplishment, and he was content to take an experimental appropriation of $75,000 to see if it would work in practice as in theory. And you see the result. Take the delivery of the mail. The rural free delivery of the mail started as an experiment on a very short route. Who would take that away today from the American people? The same with the parcel post and with our present system of vocational education and farm extension. It all started in a small experimental way, and probably after all, my friends, although I would prefer to have had $50,000,000 appropriated for this bill, though we could not get it—and there have been sound reasons, I think, on the part of the administration in view of our present fiscal condition, to try to trim down as far as possible these appropriations—probably in the long run it may be best for us to feel our way with this thing, to set up an organization, and I hope that organization is going to be a practical thing to be handled by practical men who will be on these county committees all over the country, and not encourage tenants to take up a four or five thousand dollar nicely painted house with lightning rods all over it, and other burdensome and at first unnecessary improvements.

He can go out and build a log house to start with; just the meager necessities, provided it would be his own. I think the biggest factor today in this whole problem, intensified upon the part of those people who are to be served by this legislation, is the fact that they are going to be given an opportunity to show that they can make good as practical farmers; can put off the sackcloth and ashes that they have worn for so many years with an inferiority complex and stand up and look into the face of the sun and their Creator and say, "By the generous grace of a sympathetic Government I am being given another opportunity to prove 'the mettle of my pasture.'"

As I conceive it, that is the objective of this legislation; and we will work it out, I think, if we can get a start here—not too fast. I do not want to go precipitately, because of all the measures that have ever been proposed in the Congress of the United States this is one thing that I do not want to see fail by a bad start. So, Mr. Chairman, in this rather fragmentary fashion I have asked the indulgence of the Committee to submit for their consideration the spirit and, if I may use the word, the sacrament of this legislation. The thing that has animated my ambition about it, my desire to help in it, has been very feebly expressed, but I feel that it is possible for this great Government of ours, without assuming in the long run too great burdens, to take up out of the dust these men, to nurture them to freedom by friendly assistance and Government instruction and leadership, to make them again independent, self-supporting, and extremely useful citizens for agriculture, and for all of the best interests of our Republic. I do hope that this bill will pass without any substantial modification. If there are any differences of judgment between this body and others on the details of this legislation, it may well be ironed out in conference.

I thank you very much. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I append hereto two tables of statistics. The first shows the total of white and colored farm population and total tenants by regional group, as follows:

Division and State	All farm population	All tenants (white)	All tenants (colored)	Total tenants
United States	31,800,907	10,264,801	2,955,633	13,220,434
Geographic divisions:				
New England (Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut)	711,486	56,571	191	56,762
Middle Atlantic (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania)	1,903,933	330,128	1,961	332,089
East North Central (Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin)	4,769,078	1,470,207	6,903	1,477,110
West North Central (Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas)	5,108,220	2,158,258	24,899	2,183,157
South Atlantic (Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, District of Columbia)	6,203,592	1,727,988	1,047,703	2,775,691
East South Central (Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi)	5,335,291	1,672,216	1,063,244	2,735,460
West South Central (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas)	5,387,844	2,299,855	774,460	3,074,315
Mountain (Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada)	1,188,018	310,635	6,062	316,697
Pacific (Washington, Oregon, California)	1,193,445	238,943	30,210	269,153

The second table shows by group total number of farmers, total white and colored tenants, and the total of all tenants.

Division and State	All farm operators	All tenants (white)	All tenants (colored)	Total tenant operators
United States	6,812,350	2,222,184	642,971	2,865,155
Geographic divisions:				
New England	158,241	12,164	46	12,210
Middle Atlantic	397,684	63,920	351	64,271
East North Central	1,083,687	317,231	1,523	318,754
West North Central	1,179,856	497,251	5,513	502,764
South Atlantic	1,147,133	336,991	193,951	530,942
East South Central	1,137,219	369,666	253,967	623,633
West South Central	1,137,571	495,517	181,383	676,900
Mountain	271,392	70,979	1,106	72,085
Pacific	299,567	58,465	5,131	63,596

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I know I speak the sentiment of every Member who has been in this Chamber during the last 20 minutes when I say the address just delivered by the Speaker of the House has been an inspiration to us all. [Applause.] He and the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES], in presenting this bill, have lent a dignity to this debate and a tone which the importance of the measure amply warrants.

My excuse for inflicting myself upon you for 15 minutes is due to the fact probably that I have been bound by a tradition very much like the tradition described by the Speaker a few moments ago. No member of my family during the last 150 years has been engaged in any business but farming. I refer to that group of the family that lives in a certain area in western New York. It has always been a fascinating problem to me. I have never been able to tear myself away from it. Indeed, I have not tried. I join with the prayer of certain Members that the Congress adjourn quickly, that I may go home.

We are starting on a tremendous experiment. It has been with great reluctance that I have been brought to the conclusion that we should start on such an experiment. My inclinations have always been against the Government of the United States taking any part in business or in financing what might be termed private commercial undertakings, be it upon a farm or in a factory.

But this question of farm tenancy and its underlying problems have become of such immense importance in the life of the Nation, important from its social and political aspects, as well as economic, that reluctantly, as I admit, I have come to the conclusion that the Federal Government should undertake this cure. [Applause.] At the same time I am not unmindful of the fact that governments, like individuals, may make fearful mistakes in the management or financing of business. While I am willing to see—indeed while I am more than willing to see this experiment start, and I rejoice that it is in a small way, nevertheless I can visualize some mistakes which may be made which may bring it to failure in the future. When I endeavor to point out those mistakes I beg of you to believe that I do not boast of knowing everything there is to know about farming. Indeed, I have never met a man who knows everything there is to know about farming. But there are certain fundamental things which every good farmer, at least, knows; certain fundamental principles the violation of which over any considerable period of time will bring any farming operation to ruin, no matter in what part of the country it is undertaken.

Farm troubles in this country which, of course, have been made much more acute as the result of drought, have been growing upon us for 20 years or more. Some of them have an economic origin, the loss, for example, of our foreign markets, in which we were accustomed to rid ourselves of surpluses of certain crops; accidents, acts of God as they are sometimes denominated: Drought, floods, and in recent years, very, very extensive droughts; and then, if you will not regard it as impertinent, bad farming. We might just as well admit that in certain directions and in certain important areas one of the contributing elements to farm distress has been unsound farming. I do not mean to seem to scold, but I cannot blind myself to facts. My concern with respect to this bill is that the Government, if it is to finance the purchase of farms and lend 100 percent of the value of the farms to the purchasers, shall see to it, if possible, without undue regimentation, that sound farming be practiced; otherwise, Mr. Chairman, from 25 to 50 percent of the effort will go to waste. Bear in mind that tradition of which I spoke and of which the Speaker spoke—in fact, I got it from my father and he in turn got it from his father—that the best thing for the land is the foot of the owner, an old-fashioned farming adage. It implies that the owner is exercising constant care and thought as he tramps across his acres, that he loves those acres, and is intent so to manage his farm that the fertility of the soil shall not be impaired. Impair the fertility of the soil and the capital investment is impaired, for the real capital of a farm is its fertility.

It so happens that I live in a strictly farming region in which very, very few requests for aid under this bill will arise. I live in a region fortunate above the average region. In it very, very little demand for agricultural relief has arisen in the last 20 years. I can say to you without the violation of any confidence or the exposure of any secret that within the 5 years that I have had the honor of serving in the House of Representatives I have had only two letters from farmers in my county, Livingston, in the Genesee Valley of western New York, requesting farm-relief legislation. This does not mean that they have not had their troubles; this does not mean that the depression did not hit them exceedingly hard in certain directions, but it does mean to me—and I would have this borne in upon you—it does mean to me that the tradition of sound farming has been practiced in that particular area so long as not only to assure a preservation of the fertility of the soil but also to assure a preservation of the spirit of independence of the owners. This region is not alone; there are many other regions equally fortunate. I am thoroughly and intimately acquainted with a system of farming which has been in operation for 120 years. It is practiced not only by owners but by tenants; and whenever I think of this bill and the possibilities of the future in connection with it, my thoughts revert to this thing with which I am familiar: It is utterly

against the rule, a self-enforced rule, I may say, for the good farmer in the region where I live to sell any rough fodder off the farm; it must be fed to livestock. Through the feeding of livestock the fertility is maintained.

I am in possession of records which show that these particular acres—and there are many, many farms under all kinds of ownership—these acres are producing as many bushels of wheat, of oats, of corn, and other crops as they did 110 years ago. This is the result of sound farming.

Uncle Sam now proposes to finance the purchase of farms and to put carefully selected men upon them. As you all know, I am constitutionally opposed to undue regimentation of the individual by the State, but if the State is to go into this financing of commercial undertakings and is to risk 100 percent of the value of the undertaking, it may become indispensable for the State to see to it that the property the purchase of which it has financed is not injured by unsound practices. Unsound farming extended over 3 or 4 successive years can just about destroy the present productiveness of a farm. Unsound farming extended over 3 or 4 years may require 5, 6, or 7 years of unremitting effort for the restoration of the capital; in other words, the fertility of the soil.

This is not an easy thing that we are attempting; we shall not solve it today. I am waiting to hear with great interest the discussion of the amendments to be offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIERMANN], one of which I believe impinges upon this question I have just touched upon. This is an enormously difficult thing. I am not afraid to have the Congress tackle it, but we would better not tackle it with a hysterical enthusiasm, an excessive confidence that will lead us to make all kinds of promises to all kinds of people that agricultural Utopia is at hand.

I greet the presentation of this bill in a sympathetic spirit. There are one or two things in it which I think should be changed. In general I acknowledge that this problem has become so great and so significant with respect to the future of this country that the time has come when Uncle Sam should make it his business to do what he can to help. [Applause.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY]

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, in the brief time at my disposal I cannot enter into an exhaustive discussion of this measure, but I cannot repress the impulse to comment upon the atmosphere of good feeling that is manifest in the general debate on this bill. Our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, appreciating that we had but a limited time in which to discuss this bill, took but a few minutes. He was followed by our beloved Speaker, whose wholesome remarks were received by you with marked attention. Our distinguished Speaker made not only a logical, sound, and effective presentation of the farm-tenancy problem but he brought you a wealth of information which must convince even those who are strangers to the problem that it is most serious.

We appreciate, I know, the three very brilliant speeches that have been made, including the speech of my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], on the other side of the aisle, who talked in such a convincing and sincere manner. I say we do appreciate hearing these gentlemen at this time for their speeches show not only their interest in this problem but also their firm grasp of this farm-tenant situation in which so many of us are vitally interested.

Mr. Chairman, realizing that the time for general debate on this bill is limited and that quite a number of Members desire to speak on the bill, I propose to be brief in what I wish to say here today regarding the bill that we are now considering, H. R. 7562, known as the farm-tenant bill.

This bill is substantially the same as H. R. 6240, which was reported by our Committee on Agriculture to this House some several months ago.

The reason we are now considering H. R. 7562 instead of H. R. 6240 is that in our efforts to get a rule to bring H. R. 6240 before the House for a vote we had to compromise with regard to the amount of the appropriation.

Under this bill, H. R. 7562, authorizations of appropriations under title I of the bill (tenant provisions) are limited to $10,000,000 for the fiscal year 1938, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year 1939, and $50,000,000 for the fiscal year 1940.

Under title II (rehabilitation provisions) the $75,000,000 authorization has been eliminated, but the power of the President to allot relief funds for the purpose remains. I wish we could have secured funds to help the farmer pay at a low rate of interest the mortgage that rests on his farm, but we had to take what we could get.

Under title III (acquisition of submarginal lands) the appropriations authorized are $10,000,000 for the fiscal year 1938 and $20,000,000 for the 2 fiscal years thereafter.

Our original bill (H. R. 6240) carried an appropriation under title I of $50,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1942. Title II of H. R. 6240 carried for rehabilitation loans an authorization for an appropriation for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1938, and June 30, 1939, a sum not exceeding $75,000,000 for each of such fiscal years. Under this title II of H. R. 6240 we tried to take care of the farmer whose farm is mortgaged and give him the right to secure money at a low rate of interest to pay off his present indebtedness but under the new bill we had to eliminate the authorization for this appropriation. Title III of H. R. 6240 (retirement of submarginal land) carried an authorization to be appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and $20,000,000 for each of the three fiscal years thereafter.

It will not be my purpose here to discuss the reasons for the authorizations for reduced appropriations. We did the best we could and surmounted our many obstacles as best we could. It has been a hard job to get any bill at all.

On Thursday, April 29, 1937, I made a speech on the floor of this House wherein I discussed in detail H. R. 6240. That was after the Rules Committee denied the House Committee on Agriculture a rule for the consideration of H. R. 6240.

At that time I endeavored to explain H. R. 6240, section by section and title by title, and implored the Rules Committee of the House to give us a rule so we could take this legislation up in this House.

I am indeed gratified that we have been able to work out a compromise and obtain a rule for the consideration of this modified farm-tenant bill at this time, which is cited as the Farm Security Act of 1937.

This has required time, tact, effort, and the spirit of giving and taking on the part of those who have had this farm-tenant problem under consideration for quite some time.

At the outset I want us to bear in mind that the position the House Committee on Agriculture takes, as evidenced by this farm-tenant bill and the provisions contained therein, differs materially from the position the Senate Agriculture Committee takes, as evidenced by the provisions of the Senate farm-tenant bill, S. 106.

Of course, I do not know in what respects the membership of this House will amend this farm-tenant bill that the House Committee on Agriculture has worked so hard and long on.

We have brought it on the floor of this House wide open for amendments and after general debate, it will, of course, be read under the 5-minute rule, and I know various and sundry amendments will be proposed.

Of course, no one knows what the final vote will be or in what form this House will pass this bill. However, I trust that we will pass this House farm-tenant bill in substantially the same form as it is now being presented to this House by our House Committee on Agriculture. If we do amend this bill here, I hope that whatever amendments this House adopts will be helpful instead of hurtful in our efforts to tackle this farm-tenant problem.

If the Senate passes a farm-tenant bill, it will, in my judgment, be quite different to this farm-tenant bill that we are now considering in the House.

Of course the conference committee will have to be selected and the whole matter as presented by the position of both the House and the Senate on this question will have to be considered and threshed out in conference.

If the proposed legislation reaches that stage I am likely to be selected as one of the House conferees, and I feel now that the conferees will be faced with some rather serious and fundamental questions involving this particular legislation.

No one knows just what will be finally agreed to, and if and when we finally work out our differences at this session of Congress, no one knows what the Farm Security Act of 1937 will really contain.

I am sure all of us hope that we can get some real constructive legislation enacted at this session of Congress that will enable this administration to tackle this serious and complicated farm-tenant problem in a way that will lead to lasting and worth-while results.

We know it is a vital question and one that certainly presents a most serious problem to the present and future generations of this country.

To my mind, it is certainly a problem so serious and far reaching as to require handling by the Federal Government. However, we must ever be mindful that the Federal control and supervision of this problem should be of a logical, practical, and reasonable nature.

As I have formerly said on the floor of this House in discussing this question, this farm-tenant problem is one that should be cautiously and thoughtfully undertaken.

Personally I feel that the House provisions as set forth in this bill, H. R. 7562, are much better than the provisions of the Senate bill, S. 106. However, I am aware of the fact that the President's Special Farm Tenancy Committee, as well as some of the heads of this administration, prefer the provisions and philosophy of the Senate bill to those provided by our House farm-tenant bill.

To my mind, this does not amount to more than a trifle, and the policy of the administration in handling this matter that will be shaped if and when we finally agree and pass a farm-tenant bill is, to my mind, one of great importance.

If the idea prevails as set forth in the Senate bill, the Government will be absolutely in the land-purchasing business.

Under the Senate bill the Government buys the land in fee simple and in turn sells the land to the prospective home seeker. The Government retains title, and the tenant does not and cannot receive absolute title to the property until after a long period of years.

The Senate bill, to my mind, presents some serious and grave problems in regard to taxation as to local, county, and State requirements. This land should be subject to taxation.

I will not attempt here to analyze the Senate bill. We will cross that bridge when we get to it, as no farm-tenant legislation has been considered on the floor of the Senate thus far this session.

As my time is passing rapidly, I shall be glad to yield to any of my colleagues for any questions they may desire to propound relating to this bill that is now before the House, because I know the Members are interested in this bill, and, although it is not what a lot of us like, it is the best we can do under the circumstances and is a step in the right direction. It is the policy we have agreed upon. I do not hesitate to yield to any Member to answer what questions I can with reference to how this act is supposed to be administered. I shall be glad to answer any questions I can with reference to the set-up under this act, the benefits of which will be brought to every district of the United States where farm tenancy exists and where it is prevalent according to the need and as far as the funds will go that we provide.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I call the gentleman's attention to the language on page 4, line 15, paragraph 4, which reads as follows:

> Be in such form and contain such covenants as the Secretary shall prescribe to secure the payment of the unpaid balance of the loan, together with interest thereon, to protect the security, and to assure that the farm will be maintained in repair, and waste and exhaustion of the farm prevented.

Mr. DOXEY. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is upon that point I endeavored to address myself a few moments ago. I would like to have the gentleman state to us, if he will, how far it is contemplated the Secretary of Agriculture will obligate the man who has purchased the farm with Government money to refrain from unsound farm practices and, if he does not so refrain, what will be his fate?

Mr. DOXEY. I have an opinion, and it may be speculation on my part, because I cannot answer in detail those questions which will be entirely up to the administrative agency to determine. The matter will be regulated somewhat in this way: There will be the various county committees and these county committees will select, from among the multitude that possibly will apply for the loan to buy a farm, those who appear to be best qualified to receive the benefits of this act. The county committees will select applicants by taking into account their experience, character, standing, and also whether or not they have dependents, are married, have made a partial success of farming, have enough farming implements and livestock to carry on their farming operations and so forth, all leading to a final test of whether or not in their specific cases they have been successful as farm tenants.

This bill applies only to people who are now farm tenants, including laborers, sharecroppers, and those who get the biggest portion of their income from farming operations. It does not say that a man who has possibly owned a farm in the past and who has engaged in sound farming operations, but on account of the depression or some other condition that we know has been prevalent throughout the agricultural sections of our country is now in the class of a farm tenant, cannot be selected. When the individual is selected by the county committee and the farm that he is supposed to buy or be placed in charge of is selected, the contract is made. I may say that what would be a real, practical, sensible, sizable farm in the Middle West would not be the same in the deep South or in the county from which my distinguished friend from New York comes. We know this bill can only scratch the surface, but it will enable people to enjoy the benefits from this particular bill if they will indulge in sound farming practices. When the man is selected and passed upon by the county committee, and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, or those acting under him, and the farm is agreed upon, I imagine there will be an understanding as well as a contract between that person and the source from which he receives his benefits. This will be his home, as has been so beautifully and touchingly described by not only the Speaker of the House but by the chairman of our Committee on Agriculture, as well as the gentleman from New York.

With reference to that specific paragraph and what will constitute waste and what will not constitute waste, that is left in large measure to the sound, discretionary judgment of the man who fills the position of owner and, of course, to an extent it will be regulated by the Secretary of Agriculture. There is no Member of this Congress or no member of the Committee on Agriculture who can definitely and specifically outline the program in advance. That will have to be worked out by the Secretary of Agriculture and those assisting him in the administration of this bill.

Mr. MAHON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON of Texas. Does not my distinguished friend feel that since we want to start off in a small way and conservatively, we should follow the example of other Government lending agencies, or most of them, and require that the tenant make some little down payment of say 5 percent and put a ceiling to these loans, as we do in connection with most other Government loans, providing that not more

than six or seven thousand dollars shall be lent to any one tenant?

Mr. DOXEY. Of course, I listened very attentively to the gentleman's speech this morning and I wish I had time to add something to what he said. The Committee on Agriculture has discussed every phase of this bill. We did not just begin during the present session of this Congress to study and work on this tenant problem. We started hearings on the farm tenancy problem back in 1935. We have worked assiduously on the measure and, as stated by the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, there is a great diversity of opinion. This bill provides for a county committee, which will take into consideration some of the things I have enumerated and I imagine if they find an applicant who is able to make a down payment, that will be quite a factor in that individual's being selected, you may say, from the eligible list. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I have heard our distinguished Speaker refer to some tables. I do not know what the tables are to which he refers and I do not know whether he is going to put them in the RECORD. However, I have a break-down of the statistics on the tenancy question with reference to States. If our distinguished Speaker does not include them in his remarks, I should like to revise my remarks and include therein these tables, showing not only the number of farmers in each State and the number of tenants, but the number of home owners, the number of farmers who actually operate farms today but do not own them, and the number of farm owners who do not operate their farms. I think all this information will be helpful to the membership of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may state to the gentleman from Mississippi that it would be necessary for him to obtain the consent of the House for the inclusion in his remarks of the tables to which he refers.

Mr. DOXEY. I just ask to revise and extends my remarks and set out these tables.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may extend his own remarks, but the gentleman will have to obtain the consent of the House to include the statistics to which he refers.

The consent of the House having been obtained, the tables referred to are as follows:

Percent of tenancy in the United States, 1935[1]

State	Total number of farmers	Total number of tenants	Percentage of farmers who are tenants
Total, United States	6,812,350	2,865,155	42.1
Maine	41,907	2,883	6.9
New Hampshire	17,695	1,284	7.3
Vermont	27,061	2,943	10.9
Ohio	255,146	73,770	28.9
Indiana	200,835	63,509	31.6
Illinois	231,312	102,856	44.5
Michigan	196,517	37,334	19.0
Wisconsin	199,877	41,285	20.7
Minnesota	203,302	68,412	33.7
Iowa	221,986	110,151	49.6
Missouri	278,454	108,023	38.8
North Dakota	84,606	33,122	39.1
South Dakota	83,303	40,477	48.6
Nebraska	133,616	65,808	49.3
Kansas	174,589	76,771	44.0
Delaware	10,331	3,610	34.8
Maryland	44,412	12,090	27.2
District of Columbia	89	21	23.6
Virginia	197,632	58,386	29.5
West Virginia	104,747	27,021	25.8
North Carolina	300,967	142,158	47.2
South Carolina	165,504	102,926	62.2
Georgia	250,544	164,331	65.6
Massachusetts	35,094	2,164	6.2
Rhode Island	4,327	597	13.8
Connecticut	32,157	2,339	7.3
New York	177,025	25,102	14.2
New Jersey	29,375	5,242	17.8
Pennsylvania	191,284	33,927	17.7
Florida	72,857	20,399	28.0
Kentucky	278,298	103,215	37.1
Tennessee	273,783	126,607	46.2
Alabama	273,455	176,247	64.5
Mississippi	311,683	217,564	69.8
Arkansas	253,013	151,759	60.0
Louisiana	170,216	108,377	63.7
Oklahoma	213,325	130,661	61.2
Texas	501,017	286,103	57.1
Montana	50,564	13,985	27.7
Idaho	45,113	12,861	28.5
Wyoming	17,487	4,083	23.3
Colorado	63,644	24,840	39.0
New Mexico	41,369	7,857	19.0
Arizona	18,824	3,344	17.8
Utah	30,695	4,582	14.9
Nevada	3,696	533	14.4
Washington	84,381	16,835	20.0
Oregon	64,826	14,065	21.7
California	150,360	32,696	21.7

[1] From census publications.

Percent of tenancy in the United States, 1935—Continued

State	Total number of farmers	Total number of tenants	Percentage of farmers who are tenants
Mississippi	311,683	217,564	69.8
Arkansas	253,013	151,759	60.0
Louisiana	170,216	108,377	63.7
Oklahoma	213,325	130,661	61.2
Texas	501,017	286,103	57.1
Montana	50,564	13,985	27.7
Idaho	45,113	12,861	28.5
Wyoming	17,487	4,083	23.3
Colorado	63,644	24,840	39.0
New Mexico	41,369	7,857	19.0
Arizona	18,824	3,344	17.8
Utah	30,695	4,582	14.9
Nevada	3,696	533	14.4
Washington	84,381	16,835	20.0
Oregon	64,826	14,065	21.7
California	150,360	32,696	21.7

Percentage of the value of farm real estate owned and not owned by the operator, 1930[1]

State	Total, percent	Percent of equity	
		Not owned	Owned
Total, United States	100	58.0	42.0
Maine	100	22.3	77.7
New Hampshire	100	29.6	70.4
Vermont	100	38.8	61.2
Massachusetts	100	37.3	62.7
Rhode Island	100	38.8	61.2
Connecticut	100	35.7	64.3
New York	100	40.2	59.8
New Jersey	100	43.2	56.8
Pennsylvania	100	38.5	61.5
Ohio	100	50.2	49.8
Indiana	100	58.9	41.1
Illinois	100	70.7	29.3
Michigan	100	44.9	55.1
Wisconsin	100	49.6	50.4
Minnesota	100	58.8	41.2
Iowa	100	70.8	29.2
Missouri	100	56.6	43.4
North Dakota	100	66.1	33.9
South Dakota	100	71.7	28.3
Nebraska	100	67.0	33.0
Kansas	100	65.4	34.6
Delaware	100	52.1	47.9
Maryland	100	49.0	51.0
Virginia	100	36.2	63.8
West Virginia	100	28.1	71.9
North Carolina	100	52.0	48.0
South Carolina	100	60.9	39.1
Georgia	100	64.9	35.1
Florida	100	44.9	55.1
Kentucky	100	41.0	59.0
Tennessee	100	47.8	52.2
Alabama	100	62.1	37.9
Mississippi	100	67.8	32.2
Arkansas	100	64.4	35.6
Louisiana	100	63.6	36.4
Oklahoma	100	69.5	30.5
Texas	100	66.2	33.8
Montana	100	62.2	37.8
Idaho	100	56.5	43.5
Wyoming	100	59.6	40.4
Colorado	100	65.3	34.7
New Mexico	100	60.2	39.8
Arizona	100	65.0	35.0
Utah	100	41.6	58.4
Nevada	100	54.8	45.2
Washington	100	50.5	49.5
Oregon	100	49.7	50.2
California	100	53.9	46.1

[1] From census publications.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, we are now discussing the Farm Security Act of 1937. Naturally I am as interested in the security of the American farmer as any individual Member of the House, and have been very much concerned about the problems of the farmer. In my opinion he is the hardest working and most industrious individual in this country, spending many hours working on his farm to secure a livelihood. And this applies not only to the farmer on the farm but to the wife of the farmer who spends more working hours than any other of the women of this country in assisting the farmer in running the farm.

These farmers are as fine a class of people as there are living in this country today. But, I question very much the benefits of some of the things which have been put into effect as law by this administration, especially for the farmers of my district. For instance, these reciprocal-trade agreements, whereby farm produce is imported into this country in greater and greater quantities today than ever before. I know that is the case with dairy and farm products, and if that is aid and assistance to the farmer then I do not understand the economics which this administration is trying to effect. We must keep the American markets for the American farmer.

In this bill, section 41a, provision is made that the Secretary of Agriculture shall have power to appoint those who are to administer the act without regard to civil-service rules and regulations. This I am opposed to. I think we should have the merit system in Government rather than the old log-rolling political methods which those in control of the House have so frequently objected to but which they still support.

Why, it was only last week here in the House we Republicans tried to get a vote on the C. C. C. bill and practically every Member on the Democratic side refused to grant civil service to the employees of the C. C. C. camps. Yet you say you are in favor of civil service. It is just too bad that a vote could not be had on the civil-service provision of that bill so you fellows could have been recorded. Let your constituents know where you are by a vote. Do not be afraid to be recorded. When they asked for a rising vote only five Democrats stood up, and we were unable to get a yea-and-nay vote.

It is appropriate here to add a few remarks on the state of the Nation, showing that by repealing a lot of laws which have been enacted we will benefit the farmer more than by enacting this present bill.

We want to get down to sound solid facts rather than a lot of political joyrides in legislation that will carry the farmer farther away from security rather than nearer to it. This Nation is right on a seething volcano, and if it erupts the farmers and citizens of this country will have no security under our Constitution.

THE STATE OF THE NATION

We have reached the lowest point in the depression both financially and morally from which we can survive as a republic. It is impossible longer to conceal the facts about or disguise the failures of the New Deal. The halo which was skillfully built around the personality of Mr. Roosevelt has just about disappeared. Today he stands revealed as a very human being, a blunderer who obstinately clings to the ill-conceived plans of his New Deal advisers.

That great changes are about to come in this country can be forecast from the great wave of crime which has lately come upon us and the absolute indifference of a large part of the population to law and order. We have seen those of our workingmen who refused to be exploited and herded into labor organizations forced into idleness. We have seen law and order give way before the assaults of armed and organized mobs in many cities. The impotence of State and Federal authorities in the situation has been manifest throughout. In their zeal for the success of friendly cooperators in the ranks of organized labor the New Deal agencies have, at times, themselves become the principal violators of the practices they so loudly condemn in others.

The American workingman looks over the present situation and in the privacy of his home comes to the conclusion that he will be the ultimate victim of the economic breakdown which appears to be upon us; he faces the facts and finds that there has been but little of substantial value accomplished for him and his family.

Mr. Chairman, the workingman of America now knows that we are more than $36,000,000,000 in debt. He knows that the social security he has been promised is based on pauperism. He knows that the frontiers that will be extended for him are the frontiers of regimentation and collectivism.

Mr. Chairman, while there are still many in the country who will not willingly give up their hereditary notions of the private right to work public wrongs, these present no greater dangers to the Republic than the politicians whose ascent to power has been followed time after time by raids upon the public till on their own accounts. The huge army of public employees—Federal, State, and local—has forced many of the States for the first time in history to set up economic trade barriers between each other. We are about to drive out of business many of the great industrial leaders whose services to the people and to the Nation are cheaply paid for by allowing them the acquisition of moderate private fortunes.

The demands of the Government for more and more taxes and a greater share in the production by constant applications of the tax burden have forced many of these industrialists into retirement or to seek other sources for the investment of their capital.

So the situation can be summarized. The people of the Nation no longer prostitute their hearts and hopes at the footstool of Mr. Roosevelt. Events, not politicians, have changed the national outlook. Five years ago the issue was the national depression. Last summer it was the return to prosperity. Today the issue is, Shall the Republic survive?

Mr. Chairman, the people of the Nation will no longer quietly acquiesce in the demands of the President that he be allowed full control over the purse strings of the Nation and the economic life of the masses. This Congress has a responsibility to the people and to the nations of the world. Will Congress assume this responsibility?

This Congress must act. This Congress must do something to end the uncertainty which clouds the citizen's right to work without interference from either the hand of a Federal bureaucrat or the sanction of a labor organizer. Mr. Chairman, this is the state of the Nation today. May God save the United States.

In that way and that way only can we give security to the farmers and to all our citizens. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it is necessary for me to take much time to point out the desirability of legislation which will relieve the farm tenancy situation in this country. I only regret it is such a big problem and has so many ramifications it is impossible for us to solve it all by legislation.

There are those this afternoon who have expressed their regret that we are not attacking this problem in a more extensive way, and I share that regret; that is, I wish we might do more than I feel we shall be doing through the passing of this measure. However, I think also there is something to be said on behalf of a careful and cautious approach. Whatever we may want to do, we know we cannot through the expenditure or the lending of Federal funds make every farm tenant a landowner in this country. This is an impossibility. We have 2,800,000 farm tenants. If we were to spend only $5,000 in putting each one of them on a farm, it would mean the expenditure of $14,000,000,000. However, I think we can, through this proposed legislation, meager and inadequate as it may be, demonstrate within the period of a few years whether or not this is the proper method of approach, or one effective angle of approach, to the problem. Therefore, I favor the measure we have before us this afternoon.

As I stated in the beginning, it is generally recognized that this is a grave national problem. It is not a problem of recent origin, however, because beginning back in 1880, when we had our first census figures on farm tenancy, there has been a steady increase in farm tenancy until the last 5-year period, from 1930 to 1935, when the proportion of tenancy underwent a slight decrease.

However, as I have just stated, the problem is not a new one at all, nor is its gravity new, because during the two decades from 1880 until 1900 we had a greater increase in farm tenancy, both in numbers and percentage, than we have had during the 35 years since that time. During that

20-year period we had an increase in the number of farm tenants in this country of 1,000,000, and a percentage increase of approximately 10 percent. This was at a time when our public lands were still open to settlement, and during a period when 300,000,000 acres of new land were brought into the farm acreage of this country. From 1900 to 1935 we had an increase in the number of tenants amounting to 864,000 and an increase in percentage of 6.8 percent. In other words, the percentage increased from 35.3 to 42.1 percent.

From 1900 to 1930 there was a constant increase in the percentage of tenancy, the greatest increase, however, occurring between 1925 and 1930. From 1930 to 1935 the percentage of tenancy decreased from 42.4 per cent to 42.1 percent; yet during that time there was an actual increase of about 200,000 in the number of farm tenants in this country. However, during the same period of time there was an increase of over 300,000 in the number of owner-operators, which accounts for the fact that the percentage has gone down slightly.

This problem is so great and complex that we cannot possibly go into the causes of it in the brief time we shall have this afternoon. The problem varies in different parts of the country. In some sections it is not serious. It is a greater problem in the South than in other parts of the country, yet in the Middle West, particularly in the States of Iowa, Illinois, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas, it is a serious problem, because in all these States the percentage of farm tenancy approaches 50 percent. It is 49.6 percent in Iowa, 49.3 per cent in Nebraska, 44.5 percent in Illinois, 48.6 percent in South Dakota, and 44 percent in Kansas. Therefore farm tenancy is a grave problem in those States and somewhat of a problem in at least half the States of the Nation.

The problem varies even in different counties within States. In the State of Mississippi, which has the highest percentage of farm tenancy, there is a large variation between the percentages of farm tenancy in different counties. As I recall the figures, in one county the percentage is only 11.4 percent, far below the national average, while in another county it is about 96.8 percent. In the State of Oklahoma there are wide variations, from a low of 30.6 percent to a high of 78.6 percent, and such variations exist in all the States where farm tenancy is extensive.

There are other approaches to the solution of this problem than the one we are attempting to set up today. The President's Commission on Farm Tenancy made a number of recommendations, of which Government financing of tenants is only one. They put their finger on what I think is one of the great causes of farm tenancy, speculation in farm land. If you go to the States in the northeastern part of the country, in New England and the North Atlantic States, where the percentage of farm tenancy is smallest, you will find that in these States for many years farm-land values have been stable. If you go out into Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, the Dakotas, and other States in that area, you will find that during the same period of time there have been quite violent fluctuations in the prices of farm land.

You will find, I think, that even today a great deal of the farm land in the Middle West is priced higher than will pay interest upon the investment. Of course, one of the reasons for the great fluctuations in the price of farm lands is the fluctuation in the price of agricultural products. If these prices could be stabilized, this would have a great effect upon reducing this particular cause of farm tenancy, but I have not the time now to go into any further discussion of that phase of the question.

One thing that should be remembered in connection with any discussion of the question of farm tenancy in the South is that there are two classes of tenants there, one the class which the Bureau of the Census classifies as a tenant, and the other a class which is classified as a sharecropper, a group which, in effect, is more nearly composed of farm laborers than anything else, because, while they take a share of the crop that they make, yet they ordinarily have nothing to say about the management of their operations or the crop they will grow, but simply occupy the status of working for someone else, getting their compensation out of the crop rather than in cash.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have to approach the solution of the problem of the sharecropper, perhaps, from a different angle than we do that of the tenant who has had some experience in management, who has his own property in the way of farming implements and livestock, and who has gone a little further up the rung of the agricultural ladder.

The authors of the book The Collapse of Cotton Tenancy, one of whom is Dr. W. W. Alexander, Administrator of the Resettlement Administration, conclude that it is practically impossible for tenants in the South to accumulate property or to become independent. The reasons which are given in support of this conclusion are: First, the agriculture that the tenant knows fits only the old system; second, the banks cannot finance the tenant because they are geared to the needs of the plantations; third, the cost of merchant credit leaves little or nothing for captial accumulation; fourth, the crop-lien credit system has destroyed his independence in marketing his crop. Not only do the reasons given above seem to make the problem in the South more difficult than that of the Nation as a whole but, in addition, as mentioned above, the sharecropper particularly does not at this time have either the education, experience, or background to enable him to graduate into the ranks of landowners. Many students of the problem believe that it will never be possible to make independent landowners out of this group and that whatever attempts are made for the relief of this situation should be directed, at least for the time being, to improving their status as sharecroppers and tenants.

The bill which we have before us today is based upon the idea that while we cannot help all of those who are deserving of assistance in becoming farm owners, we ought to do what we can to help the most deserving, those who are more nearly ready to undertake the obligations and the burdens of farm ownership.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question just at that point?

Mr. HOPE. For a very brief question; yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Since the Government, manifestly, is unable to help all, would it not prevent discrimination if there were some qualifications so as to enable the aid to be extended to the most deserving and thereby give all the same opportunity to qualify?

Mr. HOPE. I think that is true, and this bill does provide some qualifications which will enable the local committees to choose the most deserving.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. May I be more specific by saying that the qualifications should be that a man is able to furnish at least a part of the purchase price or is better qualified by experience to operate a farm?

Mr. HOPE. Of course, that is an element that the local committee should carefully consider. I think the success or failure of this approach to the problem is going to depend very largely upon the local committees. If we have local committees the members of which are conscientious and will give their time and their effort to a job at which they are going to be very poorly paid, and who will exercise proper judgment and discretion in the selection of the tenants, the plan has a much better chance of being successful. Local committees can also be of great assistance in the selection of desirable farms and in seeing they are secured at fair prices.

In conclusion let me say that I think it is particularly important that we recognize this bill as an attempt to solve the many-sided tenant problem from only one angle. There are many other things which need to be done not only by the Federal, State, and local governments, but by individual and community efforts as well. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to express my appreciation to the Members who have spoken preceding me on the presentation of this important question, which we have up for consideration this afternoon. This is, after all, a gigantic problem and the measure we are considering now, of course, admittedly is an experiment at best.

We are considering the matter of expending some $10,000,000 which, when divided among the various divisions of the United States, gets pretty small, being approximately $3,000 for each county in the United States, if you please. So it naturally resolves itself into an experiment which, after all, is well worth trying. When we appreciate the fact that the condition with reference to farm tenancy is continually growing worse, we realize it is high time for us as individuals and as Members of Congress to take hold of this problem and try to help bring about its solution to some extent at least.

The general intention of the bill before us today is to reduce to some extent the number of farm owners who are becoming tenants in this country. Our attention has just been called to the fact that some 50 years ago 24 percent of our farmers were tenant farmers, but that now half of them are tenant farmers. In Mississippi we are told that 60 percent are tenants, in South Carolina 62 percent, in Alabama 64 percent, and Georgia 65 percent. Between 35,000 and 40,000 farmers are becoming tenant farmers every year. So we have approximately some 2,865,000 tenant farmers and 3,800,000 farm owners.

I want, however, to call your attention this afternoon to a measure pending before Congress that I deem is of considerable importance to the country at large, and especially to those who are interested in agricultural pursuits. It is with reference to H. R. 6763, which passed this House on June 7, and is now pending before the Senate.

This bill provides for the extension for 1 additional year of the 3½-percent interest rate on Federal land-bank loans and for a 4-percent rate for the following year on land-bank loans and land-bank commissioner loans. The present extension expires on July 1 this year. Unless this extension is granted, the farmers holding Federal land-bank loans will go back to the payment of the old rate of interest as it existed 2 years ago. In other words, in just 3 days the present extension expires, and the farmers who owe these loans will be charged with an additional interest rate of from 1 percent to 2 percent.

The thing that causes me to call your particular attention to this bill is the text of the President's letter, dated June 7, directed to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House and to certain Members of the Senate, wherein he opposes the reduction in interest rates on Farm Credit Administration loans. He states in the letter that he is "disturbed by the provisions of this bill" and believes the Members of Congress should be advised of the situation which will be created by the passage of that measure. He says, among other things, that any reduction below the rates of interest that were formerly provided by the Federal land bank would create a gift to the farmer from the Federal Treasury, and he also states that the borrowers from the Federal land bank, under this bill, "are given an annual grant or gift by legalizing an abnormally low rate of interest."

He further states that the reduction in the interest rates to the farmers by the Federal land bank and the Land Bank Commissioner, as provided by the terms of this bill, will cost the United States Government more than $40,000,000 per year, and that the passage of this bill was not contemplated in the preparation of the Budget for the fiscal year of 1938. He says he is definitely seeking the balancing of the Budget, and that the Budget must not be thrown out of balance through extra appropriations or obligations.

First, I should like to give due credit to the administration for having given this problem the consideration to which he believes it is entitled. I am also in favor of balancing the Budget, just as soon as it possibly can be done, and do not want that bill to create a further deficit in the United States Treasury.

I propose first to show that I do not believe there should or will be a deficit that will require the need of an appropriation from the Treasury, by reason of the extension of the present interest rates by the Federal land bank, or the Federal Land Bank Commissioner, for a period of 1 more year. I do not believe this measure is going to cause a raid on the United States Treasury by the farmers of this country, in any sense of the word. However, let me suggest that even if the passage of this bill should result in the creation of a small subsidy on the part of the Treasury—that the administration is inconsistent in opposing it.

I realize we should not grant subsidies to one group of persons just because we have granted them to other groups of persons or concerns—but we should take into account at least, that subsidies have been granted by the hundreds of millions of dollars to municipalities and private corporations, as well as individuals, during the past few years.

In the discussion of this bill, I do not want to go into a discussion of those expenditures, except to call your attention to the fact that during the 6 months Congress has been in session, it has exceeded its estimated appropriations by millions of dollars. This seems not to have disturbed the administration or its leaders. The House has already appropriated about $600,000,000 for the Navy, and $425,000,000 for the Army. You will recall that amendments have been made to the various appropriation bills, increasing the liberal recommendations of the Appropriations Committee of the House, in many instances, amounting in all to many millions of dollars.

I do not want to take too much of your time at this point. You will, however, recall that, without much opposition, during this session this House has agreed to spend a vast amount of funds from the Federal Treasury that were not originally contemplated by the committee having the measures in charge. For instance, only a few days ago this House agreed to spend $7,000,000 for a tract of timberland in California that is to be added to a national park. I am informed that this tract is 15 miles away from the park. This House agreed to spend without the matching of State funds, $5,000,000 to complete or extend the building of a national highway in North Carolina and two or three Southern States. There are so many instances where we have exceeded the committee recommendations.

I mention these items to show that, generally speaking, the administration does not seem to be so much "disturbed" about the expenditure of a large amount of funds from the Federal Treasury, even in many instances beyond the amounts suggested by our committees.

During the past 4 years, according to statistics furnished by the Department of Agriculture, 27 out of every 1,000 farm owners in this country lost their farms for the reason that they were not able to pay their interest and their taxes. And I believe that you will agree with me that with comparatively few exceptions this failure came about by circumstances over which they had no control. Thousands of farmers in the last 4 years have lost their homes. They have either become tenant farmers or have in many cases gone on the relief rolls.

We have here a serious situation. I cite these figures to you to show that the farmer's condition is far from being solved and that he is going to need some further assistance, for a while at least, if he is expected to live on his own farm.

Now, I should like to call your attention to the fact that there are 639,800 land-bank and land-bank-commissioner borrowers in the United States which, I am informed, includes about 37 percent of the farm loans in this country. About 77 percent of these borrowers had paid their interest at the end of the year 1936. According to Federal land-bank figures, there were 95,300 farmers who were unable to take care of their interest items and the taxes which became due at the end of last year. This by reason of crop failures and adverse conditions. These farmers could not meet their obligations. These farms involve an investment of approxi-

mately $428,800 worth of land. This number would have been greater had it not been for the reduction of interest heretofore granted by this Congress.

We are dealing with a stupendous problem this afternoon. It seems to me that if we are going to save the farms for the farmers, that the least thing we can do is to maintain the present rate of interest on Federal land-bank and commissioner loans for another year, and the reason I call your attention to it now is because the bill is in the hands of a committee in the Senate, and, with the administration apparently opposed to it, I believe the situation can be most important.

One of the things we have been discussing during this session of Congress is trying to keep people from the relief rolls. We have talked about the farmers who are on relief rolls, and yet we find between 35,000 and 40,000 farmers, on an average, are losing their farms each year. If you want to keep men off the relief rolls—if at this particular time you want to help the farmer to help himself—let us see that the present rate of interest is maintained, and let us assist materially some 685,000 farmers who will be benefited thereby and without, in my opinion, any expense to the Federal Government.

A good deal has been said about the low rate of interest granted to farmers by the Federal agencies during the present emergency. I grant you that it is a comparatively low rate, but not as compared with the rates granted to railroad companies and corporations which have been assisted by the use of Government funds. Furthermore, when these loans were first made the interest rate was 4½ and 5 percent. The interest rate that is now being paid for the use of this money is approximately 3 percent. And let us not forget that the farmer, when he makes his loan, buys stock for an amount equivalent to 5 percent of the amount of his loan; and since we have some $2,000,000,000 in farm loans, we have approximately $100,000,000 of the farmers' money paid to the Federal land banks that helps to guarantee the payment of these obligations. Also, when the farmer made his loan, he paid the secretary of the local organization a fee on a percentage basis on his loan for services in securing the loan for him.

Furthermore, if you will examine the statement of the Federal land bank for the year 1936, and the first quarter of 1937, it will show a net profit of some $22,000,000, with sufficient reserves that have been set up to protect the bank against losses of shrinkage on account of judgments, foreclosures, and real estate owned, and so forth.

It is my contention that with the $22,000,000 of profits already shown by the Federal land bank, and the profits that should accrue during the next year, by the careful management on the part of those in charge of Federal farm mortgage organizations that there will be more than enough profit to offset the slight reduction in interest rates, and at the same time maintain a sound financial situation so far as the land bank is concerned.

If the farmers of this country can raise a good crop this year and have a fair price for it—the delinquencies in the payment of interest and taxes will be at a minimum in a year from now. If you want to help the farmer to help himself, here is a chance where you can assist a great number of representative persons who are engaged in the business of agriculture in this country. They are not asking for alms in any sense of the word. All they are asking for is an even break. Let's help provide it to them if we can.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as a result of legislation enacted during the past 4 years by the Democratic Party, increased income has come to the farmers of America and with it, a revival in all business. Restored purchasing power has resulted in improved business conditions in the cities. The wheels of factories, mills, mines, and railroads are again turning, and all this gained in the face of unusual natural disaster—the droughts and floods of recent years. But the consequences of these unusual natural conditions have not been as severe as the man-made disaster from 1929 to 1933, when bankruptcy and ruin overtook the American farmer and his earnings were swept from under him. Because of the legislation passed by the Roosevelt administration, national recovery has been realized and the progress made by agriculture has been of tremendous assistance to the entire Nation in recovery from the depths of depression. The Agricultural Adjustment Act was the keystone in the arch of the Nation's recovery. At present, we have the Soil Conservation program, supplemented by marketing agreements, surplus crop removal, commodity loans, flood- and drought-relief measures.

We have laid the foundation for an economically sound national farm policy. The Committee on Agriculture, of which I am honored to be a member, is now working with the farmers and the farm organizations on a permanent legislative program to safeguard food supplies and farm income. We hope to draft a bill that will make possible legislation to store up reserves of farm crops from surplus years for use in lean years. To preserve and build up the fertility of the soil, to stabilize the supply and prices of farm products, and to increase the farmer's income. This proposed legislation we hope to soon have ready for consideration by the House.

Today we deal with the farm-tenant bill. We provide for loans to be made available to sharecroppers, laborers, and tenants. Fifty years ago one out of every four farmers was a tenant. Today two out of every five are tenants. Statistics tells us that for the past 10 years there has been an annual yearly increase of tenants of about 40,000 farmers. This must not continue in the future. Sound legislation must be provided by which unfortunate people may be able to secure land or credit with which to make a crop and purchase a home. By so doing, a large measure of poverty, social unrest, and economic insecurity will be eliminated. The farm-tenant bill, now under consideration, proposes to remedy this condition and provide money for distressed farm tenants. It will prevent the tendency of landowners to become tenants, and tenants to become laborers, and laborers to become objects of charity. The bill authorizes loans to be made at an interest rate of 3 percent per annum for a period of 30 years, with which to buy farm lands. The appropriation made available in the bill is $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and $25,000,000 for the year 1939, and not to exceed $50,000,000 for the year 1940.

Only farm owners, farm tenants, farm laborers, and sharecroppers are eligible for this loan. To my mind it is a most meritorious bill. I have been greatly interested in helping to secure legislation of this kind before our committee. We have held extensive hearings, which are now in the hands of the Members of the House. My regret and disappointment is only because of the small appropriation carried in the bill, which has been made necessary because of the economy drive. I hope by next year it will be possible to increase the appropriation and to amend the bill from year to year that more money will be made available for those in need of this assistance and to prevent the further losing of farm homes and lands by their owners.

There is provided in the measure a local county committee of three members to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture to supervise the loans provided for in the bill. This will guarantee proper appraisal on the part of the borrowers and a fair basis upon which the Government can carry out the provisions of this act.

The future of America is inseparably bound with our farms and farmers. The farmer employs more laborers than all the railroads, mills, mines, and factories combined. He has more invested in capital than do all other lines of business. The successful management of this great investment and basic industry affects the future welfare of our country. It is a national problem and should be treated as such. The successful management of the farm is essential to the existence of all other business. The farmer feeds and clothes the world. He produces new wealth from the soil he

cultivates each year. He is the foundation of all national prosperity. If he does not have buying power, the wheels of industry stop. What would happen if the farmers in the United States should go on a sit-down strike as we witness today in many of our factories? Who would feed and clothe the city dweller and the factory worker? The answer is, He would go naked and hungry, seeking relief, with none to be had; yet the farmer works longer hours and more days per week than any mill or factory.

Not only does the farmer do this, but all the members of his family have their long hours, from early morn until late in the night, they each go about their daily task. If the drought, or the flood, overtakes him, he must continue his efforts. The tax gatherer and the banker levy their tribute just the same, whether the season is good or bad, whether the prices of farm products are high or low. No delays or stay of judgment is tolerated by the interest collector, nor can the payment of taxes be deferred. The one basic industry that must carry on is agriculture. America must be fed. Happy homes are the only guaranty that liberty and freedom possess. Without them anarchy and communism overtake us.

On the Union Railway Station building here in Washington are inscribed these prophetic words: "The farm, the best home for the family, the main source of national wealth, the foundation of society." How true are these words. Farming is the most satisfying life of our people. Here contentment and happiness are most often found. It is where the young men and young women are to receive their first and best training for future citizenship. The security of our Nation and of our people is wrapped up in the farm life. Liberty and freedom had their birth in the open spaces and in the country life. The love of home and the farm is the basis for the love and devotion we feel for our State and Nation. It is around the fireside and in the family circle that patriotism has its beginning. The city environment cannot, and does not produce the serenity of soul, and the clarity of vision, and the steadfastness of purpose, as does the farm and country life. This fact was well-known by our forefathers when they settled America. It was their purpose that every man should own his home and farm. Westward they went and settled the fertile acres between the Atlantic and the Pacific. They fought for more acres to have more farm homes. Today, amidst all the friction and strife that obtains in the industrial and manufacturing centers and cities in our country, the farm home stands as a beacon light to calm and still the waves of discord and discontent.

If the farmer can have equal opportunity with industry and receive parity prices for his crops, and if he can receive his share of Government credit and protection, that is all he asks. He does not seek a dole. He seeks only equality in commodity prices, in interest rates, and in taxes. No farm home in this country should be required to pay a tax where the farm is valued at $2,500 or less. The people of America should be encouraged to become home owners. Too many in the cities and towns all ready. Many of them could, and would become self-sustaining on the farm. Their families would be better off in health, in happiness, and in all the things worth while in life, if they would experience the dignity of honest toil on the farm. The city life weakens, rather than makes strong. It is mechanical and machine like. Every day like the preceding one. No diversity of employment, no change of surroundings, no independence of action or freedom of initiative, no broadening of the vision, no communion with nature, no inspiration from the hills.

The 30,000,000 farmers in America should continue to organize for their own protection and security, the same as has industry. They are entitled to a fair and stable income, the same as the laborer in the mill or the factory. They are entitled to the same convenience to satisfy home needs, as others—cheaper electricity, cheaper farm machinery, cheaper fertilizer, and cheaper interest rates.

They are entitled to a foreign policy that will encourage peace with other nations and a greater market abroad for their farm products.

They are entitled to a soil conservation program. Lands unsuited for cultivation or land that is unprofitable should be taken out of active cultivation.

Better opportunities for the farmer to own his land and his home must be afforded him. This, the bill under consideration seeks to do. Greater security for tenants and sharecroppers and greater incentive to laborers to become home owners is provided for in this measure. The bill is a step in the right direction.

Much better and more far-reaching is the measure than the resettlement and homestead programs. They have been, and will continue to be, an expensive experiment. To my mind, the so-called homesteads will result, and have already done so, in great waste of the taxpayers' money and a still greater disappointment in the future to the homesteaders themselves. Too much waste and extravagance, too many inexperienced, so-called experts and blueprint farmers and builders have been put in control and permitted to experiment with the taxpayers' money. It will be a disappointment throughout the years and will not succeed unless and until men are put in charge to superintend these projects who are actual farmers by experience and who have made a success on their own farms, and who, above all, must know the value of a dollar, and who himself is a taxpayer. No so-called "brain truster" or theorist can successfully carry on a development of this kind, as they have tried to do in the past, with any other result than a waste of the people's money.

The farmer may and does profit by advice and expert assistance, but at last he must be an individualist and work out his own salvation and be the author of his own destiny, if he is to succeed. Individual effort and personal planning has builded a great civilization in America in the past 150 years. It will likewise be responsible for our development in the future. Every farmer and businessman must be the captain of his own soul and pilot his own ship, if he is to succeed. The Government can stand by and aid the farmer and business, as it should do, but at last the farmer and businessman must be responsible for results. This alone encourages him to carry on. Thrift, economy, fair dealing, and the good-neighbor policy will make him sovereign. It will lead to success. Service and honest toil bring their own reward in the great stretch of years ahead, when the shadows fall in the evening across the western slopes.

It is not easy to bring about, by legislation, protection against the drought, flood, frost, or plague, but cooperation and teamwork upon the part of the farmers themselves will largely make this possible. The Congress can substantially aid by proper legislation and the pending bill, in its provisions, will afford great assistance to many deserving borrowers and new home owners.

A higher standard of living will be gradually experienced by the less fortunate by legislation of this kind. I regret that the appropriation provided in the bill is not sufficient to do what we would like to for all the tenant farmers and the home owners in America, but it is a step in the right direction. It is a milestone in the march of progress. Much has been done to aid agriculture in the past few years, and much more remains to be done in the future. The home owners and the farmers are the last great hope in America. I confidently believe, if we are to be saved from communism, socialism, and the Reds, it will be because of the stabilizing influence of the farmers in the United States. They will be the defenders and preservers of our liberty and our institutions in the future as in the past. It is to them that industry owes its life and existence. Business could not exist, nor the professional man live, except the farmer who feeds and clothes him, and provides a market for his merchandise, and pays to it and to him his bills from the earnings of the good earth. Let the Congress continue to concern itself with the farmers' problems. The present administration has been most helpful and, while the farmer has a friend in court, let him demand and receive equal rights and equal opportunities with the manufacturer, and all other industry. The industrialist has been subsidized and protected throughout the years. Let us give the American

farmer a legislative program that will afford him economic security and equality of opportunity.

As was so well said by President Roosevelt in his recent message to Congress:

> When fully half the total farm population of the United States no longer can feel secure, when millions of our people have lost their roots in the soil, action to provide security is imperative and will be generally approved.

This is certainly true. The Federal Government cannot alone accomplish the end desired. We must have the cooperative effort of local and State institutions. We must make possible farm ownership to tenants who have ability and experience, but who cannot become owners without assistance. Loans must be made by the Federal Government to those who are about to lose their farms and who need credit extensions. The passage of this bill will aid the tenants, sharecroppers, and farm laborers to become home owners. This is certainly to be desired by all of us.

We must endeavor in every possible way to increase the income of the farmers of America. They must be protected in what they sell because of the price they are required to pay when they buy. We must also endeavor to have land values become more stable. Too much fluctuation in the price of real estate has existed in the past. We must make it possible for our farmers to receive their share of the national income. This is a national problem. The public welfare demands it. We must provide the normal requirements of the people for food and sufficient reserves must be maintained to protect the people against the hazards of weather, drought, flood, pests, and disease, and also against the dangers of international crises. We must continue with added interest our soil erosion and soil conservation program to protect our land resources. We must also provide for the retirement of submarginal lands of the country from cultivation as provided for in this bill. Soil fertility of the farmlands must, at all times, be maintained and increased. A proper and effective national adjustment of production in line with the demands of consumption is essential. The Government must assist in aiding the farmer to control the movement of his crops to market after they have been produced in order that the prices he is to receive will be stabilized at such levels as to always insure parity income to farmers and fair prices to the producers.

National prosperity and security exist only when the buying power of the farmer is made secure and certain. The consuming public is entitled to have the normal granary and the food reservoir sufficient to meet its demands.

AGRICULTURE MUST NOT BE THE FORGOTTEN INDUSTRY IN AMERICA

The farmer needs to organize for his own protection, as has industry. His production of farm goods must be adjusted to adequate home needs and to foreign demand. Foreign policies to encourage peace with other countries and an increased market abroad for our farm products is demanded. We must afford better opportunities for the man with the hoe to own his land and increased security for tenants and owner-operator. Industrial policies to insure abundance to the wage earners and farmers alike, is needed. Within the past few years and during the Roosevelt administration, more beneficial legislation has been passed than under any previous administration in the history of our country. Let us continue this policy of making more secure the farmers, who feed and clothe us.

Let the farmer continue his fight for equality of opportunity. He deserves to win. He has had many long, lean years. He is the owner of the greatest industry in America. His success means your success. Let us pass the pending bill. I am proud I was born and raised on a farm. I am proud of this heritage. My father was a farmer. My people have all been farmers before me. I have always engaged in farming myself. I am honored to represent the people of the Fourth District of Tennessee and farming is the principle business of my people. It is a great agricultural district and contributes much in food supplies, livestock, and general farm resources. Let us undertake, for the first time in the history of the Nation, this constructive and helpful piece of legislation. We are making worthwhile history for the future in the passage of this measure. [Applause.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN].

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Agriculture, Mr. JONES, stated a very certain fact when he said that he had considerable difficulty in the committee in arriving at some conclusion on the farm-tenant bill now before this Committee. The hearings which are available covering H. R. 8 are not the hearings on the bill now before the Committee, because the policies outlined in our committee in H. R. 8 are totally different from the principles involved in the bill now under consideration. H. R. 8 provided that the Government should go into the land business and buy farms and distribute those farms to individuals selected by the Secretary of Agriculture, through the county committees, while the bill before us today provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall make loans to farmers who desire to purchase farms and who receive the approval of county committees and the Secretary of Agriculture. The farmers in this instance will immediately get title to the land they purchase, while under H. R. 8, which was not reported by the committee, they would not have received title until they had operated the land from 20 to 40 years.

I do not believe the bill now under consideration—and I feel sure it will pass the House—will remain in its present form when it gets to the United States Senate. I am satisfied that the bill will be amended and that the old Bankhead bill will be substituted. In other words, they will put in the farm-tenancy legislation, the original bill, which was rejected by the Committee on Agriculture after 11 weeks of debate in the committee.

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

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman tell us the difference in the two bills specifically?

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. I have just stated that the bill which was before the committee, which was rejected by the Committee on Agriculture, sets the Government up in the land business, so that the Government would go out and buy land and select future owners to occupy it, and that they would be from 20 to 40 years in paying for it, while in this instance the tenant may exercise his own judgment, may go out and pick out a farm, go to the county committee and make application for a loan, and if it is approved by the county committee and the committee thinks the farm is all right and the value is all right, then he can get a loan up to the entire purchase price of the farm if the value fixed by the county committee is the same as the purchase price.

Mr. HOOK. In other words, the committee decided to write its own legislation?

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. The gentleman is correct. We tried for 11 weeks to write this bill. The chairman of the committee tried his best to get a majority of the members to write the kind of a bill he wanted, but after all these weeks of debate, the committee finally wrote the bill which the committee decided it wanted. That is the bill that is before us.

This bill has been termed "an experiment." That is not exactly correct, because the Resettlement Administration under the Department of Agriculture, has been conducting a similar experiment for the last 2½ or 3 years. They have purchased thousands of farms throughout the United States in all sections. They have selected tenants or individuals to occupy those farms. Many of you know something about the experience of the Resettlement Administration and the unsatisfactory results. I know of an instance in my own congressional district where they completed a resettlement homestead project 2 years ago, and to this date the 52 tenants, or purchasers, do not know how much they are going to pay for those homes which they have purchased from the Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Minnesota 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. In just a moment I will yield.

I have tried for the last 9 months to have the Resettlement Administrator tell me how much each of his subsistence homesteaders will have to pay for his home. They all want to know. Still he fails or refuses or is unable to give the information. As a consequence, a great many of those homesteaders have become disgusted and have moved off of the premises, because they do not know whether they have title or ever will get title, or how much they will have to pay for it in the end.

Possibly some of the things that the Resettlement Administration did are subject to criticism. In this particular project in my own congressional district, which I have in mind, the tenants were led to believe that they would pay around $2,500 for each homestead. The construction was so poor and there were so many idealistic things that the Resettlement Administration thought homesteaders should have, such as a new $10,000 community house and a great many other things that raised the cost, that now when we divide the total number of homesteads by the total cost of the project, instead of the individual paying $2,500, the cost has mounted up to over $5,200 for each homestead. So throughout the United States where these individuals who were to be helped, thought they were going to pay a medium price for the new homes, they will find that the cost will run up to five, seven, ten, or twelve, or, in some instances, $15,000 for a little home and a few acres of land.

The same group which has handled the Resettlement Administration will undoubtedly handle the administration of this act. I hope it will succeed. I am for the bill because it is the best bill we could get out of the committee. The tenant problem is a serious problem, not so much in our section of the country as in some of the other States.

When I heard the distinguished Speaker of the House today picture the condition of the tenants down in his section of the country, I realized the truth of many of the facts that he pointed out. I have visited a good many tenants and sharecroppers down in that section, and I say to you honestly that we in Minnesota and the northern parts of the central West would not let our hogs live in the houses that the tenants and sharecroppers live in in that part of the country. It is a shame; it is a reflection on someone; whether it is the United States Government, the individual, or the landowner, I do not know, but whoever has the responsibility in connection with the present status of this large class of people in the Southern States should assume the responsibility and not blame us in other parts of the country, for we are trying to fulfill our duty by giving them the proper kind of help to make them contented American citizens.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman spoke about delay in payment. I am wondering whether this bill, providing, as it does in subparagraph 5 of title IV, power for the Secretary to make payments prior to audit and settlement by the General Accounting Office, will correct it and whether it is a good correction.

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. No; I do not say it will correct it, and I do not think that we will get away from governmental red tape and delay in connection with this proposition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I think that this program will fail, although I hope that it will not. The reason I say that it will fail is because of governmental red tape. Let us take the case of a tenant sharecropper who wants to buy a farm. He goes over and looks at John Doe's farm. They agree on a price and he tells John that he will buy the farm if he can get a loan from this new set-up of the Government. They sign a contract. Then the sharecropper has to go to the county committee and place his problem before the committee and make his application. They will look at the farm, and if they feel that the purchase price is all right and that the man is all right, they will recommend him for a loan. They recommend him to the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture will get it after 3 or 4 months. Then he will have to have his legal experts look up the title, and this takes anywhere from 6 months to 2 years. The sharecropper gets the action or approval in anywhere from several months to 2½ years. By that time the man who was going to sell the farm has lost his sale, but in the meantime he has had all of his land tied up. I think it will be difficult to get any individual who has land to sell to enter into an agreement to sell his farm contingent upon the purchaser getting a loan from the Secretary of Agriculture under this bill. It will take too long. We cannot do much about it except try to put through a piece of legislation that we believe will be helpful to some of the tenant farmers and others who desire to own farms in this country. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the generosity of the House in unanimously granting this time is deeply appreciated.

The kindliness and the friendliness shown by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], in promptly, when his attention was called to the fact, withdrawing the erroneous statement which he inadvertently made and which intimated that I was advocating unnecessary violence, is acknowledged. His action was characteristic and explains, if explanation was needed, the reason for the esteem in which he, as dean of the House, is held by its membership. Again I thank you, gentlemen.

He, who by word or deed when strife is abroad in the land, has sought to stir up class hatred, dissension, or strife, serves not the cause of patriotism. If his act be thoughtless, he deserves the reproval of his associates. If his act be deliberate, he deserves their censor, and that in no uncertain terms.

Time was sought to correct an error made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK], not because of any feeling of personal hurt or chagrin, but for the reason that today throughout the country there are two schools of thought held by two groups of people who are swiftly and steadily traveling toward a destination which, when reached, if the objectives now sought are not changed, can but lead to bloody civil strife. These are not the words of an alarmist. The fact is known to all.

For that reason there should be no misinterpretation of the signs along these pathways, there should be no misunderstanding of the purposes of those who advocate their use, no regret after our choice has been made. Let us look, therefore, at the facts as they exist. On June 22, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6162, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK], speaking in the House, among other things said:

> Mr. Speaker, referring to the behavior of judges, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] turned to me and said that I had gone into the State of Michigan and had made a speech for the C. I. O., stating that I hoped the C. I. O. would be organized in the South. That is not wholly correct. I want labor organized in the South and everywhere, and the citizens can choose what organization they please. I am frank to say that I hope the C. I. O. is organized in mass industries.

The statement by me, as referred to by the gentleman from Texas, will not be found in the printed RECORD, as under permission given me to revise my remarks, it was stricken. In fairness to the gentleman from Texas, I have obtained from the stenographer a transcript of what was said on the floor. It was this:

> Mr. HOFFMAN. I will try hard to abide by the ruling of the Chair. The point of order is raised by the gentleman from Texas who went into Michigan and told people up there he was going

to help the C. I. O. organize the South as well as the North to free the slaves of Ford. [Laughter.]

My basis for that statement was taken from the remarks and a speech which he caused to be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, from pages 1517 to 1519, and which I ask you gentlemen, if you are interested, to read as it is a notable contribution to present-day knowledge. The address was delivered on June 5 before the United Automobile Workers of America, at Baby Creek Park, Detroit, Mich.

The gentleman stated to his audience, among other things:

Oh, my friends, I want you to know in the first place that down my way labor is not very well organized; labor is not very well organized anywhere in the South. But let us get organized North, South, East, and West, and let us do it for the purpose of preserving American liberty and the American standard of living.

You know, my friends, I thought it a little significant and that it really meant something, because the very first tune you played was John Brown's Body Lies A 'Moldering in the Grave. That is the same tune they played and the same song they sang when the slaves were freed in the South.

Yes, fellow Americans, that's what we are going to do for the people of the Ford plant. [Applause.] Or, better, in modern parlance, we will cooperate with them in organizing so that they may protect their own rights.

On the subsequent page, he said:

* * * I know and appreciate John L. Lewis. I think he is the greatest labor organizer in America, because he has intelligence and character and because he is honest. [Applause.] * * *. The point is the United Automobile Workers is a fine organization; it is the strongest one in the field; and Lewis is the strongest man in the field; and Homer Martin, your leader, is absolutely O. K. [Applause.]

The accuracy of the author, historian, and statesman from Texas and the nature of his reasoning may perhaps be understood by two quotations from the RECORD.

The eminence of the gentleman from Texas who confers with the President, who, according to the papers, announces the President's will upon his return from the island, makes me hesitate that I should question either his accuracy or his philosophy.

In passing, let me note, that on page 1589 of the Appendix of the RECORD, in the speech delivered by the gentleman, I find this statement:

After the war began there were more and more blunders. Armies went out of their way to meet and destroy each other, and their tactics were brave and courageous, but foolhardy to the extreme.

May I most humbly venture to say to the Speaker and to the Members of the House that there is a somewhat startling statement. Armies went out of their way to meet and destroy each other. The gentleman from Texas added greatly to the historical knowledge of our day by that statement.

Again I find on page 1586 of the Appendix of the RECORD, news for you of the South who so justly glory in the bravery of your soldiers. The gentleman from Texas, referring to the heroism of General Pickett and his men, said:

But I was shown the field where General Pickett charged, and I could see in my imagination the Confederates as their cavalry sabers flashed in the sun, bravely advancing in futile attack.

Again, if memory serves correctly, Pickett's men went forward across the shell-torn fields, advanced up the hill, surmounted the fence, but they were on foot, and it was here, as leaders of this charge, that brave Armistead and Garnett died within the Federal lines and at the muzzles of Cushing's guns. Cushing gave up his life at the same time. But perhaps I am unduly critical in suggesting to the gentleman the facts should not be disregarded and truth ignored, even where the object is the attainment of some worthy end.

The record of John L. Lewis is written so that all men may read it, all men may choose whether they will follow his leadership. It would be presumptuous for me to suggest to the gentleman from Texas that he should follow any man as a leader.

It would not be improper, however, to call his attention to the fact that after a telegram was received at Herrin, Ill., in 1922, 25 unarmed, defenseless men, who had surrendered to Lewis' mine workers, were either beaten, shot, or hanged until all were dead. It should not be forgotten that, while Lewis has collected millions of dollars in dues from workingmen, he has left behind a trail of loss of wages, reduction of production, violence, bloodshed, and death unequaled by that of any other labor leader.

It might be noted in passing that a Department of Labor report shows that during the first 4 months of the year, 10,851,706 days' work were lost, and this by labor while Lewis was carrying on his campaign.

From 1922 through 1926, a period of 4 years, 17,050,000 workdays were lost because of strikes. From 1927 through 1931, another period of 4 years, 5,665,000 days' work were lost because of strikes.

It will be noted that, while Lewis was in the saddle organizing and directing labor, almost twice as many days' work were lost through strikes in a period of 4 months as were lost in the 4 years from 1927 through 1931.

It is the gentleman's right—it may be his pleasure—to turn in on a highway like that and follow it to the end of the road. For myself I seek another destination over a traveled way, perhaps not so easy, not so broad, and at times perhaps more lonesome, but which, along its traveled way, has signboards of equality, justice, law, order, and which in the end has liberty for the individual, prosperity and perpetuity for the Nation.

June 22, in the House, the gentleman said:

I am getting a little bit tired of constantly hearing this ranting and roaring of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. It is getting very boresome—

May I most humbly apologize to the gentleman from Texas and assure him that I will endeavor to avoid any contest, for I have not the slightest idea of ever at any time, in view of the excellence of his performance in the House, making the slightest effort to compete with him in ranting or roaring.

May I concede to him all the laurels which go to the winner of such a competition. If not presumptous, may I suggest that he might have retired to the cloak room for a few moments and saved himself a bit of weariness.

The gentleman then continued—

But, speaking of his getting together an army and marching into a State, if we go back into history and study one of the famous judicial trials of the South, when Mr. John Brown came into the State of Virginia with arms and ammunition he was tried for treason. Suppose Mr. John Lewis would announce, like a Congressman, that he was getting up an army to invade a State, what would happen?

But a Congressman can get up and say that he can invade a State with arms and ammunition, and have his son get ammunition, like John Brown's son did, and that is all right. That is fine; that is wonderful. But if John L. Lewis said that, he would be tried for treason, as John Brown was. He would be called a traitor on this floor; but we permit one of our own Members to do it. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander; and a Congressman has no more right to violate the law of the land than John Lewis or anybody else.

Most assuredly a Congressman has no right to violate the law of the land. He should, and I have always tried to be, extremely careful to obey not only the laws of the Federal Government, of the State, but the ordinances of all communities.

Never but once have I even taken advantage of the privilege of a Congressman to park where others could not, except as I park my car in a space reserved for the purpose alongside buildings. In view of the gentleman's statement about getting together an army and marching into a State, let us consider briefly what was said and the circumstances which brought about that statement. When the facts are clear, it is to be doubted whether any true, patriotic American will disagree with what was said or the purpose intended.

Sunday, June 13, I drove into the city of Monroe, in my own State. Some time before, less than a hundred workers out of a total of over a thousand had called a strike in the Newton Steel plant, and a small group of pickets, which had kept the public highway blockaded and the men from their work, were, by officers duly appointed and deputized, driven from the picket line. In reply to this action, the

C. I. O. had announced that it would invade Monroe. It had threatened to hold a demonstration in that city.

On this Sunday I saw honest, respectable businessmen and workers armed with clubs, knives, pistols, shotguns, tommy guns, standing guard to repel an invasion. That same day, according to the newspapers, some 8,000 men from other parts of the State and outside the State—for Monroe is less than a half hour's drive from Toledo—met in the park just outside the city limits threatening advances on the people of Monroe.

I came on my way, and Monday's papers quoted Bittner, one of the C. I. O. organizers from Chicago who handled that crowd, as saying, "If we wanted violence, we'd go to Monroe today and take it", then added, "but what would we have if we took it? Who ever heard of Monroe until a few days ago? It is a fly spot on the United States." He threatened the C. I. O. would be back, and he said—I quote: "By God, they will pay for what they did at Monroe, and pay well."

Having seen the strained, drawn faces of the men at Monroe; having heard their expressions of anxiety, of fear; having sensed their determination to protect their city and their people; having in mind the invasion of the plant by hundreds of armed workers from outside the State, knowing Murphy stood back of and encouraged lawlessness and violation at Flint, Mich., I sympathized with these men of Monroe.

My heart went out to them in time of stress in their helplessness against the army which the C. I. O. could bring against them. So I wired the mayor of that city and I also at the same time wired my secretary in my home town "to have reliable citizens who are willing to go to Monroe to aid in defending the city from invasion promised by C. I. O. Organizer Bittner leave name, address, telephone number, list of arms, tents, and cots at office." For that action I have no apologies to make. The offer to the mayor of Monroe was made in good faith. It stands.

The fact which the gentleman from Texas and the C. I. O. organizers fail to grasp is that the farmers of America, the small businessmen of our country, the people, women, as well as men, in the smaller communities, will shed their blood, will give their lives, before they will be dominated, driven from their working places, from their towns and cities, by the C. I. O. or any other Communist-controlled group.

Another mistake which the gentleman and the C. I. O. workers make is the assumption that, like the innocent medicine man of old, they are immune from the fatalities which overtake others.

It is the privilege as well as the right of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] to go up and down the countryside assisting the C. I. O. and its affiliates in organizing to fight and march under the banner of Madam Perkins in her effort to force businessmen to acknowledge the supremacy of Lewis. It may be his pleasure to address crowds which boo the mention of the Supreme Court, as was done at Detroit. They will make no impression; he will get little sympathy in his preachment of the doctrine that American citizens should permit their towns, their cities, their industrial plants, to be taken over by those whom he enlists under the banner of the C. I. O. and the Communists.

It may have given the gentleman pleasure to say, as he did at Detroit, "and Homer Martin, your leader, is absolutely O. K."

But I call attention to the fact that it was Homer Martin, acting under the leadership of Lewis, who stilled the wheels of industry; who closed the factories; who destroyed automobiles in the making; who prevented the orderly execution of the lawful processes of the Court; who sent workers by the thousand from their jobs; who deprived women and children of the means of livelihood; who brought anarchy to Detroit.

It was members of an organization which acknowledges the leadership of Homer Martin, who turned off the power in the Saginaw Valley, depriving hundreds of thousands of citizens of the necessities of life and who undoubtedly would have kept the people of that valley plunged in darkness, had not the sheriffs of three counties notified Michigan's Governor that the citizens would take the law into their own hands, if power was not restored.

We have come to the parting of the ways. For the moment the broad and the easy road, politically, may be the one pointed out by the gentleman from Texas. Along that road under the banner of a fighting leader with almost unlimited funds at his command, with an organization the like of which has never been seen in this country, march hundreds of thousands of grim, determined men who have been led to believe, who are told frequently, that they are the slaves of industry, of men who would deprive them of their just rights.

Small wonder then that they are earnest, that their actions are vigorous, that they are willing to sacrifice. But hundreds of thousands of men have suffered and have died because of erroneous belief, because of false leadership. Lewis is hailed as the greatest labor leader of the century, and it is true that he has gathered millions under his banner, but he has gathered them by the holding out of false hopes, promises impossible of performance, and by intimidation and violence.

And where has he led them and what has he accomplished? Examine thoroughly, painstakingly, the history of the recent strike in General Motors. Compute for yourself from reliable sources the increase in wages and against it set the total pay-check loss of the workers, and to that loss add the amount which Lewis' organizations collected for initiation and dues. Then balance your books and note the result. Ascertain the working conditions and the hours which prevailed before Lewis entered the field, examine subsequent conditions, and determine what, if anything, has been gained. Apply the same methods to the other industries which have felt his blighting touch, and you will have a fair and true picture of what has happened.

That the C. I. O. does not always represent the workers has been convincingly and spectacularly demonstrated at Youngstown and also at Johnstown, where, when the workers were assured of protection, they went back to their tasks, the mills were opened, and the pay checks are ready.

But that is not the whole story. Lewis raises a man of straw, a false issue, and makes the declaration that his fight is between the workers and the employers. All know that this is not true. His fight is not only against the employer, but into that battle he has thrown his workers against the unorganized and the organized workers who do not belong to his organization. From the beginning he has constantly attempted to drive every toiler into his organization to sign on the dotted line. About this there is no dispute, so that under whatever banner the fight may be waged, under whatever slogan the battle carried on, the truth is that the C. I. O. is fighting not only the employers but all other industrial workers.

Even this does not complete the story, for aside from the workers in the industries where Lewis' efforts are concentrated, the New York Times in an editorial of yesterday tells us:

> • • • that all the workers in all the coal mines in the country, in all the iron, copper, gold, silver, lead, and zinc mines, in all the quarries, oil wells and gas wells, in all the iron and steel mills, in all the automobile factories and repair shops, car and railroad shops, agricultural implement factories, ship and boat works, and in all the metal-working industries together, constitute, according to the census of 1930, less than 10 percent of the total number of gainfully occupied persons.

And upon the remaining 90 percent Lewis would throw the larger part of the immeasurable cost of his industrial warfare. While the gentleman from Texas marches shoulder to shoulder with Lewis he should not forget that with Lewis and with him march Homer Martin, Frankensteen, the Reuther boys, Browder, and a host of Communists who sneer at the Supreme Court, scoff at law and order, and boast of the aid of State and Federal officials in their enterprise.

The issue cannot be confused. Letters pouring in from all parts of the country, from the uneducated and the educated, from the man who dictates his letter to the man or woman

who writes on tablet paper or a post card, from the editorial writers of the great national dailies to the most obscure weeklies, bring the word, the thought, that the right to work is not only a right guaranteed by law but it is a right demanded by necessity.

I cannot more accurately, clearly, and concisely state the issue than to quote Governor Davey, of Ohio, who said: "The right to work is sacred; the right to strike is equally valid."

He lays down the doctrine that those workers who wish to remain on strike "certainly are entitled to do so, and to continue any and all lawful protests", and that in equal fairness, he said, "those who want to work should enjoy that privilege without being molested."

Speaking of government, he said: "It must not abdicate its sovereign powers to any who challenge its existence."

Here is a declaration of principle which breeds justice for all, and which, if announced by either the President of the United States or the Governor of Michigan in December of 1936 when these sit-down strikes began in the General Motors plants, would have avoided controversy, violence, and bloodshed. It is the application of this principle as followed by Governor Davey, as followed by Governor Townsend, of Indiana; Governor Horner, of Illinois; Governor Cross, of Connecticut; Governor Hurley, of Massachusetts, Democrats all, which must be adhered to if peace is to return.

Another thing which must come before we will have lasting peace in industry is the repeal or the drastic amendment of the Wagner Act. That piece of legislation, no matter what its purpose may have been, has proven to be the entering wedge which has driven apart organized and unorganized labor, employer and employee.

The unfairness of that act, as enforced by the National Labor Relations Board, the arbitrariness of it as applied by the decisions of that Board, the encouragement which it gives to ambitious, self-seeking racketeers, have demonstrated beyond all question that it adds to, rather than diminishes, strife. Could those who passed it have foreseen the interpretation which would be given it, and the purpose for which it would be enforced, and the disaster which has followed in its wake, it is more than probable that it never would have reached the statute books.

We have the National Labor Relations Board telling us that it is the duty and the obligation of employers to sign a contract with the C. I. O. and its affiliates in various interests. We have the President of the United States making the bald declaration that employers should sign with the C. I. O. in the steel strike now on. But listen to the argument, to the promises which were made when the bill was before the Senate. The Senate committee in reporting it favorably, among other things, said:

[S. Rept. No. 573, 74th Cong. 1st sess., p. 12]

The committee wishes to dispel any possible false impression that this bill is designed to compel the making of agreements or to permit governmental supervision of their terms. It must be stressed that the duty to bargain collectively does not carry with it the duty to reach an agreement, because the essence of collective bargaining is that either party shall be free to decide whether proposals made to it are satisfactory.

Senator WAGNER himself wrote on November 2, 1935, that there was nothing in the law to compel an employer to sign. He held further and said Congress had no authority to impose such a requirement. Getting Saturday's papers, we find the reputed author of the bill particularly criticizing the mill operators because they will not sign a contract which he formerly said the law did not require them to sign, which Congress had no authority to demand that they sign, and which the committee said was not designed to compel the making of a contract or permit governmental supervision of its terms.

Aside from the use of Pennsylvania's armed forces by the Governor to drive men from their work, perhaps the most outrageous demand ever put forth was that Governor Davey said was made upon him by Madam Perkins, who, he says, asked him to call in Tom Girdler, of Republic Steel Corporation, and Frank Purnell, of Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., and "keep them there until they sign an agreement" with their steel workers.

The Governor characterized Secretary Perkins' suggestion as the "exercise of the most autocratic and dictatorial powers ever attempted" and "in private life it would be kidnaping." Let us pause here, use a little common sense, and consider. Just assume for the moment that the Governor had the authority and could and would call in Girdler and Purnell, and suppose he called in Lewis and his chief lieutenant, and he announced his intention of holding them until they agreed. Just what agreement could he force them to make?

I am now waiving all questions of law, all questions of right. Here they sit around the council table. Lewis says you must sign. Girdler and Purnell say we will not sign. The Governor says sign; they sign; sign what? An agreement to bargain collectively. Well and good. Now, what is the bargain? Lewis has so many thousand men. He says he will work under certain conditions and for so much per hour. Girdler and Purnell say, we cannot pay it; we will not pay it. Shall the Government say, you shall pay it, regardless of whether the industry can stand the charge? Regardless of the fact that the demand may break the industry and drive it into bankruptcy? Assume Girdler and Purnell say that they cannot meet the union demand for a dollar and can pay but 50 cents per hour. Lewis says, "We will not accept it." Shall the Government say, "You must work for 50 cents an hour?"

These are extreme illustrations. Nevertheless, the constantly increasing demands of labor for a larger share of the gross sales price, the ever-present desire of the manufacturer to reap a profit, are in continuous conflict and if Government, as pointed out by Donald Richberg, assumes control, labor may in the end find itself begging for the right to sell its services to the highest bidder, rather than in a Government-controlled market.

Labor cannot be employed without industry, and industry cannot make a profit without labor, and if the two are left alone without Government compulsion to bargain collectively, and meet in a spirit of reasonableness, they will in the future, as they have in the past, find a common ground where labor will have employment at a steady wage, and industry will be able to make a profit which will enable it to exist.

Denunciation—criticism without the suggestion of a remedy—is futile. January 14, on the floor of the House, I pointed out that "by failure to act, the Governor of Michigan and the President are permitting, if not sanctioning, mob rule." From that day to the date when Governor Davey, of Ohio, announced his policy of protecting the man who wants to work, guaranteeing his right to a job; lawlessness has continued to increase, and the battle front has been rapidly widening.

The gentleman from Texas said he was getting a little bit tired of constantly hearing this ranting and roaring. May I call his attention to page 6213 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of June 23, where the Democratic whip in the Senate said:

There is not a State in our Union which just now is not threatened with what may be called a form of riotous confusion. * * * Shall we overlook at this time and forget that it was in like manner that Italy yielded, bring in a condition which has finally resulted in a tyranny and a form of despotism we shrink to mention? * * * Here within ourselves we are nearer to insurrection and apparently, sir, confronting an army of revolt in the largest numbers, whether from the employers or the employees becomes secondary.

Turn to page 6284 of the RECORD of June 24 and note there the statement on present conditions by a distinguished Democrat whose loyalty is unquestioned, whose vision is clear:

We have got no government in Washington, and we have got no government in some of the States, because government has surrendered to mob rule.

It was with the thought of doing something to remedy the situation that, on April 15, I offered H. R. 6456. This bill provided, among other things, for the registration of labor organizations, for the enforcement by such organizations of discipline upon their members; prohibited sit-down

strikes; made labor organizations responsible for the acts of their officers and their members.

That bill has remained with the committee ever since, while conditions have steadily grown worse.

It was on June 21 that I offered H. R. 7598, making it a felony to transport in interstate or foreign commerce persons who are engaged in going from one State to another to close factories.

Each of these bills, if enacted into law, would go a long way toward aiding in the solution of some of our industrial troubles and there is nothing in either that would be unfair to labor, or that would in any way prevent the growth of unions. In fact, if the same result followed which followed the enactment of the British labor law—and there is no reason to believe that it would not—the enactment of these two measures would strengthen labor unions, aid in driving out racketeers and create new confidence between employer and union organizations.

These two bills were followed, on the 22d day of June, by a resolution respectfully calling upon the President to declare that no citizen of the United States should be deprived of the opportunity to engage in his usual and customary task, and further requesting that where the civil or military authorities of a State or of a subdivision failed, for a period of 2 days, to give protection to any person desiring to work, that right should be secured to him by the action of the armed forces of the United States.

That such a resolution was necessary to dispel the idea that lawlessness was approved by the national administration is a matter of common knowledge. Such a declaration would undoubtedly, in almost all instances, protect, without bloodshed, the right of men to work.

That this is evident is shown by the circumstances following the declaration of courageous Governor Davey, of Ohio. There, immediately upon being assured of protection, the men returned to their work, demonstrating, as I have said before, that they do not wish to strike; that they are driven into strikes by the lawless violence of a small minority.

May I not appeal to the Democratic Members of this House to consider the situation as it exists today? And when I say Democratic Members I mean Democratic Members; I do not mean New Dealers.

Many of you sat here in the last session. You heard that most eloquent Member of the House from Alabama, Mr. Huddleston, make his remarkable plea for what he believed to be right and just, and you remember how, because he dared to oppose these fanatics who were advising the President, he went down to defeat after years of courageous, patriotic service here.

Now, make no mistake and do not deceive yourselves. You gentlemen who have the courage to express your convictions are marked for political slaughter. Jim Farley and the vote-buying boys will get you if you do not watch out.

You may have thought in the past that you were a part of the national administration. Nothing is further from the truth. You have been the tools, the errand boys, for the national administration. Of all the laws which have been enacted since the President was elected, probably not a hundredth part of the thought expressed is your thought.

The gentleman from Texas told how Pickett's men made their glorious charge on the hill at Gettysburg, and, in truth and in fact, history records no instance of greater patriotism, greater courage, greater loyalty to a leader, more self-sacrificing devotion.

But in another way you gentlemen of the South have, during the past 4 years, shown a loyalty to your leader equal to that of Pickett's men. You have submerged your individual opinions. You have followed blindly, unhesitatingly, and unwaveringly the commands, the suggestions, of the President.

You have watched with doubt and apprehension many of the moves which he has made. In your minds you have questioned not only the legality but the soundness of the policies which he advocated.

Nevertheless, you yielded obedience; you made the fight; you upheld his hands.

You have been sitting here watching, waiting, hoping, and I know many of you praying, that he would cease in those efforts which at last you realize will overthrow the Government which you love.

Today you know, you understand, as you have never understood before, the road which he is following, the destination toward which he is traveling.

With amazement and almost unbelief, you saw his attack against the Supreme Court unfold. You received his reorganization bill and you sensed its purpose. You were given the hour and wage law and you realized its import.

You saw going in and out of the White House John L. Lewis, who publicly demanded that the President of the United States pay a political debt.

You have observed the President of the United States sitting silent and, by his silence, giving approval to the acts of Lewis and his organizers in wrecking industry throughout the land, in depriving men of their right to work.

You have heard the statement of a great Democratic Governor of the great State of Ohio that the President's Secretary of Labor called upon him to kidnap the heads of industry and hold them until they yielded.

And, whatever may be the controversy between the great Governor of that State and Mme. Perkins, you know that the President has not interfered when industries have been kidnaped and held to ransom.

Oh, I appeal to you Democrats of the South and true Democrats of the North, to act before it is too late.

Do not believe that the loyalty and self-sacrificing service which you have given to the President will save you. You will follow in the wake of that long, long list of patriotic Democrats who have been kicked out of the party organization.

Have you forgotten what happened to the Democrats of Minnesota in the last campaign? Have you forgotten other loyal Democratic candidates who were sacrified by the President where his organization thought it politically expedient?

Already the signs point to a new Democratic leadership in the Senate and House.

Sucked dry like an orange, having no more to yield, you will be carelessly but deliberately tossed aside into the political gutter.

Jonah's shipmates tossed him overboard with no more disregard of consequences than will the Administration heave you gentlemen out to sink or swim—only you will find that, instead of a rescuing whale, Jim Farley and his political machine will be on your neck.

Why not from this day on make the fight, not only for the principles of true democracy, but for your own political salvation? After all, in 1938, the voters will be the ones who pass upon your fate and they will have in mind the President's assault upon the Supreme Court, upon our form of government, his approval of the sit-down strikes and of lawlessness.

The people of the United States will not quietly submit to the wrecking of their Constitution; to the assault upon the integrity of the Supreme Court; to the destruction of their form of government.

Let the President, John L. Lewis, and the C. I. O. continue on the course which they have marked out, and you will have civil strife throughout the Union.

The President has gone from an open and willful disregard of all of his campaign promises to a repudiation of his oath of office and his obligations to uphold the law, and this he has done in order to obtain his objective, which now stands disclosed as the domination of all industry and commerce and the centralization of all functions of government in the executive department.

Writers like Lawrence, Sullivan, Thompson, and Walter Lippmann, and a host of editorial writers from the great dailies of the cities to the country weeklies, have long been pointing out the end to which his course will lead, and long have they been saying that they did not believe the President was aware of the inevitable results of his actions.

This attitude was charitable, but it was inaccurate and implied that the President was a man of small intellectual

attainment, that he was deceived and misled by those who advised him.

Nothing but a lack of the knowledge of the abiding principles of justice, of equality, of a square deal for every man, or a failure to apply that knowledge, can account for the failure of the President to declare for law and order when these strikes first came about.

I ask you to read the article of Lippmann in Saturday's issue of the dailies and note how he, always a friend and an admirer of the President, has at last arrived at the conclusion that the President is seeking to establish a dictatorship.

All this welter of violence and of bloodshed which confronts us, which, beyond question, will come to us, can be avoided, if you men who believe in the principles of the great Democratic Party here and now insist upon the application of those principles to the present situation.

The time has come to repudiate men like Governors Earle, of Pennsylvania; Murphy, of Michigan; and to follow men like Governors Townsend, of Indiana; Cross, of Connecticut; Horner, of Illinois; and last and most unflinching of all, Governor Davey, of Ohio.

Get back of him, declare for law and order, pass the resolution which I introduced and see this threatened trouble fade like mist before the morning sun.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIERMANN].

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, in considering this bill it is well to bear clearly in mind the purpose of the legislation and not to lose sight of that. The purpose of this legislation is to make owner-operators out of people who have heretofore not been owner-operators, or who, having been owner-operators, have failed in that capacity.

I expect to offer the following amendments which are calculated to promote the purpose of this bill:

Page 5, after line 3, insert:

(7) Be in such form, and contain such provisions, conditions, and limitations as may be necessary to assure that the borrower will conform to such farming practices and methods as the Secretary may prescribe in order that, during the first 5 years the loan is in effect, the borrower's farming operations may be sufficiently profitable to enable him to carry out successfully the responsibilities of ownership and his undertakings under the loan agreement.

Page 4, line 6, after "not", insert "less than 20 nor."

Page 4, strike out lines 24 and 25, and on page 5 strike out lines 1 to 3, inclusive, and insert:

"(6) Provide that the borrower shall not voluntarily assign, sell, or otherwise transfer the farm, or any interest therein, without the consent of the Secretary, and provide that upon involuntary transfer or sale the Secretary may declare the amount unpaid immediately due and payable.

"(8) Provide that upon satisfaction of the borrower's obligation, but not less than 20 years after the making of the loan, he shall be entitled to the farm free of any estate or property interest retained by the Secretary to secure the satisfaction of the obligation."

Page 5, line 5, before the period, insert a comma and the following: "except that the final payment of any sum due shall not be accepted if the effect of such acceptance would be to make ineffective the 20-year limitation provided in paragraph (8) of subsection (b) of this section."

The first of these amendments provides that for the first 5 years after the arrangement has been made with the beneficiary of the act he shall be given the advice of the Department and also a certain amount of supervision by the Department in order that he may not only conduct his farm in a farmerlike manner but that he shall conduct it in a businesslike manner.

I heard or read a statement many years ago which I have had occasion to see proved again and again: That if a man were in the position of an employee until 40 years of age and then were to become an employer that the chances are against his making a success. It does not foreclose his success, but it makes the chances of success against him. The beneficiaries of this act will be of two classes: Tenants who never owned a farm, or former owners who for one cause or another lost their farms. I submit to the committee that the chances are against these people paying a 100-percent loan unless they have the most careful supervision and advice. This amendment provides that during the first 5 years of this relationship they shall have the benefit of sound advice and wise supervision.

My second amendment provides that the beneficiary of the act cannot alienate this farm; that is, he cannot sell it during the first 20 years of this relationship.

He cannot pay off his obligation completely for at least 20 years.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, he cannot pay it off in less than 20 years?

Mr. BIERMANN. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Why is that?

Mr. BIERMANN. I am going to go into that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIERMANN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Would that be mandatory? Would he have to carry out the advice of the Department? In other words, would it be mandatory?

Mr. BIERMANN. I think that is something the Secretary ought to work out, but I believe to a large extent it ought to be mandatory.

We are not entering into a strictly business relationship. We are entering into a sort of paternal relationship. Of course, it is not sound business policy to lend 100 percent of the value of property. It is not businesslike to lend money at 3 percent, because that will not pay the cost. If we enter into such a relationship, I contend it is proper for the lending agency to exercise some supervision over the borrower.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Does the gentleman's amendment make it mandatory?

Mr. BIERMANN. I think it does. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIERMANN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS. Has the gentleman considered the possibility in connection with this advice and counsel, which I feel is most important, of allowing the tenant certain credits against the indebtedness if that advice is followed?

Mr. BIERMANN. No; I have not considered that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That would be lending more than 100 percent of the value.

Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIERMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee. My colleague is a member of the committee and I know he is anxious to serve the farmers. I do not understand the gentleman has in mind he would actually keep the man from alienating or selling this farm for a period of 20 years?

Mr. BIERMANN. Yes; exactly.

Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee. Would not that discourage the idea of taking advantage of a Government loan?

Mr. BIERMANN. No; I do not think so.

Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee. I think it would.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I would prefer not to yield any more, as my remaining time is short.

It has been pointed out here again and again this afternoon that this legislation is going to reach only a small fraction of the potential beneficiaries, at least for a few years. We can hand pick them. I would like to hand pick the kind of people who seriously want to make these farms their long-time homes, and not to enter into speculation. There are two things that have been of great damage to the farming business of the United States; at least, these are two of the biggest items. One is the ups and downs in the prices of the products of the farms. The other, which has been nearly, if not quite, as damaging, has been the ups and downs of the price of the land itself. If we leave this bill as it is, a man may buy a farm today for $50 an acre and if in 6 months he can get $60 or $75 an acre for the farm, under the bill as it is presently written he may sell

the farm and, of course, he will. Instead of getting a long-time owner operator of the farm who looks upon this farm as his home and as his dwelling we have a speculator.

We want to recall if we pass this bill and make it law we are going to get the Government into the business of financing the purchase of farms. The Government, in effect, becomes another land buyer and each added buyer tends to raise land prices. That is a bad thing. My amendment will, as far as the beneficiaries of the act are concerned, take the land the Government finances out of the speculative class for 20 years at least. It will make this a bill for the benefit of permanent home owners, and that should be the main purpose of the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIERMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. If we take this man out of the speculative class, we would permit his neighbors to speculate on their farms and deprive him of any profit they might make on theirs?

Mr. BIERMANN. Under this bill we are considering just one type of farm and I would rather confine my discussion to that one type.

Mr. LUCAS. Would not the gentleman consider a windfall tax, whereby we would take the profits on all farms rather than take the profits on a single farm?

Mr. BIERMANN. Yes. I would be in favor of any kind of practical legislation that would prevent or lessen speculation in farm land.

May I say further that the amendments I propose are precisely in line with the findings of the Farm Tenancy Committee which the President of the United States appointed to investigate this problem, not only in this country but in foreign countries. They have written a report in which they suggest what we should do in regard to this problem of farm tenancy, and among the things they proposed are these two ideas which I have embodied in the two amendments.

Mr. THOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIERMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. I am in sympathy with the general object sought to be attained by the gentleman from Iowa, but let us suppose this instance: Here is a family who locates on a farm and the husband suddenly becomes an invalid and cannot continue the operation of the farm.

Mr. BIERMANN. The bill covers a situation of that kind in another section. My amendment would not preclude that. If a man becomes an invalid or if he dies or if some unforseen thing happens, there is a remedy provided.

Mr. THOM. You would have to have some discretion in the Farm Board.

Mr. BIERMANN. The following is a simple illustration of what may happen in thousands of cases if the credit and mortgage program as now proposed in H. R. 7562 is put into effect and the purchasers are allowed to pay their debts to the Government and sell the land at any time they desire. Let us assume that the reasonable appraised value of the farm is $3,000, and that the Secretary secures the loan by a first mortgage on the property which is to be amortized within 30 years, at 3-percent interest. Under such circumstances the annual payment would be $153, a part of which would be used to reduce the amount of the loan. Within 3 years the tenant purchaser would have repaid the Government approximately $195 on the principal of the $3,000 loan.

Suppose now that land values have risen and a local real-estate operator knows that he can sell this particular farm for $4,000. Obviously, he can make a profit if he can buy the farm for $3,500. Since the tenant purchaser agreed to pay the Government $3,000 for the farm, and has actually paid only $195 on the principal, it is obvious that he also has a chance to make a profit by selling for $3,500. If he accepts the offer made by the real-estate dealer, he can pay the Government the balance of $2,805 and have left $695 in cash, of which $500 is clear profit.

Both the speculator and the farmer have made a $500 profit each on the double transaction. But what has happened to the Government's program of aiding the tenant farmer in becoming an owner? Obviously, it has failed. The tenant purchaser whom the Government started toward home ownership no longer has a farm. The man who now owns the farm may be another speculator or an absentee owner. He may, of course, be an operating farmer, but even so, he has paid $4,000 for a farm at speculative levels which, according to normal appraised value, is worth only $3,000.

Unless there is some kind of restriction in the mortgage or loan contract, which will prevent such a situation from occuring, a Government program of this type will aid in bringing about an increase in land values. Its greatest adverse effect will be at times when speculation is rife, and hence the program will be a direct impetus to speculative booms.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, title I of this bill provides authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to loan $10,000,000 for the first year, $25,000,000 the second year, and $50,000,000 the third year to farm tenants, farm laborers, and sharecroppers to purchase farms. While this is a large amount of money, it will be only a drop in the bucket in comparison to the amount that would be required to make farm owners out of all the farm tenants in this country. At present there are 2,860,000 tenants. There are 40,000 people being added to this class annually. Assuming that the average cost of a self-sustaining farm would be $5,000—and it runs much more than this in the North—only 2,000 tenants in the United States could be financed the first year, 5,000 the second year, and 10,000 the third year, with $50,000,000 appropriated. In other words, the $50,000,000 would only take care of about one-fourth of those dropping into the tenant class every year, and it would provide a farm for only one of every 286 tenants and sharecroppers in the United States. The $10,000,000 will provide loans to purchase only 1 farm for every 1,430 tenants and sharecroppers.

With 2,907 counties in the United States having 300 or more farms each and regarded by the Agriculture Department as agricultural counties, it is evident that it would require approximately $15,000,000 to finance only one tenant in each of these agricultural counties in the United States. It is clearly evident that only a very small percentage of the tenants can be benefited under this legislation and that the vast majority, who might be led to believe that a generous Federal Government will loan them money to purchase a farm, will be disappointed. If you are going to treat them all alike, it would require over $14,000,000,000 to finance the purchase of farms for all the tenants and sharecroppers in the United States. Obviously this cannot be done.

Under the bill as it stands, the Secretary is authorized to loan 100 percent of the purchase price. Such an unsound loaning policy by the Federal Government, in my judgment, cannot be justified.

The serious question involved is, Should the Federal Government embark on an unsound program that will in future years bring demands on Congress to appropriate billions of dollars for this purpose, or should we approach this problem with a more practical loaning policy that would in itself limit the number who might apply for the benefits of this act?

I propose to offer an amendment at the appropriate time to section 3 (a) of title I, to provide that these loans shall not be in excess of 90 percent of the value of the farm. I do not contend that this will make all the loans sound, but it will be a great improvement over the present provision authorizing 100-percent loans. It is a mistake to encourage tenants to assume the burden of ownership before they are financially able to do so. A great many farmers are in a far more fa-

vorable position as tenants than they would be as farm owners.

By requiring the tenant who is to be financed to make a down payment of 10 percent, the Government will be saved millions of dollars in possible future losses and the future success of this program will be greatly enhanced. It will encourage thrift to make loans available only to those tenants who are better able to purchase and assume the burden of financial responsibility of operating their own farms. And furthermore, by requiring the 10 percent payment, the prospects are greater for the purchaser to eventually pay off the indebtedness due the Federal Government.

This bill will not solve the farm-tenant problem which is a result, rather than cause, of an economic maladjustment. If we could make farming profitable, the farm-tenant problem would solve itself.

I have 32 counties in my district, which is entirely of an agricultural nature. The State of Nebraska depends solely upon agriculture as it has no natural resources other than fertile soil and water. Of the farmers in my district, 49.3 percent are tenants. I do not believe there is a better class or a more worthy class of farm tenants in the United States than you will find in Nebraska. They are not expecting, neither are they asking, the Federal Government to finance the full purchase price of a farm for them. They realize that some limitation must be placed on Federal expenditures and that they will be called upon as taxpayers to repay their share of the 36 billion dollars of bonds the Federal Government now owes, not to mention any further increases that may be incurred. They realize the Federal Government cannot maintain its stability in continuing indefinitely to spend more than its revenues. They are more interested in legislation that will maintain fair prices on agricultural commodities.

Nebraska last year suffered a loss of $288,000,000 due to the drought. This is more than one-half of the total loss sustained by all of the States in the recently flooded area of the Ohio River. In 1934 we suffered a drought equally as severe, and the 2 years were the worst droughts in over 40 years. In spite of all this, Nebraska as a State has maintained its credit and is one of the few States in the Union that has no bonded indebtedness. It has no State income tax nor State sales tax. Nebraska balances its budget. When we do not have the money we do not spend it. I commend Nebraska's record to you in charting the future financial policy of the Federal Government.

Because of the great distress in the drought area, rehabilitation loans, as provided for in title II of this bill, have been of great assistance in rehabilitating many worthy tenants. In many cases a loan of a few hundred dollars has made it possible for these rehabilitation clients to become self-sustaining on rented farms at less expense to the Federal Government than would have resulted had they been left on the relief rolls and to work on W. P. A. projects.

Under title III funds are authorized for the purchase by the Government of submarginal land. This would be a continuation of the present program and in many States additional purchases are necessary to block together the purchases already made. The objective is to retire this submarginal land from unprofitable crop production and to turn it back to grass and into grazing and forest areas. In purchasing this land the Government will have something to show for the money spent. It will help to relieve crop surpluses, especially in wheat, since in good years this submarginal land helps to swell the price-depressing surplus. Twenty-five percent of the net revenue received by the Secretary from the use of the land will be paid to the respective counties for school and road purposes. This is quite essential inasmuch as a great deal of the taxable property in some counties has been or will be purchased by the Government under this program.

I am supporting titles II, III, and IV of this bill, and I urge that title I be amended to limit the loans to 90 percent of the value of the farm in order that we may approach the farm-tenant problem on a sounder basis. [Applause.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, although I am speaking on a related subject, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes out of order.

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

There was no objection.

THE FORGOTTEN MAN—THE AMERICAN DAIRYMAN

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] last week made reference to the sad plight of the dairymen in the North and Northeast. This picture he painted was not too pessimistic. The American dairyman, be it said, is making a more important contribution to the health and welfare of the American people than any other type of farmer. He is making an essential contribution to the physical growth and development of American childhood and youth. It is important to remember in these days when we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars on soil conservation that his is the only type of farming that conserves soil fertility. Nor is his any seasonal job. He works from dawn to dark 365 days of the year. The assessments on his property require him to pay $90,000,000 annually in taxes. The dairymen of the North and East have spent $250,000,000 in perfecting their herds and in insuring the sanitary production and marketing of milk. He educates his worth-while child and from this group is recruited the American leadership in professions, science, art, and politics. Despite all this record of service to the Nation, he is today threatened with social and economic extinction. If present conditions continue he and his will be scattered to the four winds, and the professionals, exploiters, and economic parasites will be "in the saddle."

THE FORGOTTEN DAIRYMAN

The condition of the corn, cotton, and wheat farmers has, so far as the Government can do it, been aided and promoted. But on the head of the dairyman has fallen in these troublesome times all the evils of an arrogant and stupid bureaucracy. The original A. A. A. included dairy products as one of the basic commodities. Under the urge of the late Rex Tugwell, now gone to sweeter camping grounds, Secretary Wallace's initial object was to hamper the dairyman by destroying the solidarity gained through cooperative organizations. This procedure failed, but it left the dairyman exhausted and with no governmental remedies applied to his desperate condition.

No sooner was the program out of the way than the dairyman was placed on the altar of foreign trade by the present scheme of trade agreements. In these agreements he was sold over the Lakes and across the seas by the foreign trade policy of the administration. Year by year this foreign encroachment on the market of the dairyman, both from this continent and Europe, has been increasing in volume. Last year the shipment of dairy products to the United States from sources where sanitary production is entirely unknown, amounted to $16,102,954. The foregoing facts are now history, and I merely review them so that the House may have a picture of these recent years.

UNDERPAID AND EXPLOITED

The economic vise in which the dairyman finds himself is due to the fact that he has been unable to obtain a living price for his product. This has not been due to overproduction, although at times the production of dairy products just about balances the national demand. The fact is that this marketing of dairy products is in the grip of an unrestrained savage monopoly which reaches into practically every part of continental America. This monopoly is composed of the National Dairy Products Corporation, which corporation, acting in collaboration with the Borden Co. and the Plymouth Cheese Board, of Plymouth, Wis., fix with inflexible certainty the amount that the dairy producer shall get for his product. These outfits hold the dairyman in the hollow of their hand, and, while these great

corporations are paying high dividends on their very much watered stock and millions to their officers and lobbyists in salaries, they give the dairyman starvation prices for his products. I again make bold to say that the dairyman, under the manipulations of these professionals, will soon cease to be an economic and social factor in America.

A CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY

The first phase of this criminal monopoly to which I wish to call your attention is the price-fixing performance which for many years has been going on at Plymouth, Wis., principally through the Plymouth Cheese Exchange. I call the attention of the House to the report of the Federal Trade Commission made April 30, 1928, and printed as Public Document No. 95. It appears that this Plymouth Exchange meets weekly and is made up entirely of dealers and processors. The dominating influences on the board are the National Dairy Products Corporation, the Borden Co., and the "packer kings", Swift & Co., and Armour & Co. The satellites of these outfits meet before the alleged market day and agree on a price of cheese for the following week. The next day a meeting of the board is held and the fiction of bids with no deliveries is gone through with. The price of cheese is thus fixed for the following week by these criminal monopolists and the 140,000 dairy farmers who are delivering milk to cheese factories throughout the United States receive a price for their milk at the cheese factory based on the weekly price of cheese fixed as I have stated.

There are 160,000 farmers delivering milk to evaporated milk plants in the United States, and the price they receive is fixed on a formula in which the price of cheese at Plymouth, Wis., is a large factor.

In the Chicago milkshed at least 20,000 dairy farmers are delivering milk for fluid purposes in the city of Chicago, and they are paid for their milk on a formula which takes into consideration the price of cheese at Plymouth, Wis., fixed by the "packer kings" and their associates. In the Nation generally there are 2,500,000 additional dairymen whose economic life is threatened by this brazen procedure.

The price of milk products is interdependent. When the price of either butter, cheese, or fluid milk is beaten down, it affects the whole price structure in every part of the country. It affects the well-being and security of every dairyman in the Nation. And so I charge today that there exists at Plymouth, Wis., a criminal conspiracy against the well-being of a great mass of our people, which is, in fact, holding this great army of dairy producers in a state of almost complete serfdom. The Federal Trade Commission has made repeated findings on this question, and yet the executive branch of our Government and those officials in charge of enforcing the Antitrust Act do not function. They permit this economic homicide to go on without hindrance.

THE ROBBER BARONS

I refer the Members of the House to the report of the Federal Trade Commission, made in September 1936, where it reiterates former findings, and states that the price of twins cheese, which is also the basis of determining the price of fluid milk to dairymen, was fixed by the sales offers made on the Plymouth, Wis., Cheese Exchange by a subsidiary of Swift & Co., a subsidiary of the National Dairy Products Corporation, a subsidiary of the Borden Co., and a subsidiary of the Armour Co. If the Federal Trade Commission does not have jurisdiction over this question, the query naturally arises as to whether or not they called it to the attention of the Attorney General's office. Three times this Commission has gone to the well on this and made findings, and yet on March 2, this year, the Commission sent out a new press release, which only promised further investigation. I make bold to call upon the Federal Trade Commission to pursue this inquiry to its logical conclusion and to call into play the full power of law enforcement against the "packer kings" and the other robber barons, who are, in fact, destroying one of the most essential and worth-while farm groups.

THE DUTY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

I likewise call upon the Attorney General, whose record in the field of criminal-law enforcement is greatly commended and admired by me, to turn loose the G-men of his Antitrust Division against these greedy monopolists who are robbing the American dairyman blind. I suggest to the Federal Trade Commission and the Attorney General that they stand not upon the order of their going, but go at once and land some of these criminal parasites behind the bars of Leavenworth prison, or some other convenient Federal domicile.

My remarks on this question would be inconclusive if I did not enumerate more in detail the outfits which are destroying the dairyman. Let me briefly call the roll on some of these participants in this criminal conspiracy.

First, there are the so-called "packer kings", Swift and Armour, and others of their ilk. They toil not, neither do they spin, but even during the lean years of the depression they showed profits well up into the hundred millions. Just now they are engaged in a frontal attack on the butter market by exploiting the manufacture and sale of synthetic oleomargarine in place of life-giving butter. You have all had their propaganda on your desks and know whereof I speak.

THE MONOPOLY CALLED THE NATIONAL DAIRY PRODUCTS CORPORATION

Perhaps the most colossal outfit in this field is the National Dairy Products Corporation, which was born in 1923, and is now in control of, and has acquired by purchase, 238 organizations which have to do with the marketing of dairy products. They reach into every nook and corner of the land, and for good measure, so they may give the American dairyman foreign competition, they have plants in eight foreign countries. The report of the Federal Trade Commission, filed with the Speaker of the House on September 30, 1936, shows that during 1935 48 officers and executives of the National Dairy Products Corporation received in excess of $15,000 each, and that the total salaries of this group amounted to $1,129,000. The average salary of these men came to more than $25,000 annually. The president of this company received an annual salary of $108,000; J. L. Kraft, an officer, received $75,000 annually, and L. A. Von Bomel, of the Sheffield Farms, a subsidiary of the National Dairy Products Corporation, received an annual salary of $60,000. These were the salaries which appeared on paper, but doubtless the amount they received in bonuses and from other sources amounted to as much more. It is safe to say that they disburse annually for lobbyists and entertainment in various State capitals and for political lawyers as high as $5,000,000. All through the years and through the depression they paid liberal dividends on their preferred and common stock, this at a time when the dairyman was going over the hill to the poorhouse. This quasi criminal outfit has a stranglehold on the milksheds of the country.

I charge that the National Dairy Products Corporation is in direct collusion with Borden, the "packer kings", and other distributors in fixing the price paid to the producer.

THE FUNCTION OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

I have been carefully through the findings of the Federal Trade Commission in the various milksheds as to the activities of this outfit. May I say that I have always had a high regard for the Federal Trade Commission as a fact-finding body? I have been inclined to class them with the United States engineers in their loyalty and devotion to the public service. But I confess a feeling of disappointment in reading their report. In some respects it is haphazard, and its conclusions are often mere surface findings. It does not live up to the high traditions of the Federal Trade Commission. Reading between the lines it is apparent to me that monopoly exists in most of the milksheds of the country, and the National Dairy Products Corporation and the Bordens are in command.

It appears, too, from the corespondence set forth in the report that these outfits have divided up the various milksheds like captive provinces and have thus regulated the price the dairyman gets for his product. This question is, of course, infinitely more important than any partisan consideration, but the story is rife, and will not down, that Field Marshal Farley has placed his hand on the staff of the Commission. We all know the firm of Davies, Busick & Richardson, lawyers, are the attorneys for the National Dairy Products Corporation. Joseph B. Davies, of this firm, is

now Ambassador to Russia and Donald Richberg, who was the last potentate of the defunct N. R. A., is likewise a member of this firm. Mr. Richberg is said to be the Presidential choice for the Supreme Court vacancy and is now said to occupy the position of chief adviser and "brain truster" extraordinary to the distinguished occupant of the White House. I am curious to know how much the National Dairy Products Corporation pays this firm of lawyers and for what.

The fact is the National Dairy Products Corporation has gone into 300 communities and by oppressive methods, which were characteristic of the lush days of the Standard Oil Co., broke down the price structure to the dairymen and so holds him eternally in a vise. This inference of mine would be made by any jury, and the statement that the National Dairy Products Corporation only use such a percentage of national production, as appears from this report, would seem to come from the lips of the political lawyers who represent this outfit.

THE BORDEN GROUP

Hand and hand with the National Dairy Products Corporation goes the Borden Co., which now controls 200 companies in every branch of the dairy industry. There are 19 States, as well as Canada, England, and Sweden, in which this company is active. I call attention again to the foreign affiliates of this company. They are used, of course, to stimulate foreign imports and to break down the price structure to the dairyman. The surface salaries of this outfit amount to more than a million dollars a year. The president, Arthur W. Milburn, receives $95,000 a year. This company is especially concentrated in the metropolitan areas, where the spread between what the producer gets and the farmer gets is little short of murderous. The correspondence printed by the Federal Trade Commission established conclusively that this company is acting in violation of the antitrust act continually. The methods of this company are notoriously corrupt and oppressive. They maintain lavish suites at the various capitals and you can always have the Borden lobbyist pointed out to you. He usually sticks up like a sore thumb. Last year the Borden profits were the best in its history.

The foregoing is true of the National Dairy Products Corporation. Last year their income was higher than ever before. Their net profit, after charges and dividends on preferred stock had been deducted, amounted to $13,000,282.38.

I have great confidence in the integrity and high ability of Messrs. Davis and Ayers, of the Federal Trade Commission. They were former Members of the House. I was delighted when the President appointed them to the Federal Trade Commission, for I knew they would carry the banner for real law enforcement in the interests of the people. I have not lost my confidence in these men. But I am calling to the attention of the country and the Commission the foregoing facts and hope that investigations of milksheds where the National Dairy Products Corporation is concerned will no longer be perfunctory or casual. In doing that I speak for the dairymen of my district and of the country. Not long since the president of the Dairyman's League in New York State, Mr. Fred A. Sexauer, called the attention of the dairymen of New York State to the fact that dealers expect, through coercion, threats and propaganda to force farmers to protect dealers' interests. Mr. Sexauer knew whereof he spoke. There is a new milk law in New York State, born of agitation and distrust, and obviously it is the intention of these monopolistic outfits like the National Dairy Products Corporation and Bordens to endeavor to take the law in their own hands. I particularly invite that situation to the attention of the Federal Trade Commission and ask that they go into action on it.

A CHALLENGE TO ORGANIZED SOCIETY

In conclusion let me state the conditions I have described are a challenge to organized government. They concern public health and a vast number of dairymen who have their backs to the wall by reason of this monopolistic performance. The legal machinery is adequate for disciplining these exploiters and the time is now ripe when they must be shown that organized government and the law dominates this Nation. The Congress and the country will watch with interest and concern the performance of the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission in this situation. [Applause.]

FARM-TENANCY BILL

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, my congratulations to our colleague from New York [Mr. CULKIN.] He has put his finger on the difficulty and explained why we have farm tenancy.

We have heard eloquent speeches from the Chairman of this Committee, from the Speaker of this House, and from the always eloquent gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. The real reason for farm tenancy was correctly stated by Mr. CULKIN.

I hope you are all familiar with Charles Beard's history which he calls the Rise of American Civilization. In opening his chapter on agriculture, he says:

> In every age and in every clime where civilization has passed its most primitive form, there has always appeared a small group of men devoted to finance, commerce, and industry, and this group of men has always borne down with terrific oppression upon the group that derives its sustenance from agriculture.

When our Speaker this afternoon so eloquently told us of the conditions in Alabama and described the condition of those people who are the descendants of the Huguenots and the Cavaliers, the best blood of America, I could not help but wonder why they had lost their heritage. It is a well known fact that following the Revolutionary War the finest strip of land on earth was from the Alleghenies west to the Mississippi River and from the Lakes to the Gulf, afterward increased by the Louisiana Purchase and extended later by the acquisition of Texas and the great Northwest. Why did the descendants of these Cavaliers and Huguenots lose their lands? For the very reason that Beard so graphically described—on account of the group devoted to finance, commerce, and industry who, today, have borne down upon the group that lives on the farm as described so eloquently by the gentleman from New York.

Farm tenancy is a symptom, it is not the disease. A few weeks ago I had an acute pain in my side. The physician looked me over. He did not give me medicine to kill that pain, he put me on a table, cut me open, found out the cause, removed it, and this is what we should do with respect to farm tenancy. What has caused it? The very thing that our colleague from New York has so graphically described.

It surely is not necessary to call the attention of the Committee of the Whole House to the fact that this bill under consideration is no cure for the farm problem. It will not even scratch the surface. This farm bill is a mere gesture. The farm problem is a serious one which has been more than a century and a half in the making. Soon it must be met and solved by some substantial and far-reaching action quite unlike our emergency legislation. The American farmer must really be put on a parity with industry or he will sink to peasantry. By "parity", I mean income for labor and investment and resultant products equivalent to that which is the reward in industry and commerce. Farm tenantry is not even one of the major problems confronting the men and women who are producing the food and fiber upon which America is living, and upon which industry thrives. Millions upon millions of acres of land were given by the Government, practically without cost, to the ancestors of many of the present tenants. Conditions that made tenants of them, instead of landowners, are still here. These conditions are not corrected by this bill, nor can they be changed by any similar bill. Tenancy conditions are very different in sections of our country. In my section, good farmers prefer to rent lands because they make more money and have full use of earnings, avoiding taxes and interest. It is now hard to find a good farm for rent. In some sections tenancy seems to be a form of peonage. The same legislation cannot be

curative in all situations. The Committee on Agriculture of the House spent over 12 weeks, sitting almost every day, considering practically nothing but farm tenancy. It was the longest discussion of one phase of the farm situation that has occurred in that committee since I have been a member of it.

THE FIRST TENANT BILL

While I do not consider the problem a major one, nevertheless, since farm tenancy increases year by year, it is a matter of concern and should be studied. It will continue, in spite of all the bills of this class we may pass. Major problems facing agriculture should first be correctly solved. There are two theories advanced for corrective legislation on the farm-tenant problem, and each was forcefully presented by its proponents who appeared before the Committee on Agriculture. The one pressed hardest was the plan by which the Government would buy tracts of land in tenant sections and resell farms to selected tenants. The original idea was to invest $100,000,000 a year for 10 years, or a total of $1,000,000,000 to be provided by the Government for the solution of this minor problem. This parallels the Russian system, making the Government a superlandlord. It would have been a great help to those who have found themselves in possession of enormous holdings of land of little value. I doubt if it would have helped the small farmer. This plan contemplated the supervision of the tenants from the fountain of all wisdom on agriculture, namely, Washington, D. C. Had regulations been adopted similar to those used in Resettlement, the tenant would have been obliged to secure approval from the National Capital for every improvement planned and for each building that he wished to construct. These plans were based on the assumption that Government would supply, as leaders or preceptors, men of perfect judgment and wide practical knowledge. My observation leads me to suggest that men and women engaged in advising others should first qualify themselves by successfully operating under similar conditions.

One idea discussed at great length, incorporated in some of the prints of the bill, was that the tenant should not be allowed to sell the land once he entered the "service" and made payments thereon, until many years had passed. Those who proposed this kind of treatment acted upon the theory that tenantry had been brought about by the carelessness of the tenants; that they had not kept their land, had wasted it and what it had produced. The facts are that tenantry has grown, and will continue to grow, from causes that cannot be corrected by the tenant.

THE PRESENT TENANT BILL

A substitute bill was offered providing for a Government loan fund for those who wanted to buy land and become landlords. This bill, now pending before this House, is a compromise bill and provides that $10,000,000 for the first year may be loaned under certain conditions to tenants selected by the Department of Agriculture which is given the unrestricted right to acquire the lands for the experiment. The second year $25,000,000 to be devoted to such expenditures, and the third year fifty millions. There are about 3,200 counties in the United States; it is safe to say that portions of this money will be desired by nearly 3,000 counties. This would provide one farm of $3,000 in value for some one lucky tenant who wants to become a landowner in each of the 3,000 counties, provided the money is equitably distributed. It is like trying to dip up the ocean with a bucket; it will not make even an impression. It will be difficult to administer such an act impartially and to the satisfaction of the poor farmers. Next year there will be $25,000,000 to spend, that will be two and one-half farms in each county, and the third year it will be five farms to a county at a valuation of $3,000. The facts of the case are, that in most of the Pacific Northwest and much of the North, not very much of a farm can be purchased for $3,000. Still I believe that it is best to pass the bill and stop the clamor for this type of legislation.

OBJECTIONS TO THE BILLS

I am free to admit that I opposed the first bills for the Government's purchasing tracts of land, and then trying to fit the tenants into the picture. I think that was the height of folly, especially for the West. I have no accusations to make and no time to state the fears expressed to me, but how easy it would be for certain people or companies owning tracts of land to make the proper showing to certain officials, and to secure from them the sale of their lands to the Government. How easily the worn-out, valueless, heavily eroded land could be sold to the Government for real money and then unloaded on a poor tenant compelled to assume the burden for repaying his "paternal" Government. The poor fellow might be bilked by the very Government that was pretending to help him. There might have been very great danger of fraud or charges and suspicion contaminating every movement of such a plan for solving the tenant problem. I am glad that system was not adopted.

I dreaded such results more than I feared the situation pictured by our colleague from Iowa, and others, that the farm tenant, after buying a place with Government help, would sell the land when he could make a few dollars. We ought not to prevent the tenant, who has struggled through years without any margin of profit, from realizing a little profit of his own. I, for one, would not blame him when he can have $1,000 in the clear, or whatever he may think sufficient, if he should sell his farm to another. I see no harm in allowing the farmer to be a free agent.

FARM PRICES MUST BE STABILIZED

The real difficulty of the whole agricultural situation will not be even remotely affected by the passage and enforcement of this bill. Among the farmers' serious problems I would list first the uncertainty of price for his products. When he plants a field of corn or an acre of wheat the farmer has to take all chances on weather conditions that may ruin the crop at any time from planting to harvest; and then, when the product is ready for the markets, he is obliged to sell it in competition with the same product from all the leading countries of the world. Especially is this true of wheat. Somebody has said the farmer is a gambler; indeed, I know of no one who takes bigger chances than the wheat farmer, with smaller opportunity to make a winning. I can see no solution for the future except some sort of fixed and guaranteed price. I do not know that the country is ready for it; I do not know that it could be enforced even if we enacted it into law; but certainly from ocean to ocean and in every meeting of groups where farmers' problems are discussed, the question of a reasonable price for leading agricultural products should be under discussion. The 12 weeks spent on the farm-tenant bill, I think, could have been better devoted to consideration of the problem of prices on leading farm products than so many hours spent attempting to get the Government into the real-estate business by purchasing large tracts for the purpose of settling tenants thereon.

SPECULATION IS THE MAJOR FARM PROBLEM

The ever-normal granary is not an idle dream; it is a suggestion worthy of the most careful study. There should be held in this country, at all times, sufficient products, like wheat, to carry us over any reasonable period of crop failure. Wheat, corn, rice, and other products of this nature lend themselves easily to storage and can be carried over from year to year for a reasonable length of time. The plan would aid materially in wiping out the agricultural depressions and levelling down the high spots. When the farmers of the Pacific Northwest harvested their crop in the fall of 1936, all creditors immediately commenced to push hard for their money. Wheat at that time was about 60 cents a bushel at local stations. Many of the farmers, perhaps most of them, were obliged to sell. Wheat later in the fall and early winter went up above the dollar mark at the local stations. That rise of 40 to 50 cents did many of the producers no good—it was money made by the speculators, the warehouse men, who had been able to buy of the distressed farmer and hold for the higher prices. For several weeks, now, in the leading markets of the United States, the price has ranged around $1.10 to $1.30 a bushel, bringing to the farmer something like 85 cents to a dollar. Should the full crop mature, as we now have in prospect, again there will be a depression in prices, unless some unforeseen event occurs.

Many of the farmers will be obliged to market their crop at 75 or 80 cents a bushel, which will leave very small margin of profit, if any. That leads me to the conclusion that there must be some legislation wiping out the speculation in grains. During the years of the World War I was a large producer of wheat in Oregon. We had a set, firm market in Chicago at that time, for the gamblers were not buying or selling. They were not allowed to operate under the law. I took chances when I planted my wheat on the quantity of the crop, but I knew the price I was going to get for it when it was ready for the market. Those were the 3 most happy years of my life in the farming industry. The Government had fixed the price at cost with a reasonable margin of profit. Ever since I have wondered why if such laws can be passed and enforced in times of war they will not serve in times of peace? Speculation in farm products is the first and major farm problem.

TAXES THE SECOND PROBLEM

Another problem, and one that seems to grow worse with the years, is that of taxes, which are just the same whether the farmer has a good year or a bad one, whether prices are high or low. The farmer's possessions out in plain sight are tangible and the assessor has no difficulty in finding them. He can see livestock and land and all the machinery that the farmer has. The assessor fixes the value, and the farmer pays on a higher percentage of value than any other taxpayer. All government activities grow more expensive year by year. The merchant must ask a little more for his goods that the farmer has to buy because he, too, pays more taxes. Farmers' mowers, reapers, or binders cost more because that merchant has to pay the extra charges. In other words, the extra high taxes in city, county, State and Nation are passed on to the man who cannot pass them on—the farmer. He goes ahead and does not and cannot question the price of anything, neither that which he buys nor what he sells. An investigation of the trusts which make farm machinery has been too long delayed. Why does Government permit these prices to soar?

Recently I made a study of the cost of electricity to consumers, comparing Portland and Tacoma. I ascertained that the city of Portland pays about $5,000,000 a year more than it would pay if it had a publicly owned plant operated like that in Tacoma. Those $5,000,000 are paid by the citizens and businessmen of Portland. The merchants of Portland collect them from their customers, some of whom are the farmers, who pay much of that $5,000,000 in increased costs of what they buy, and lowered prices of what they sell.

Several years ago, when Governor of the State, I started a campaign to remove all State taxes from real estate by substituting income and other taxes; I met with many difficulties. I am delighted to note that now, some 15 years later, the goal toward which I struggled in the years gone by has been reached and Oregon levies no taxes upon real property for the maintenance of State government. Real property should pay a reasonable tax, but much of the expense of city and county governments should come from sources other than real estate.

INTEREST RATES ANOTHER PROBLEM

Another ever-present problem on a farm is interest. I have spoken so often in the last 5 years on the floor of this House on the subject of interest rates, that probably there is nothing new to be added. I do desire again to emphasize my belief that interest, unconscionably high interest, is largely the cause of our difficulties today. Our capitalistic system, which has developed such a useful, valuable, pleasant civilization, is based on interest higher than the increase of wealth. It is such a cancerous, deep-seated growth that the only way the present capitalistic civilization can survive is occasional periods of depression in which large amounts of capitalization are wiped out by repudiation and compositions. Business starts up again and goes on until interest has once more brought its evil results, and another depression follows. In other words, the depression cycle seems to be a part of the economic system, for when obligations draw interest beyond the increase of wealth it is only a question of time until those obligations become so oppressive and the annual contribution for interest each year is so large that it cannot be paid. The farmer, being the ultimate consumer and in a business requiring borrowed money, is in a position to bear the brunt. He takes the heavy load resulting from these interest charges above and beyond the increase of wealth. No interest beyond the increase of wealth should be charged or collected on long-time obligations. The one who contributes only his money and demands 100-percent security and takes none of the risks of the business should justly receive only the amount that would approximate the increase of wealth which is usually calculated at about 2 percent a year.

I deeply regret the refusal of this administration to assist in holding the reduction of interest in the Federal land bank to 3½ percent for another year. I realize the fact that the Federal land bank has several millions in outstanding bonds which are drawing 4 percent and more interest, and most of these bonds are not yet callable. The farmers of today ought not to pay for the governmental mistakes of yesterday.

I cannot see now, and never could see, any justification in requiring the borrower to invest 5 percent of the amount of his loan in stock in the loaning association. The same exaction is made from the producer who is obliged to borrow through the Crop Production Association. I never have been able to obtain figures from the Farm Credit Administration as to what portion of that 5 percent exacted from borrowers is lost through bad loans, but my observation is that the loss of this stock is 100 percent to many borrowers. This is not the fault of the farmer but of the method. The result is that many who borrow money on land from the Federal Government at 4 percent pay more than 5 percent for that money. Those who object to the reduced interest rate never mention the 5-percent forced investment.

I know the Farm Credit Administration constantly issues newspaper releases showing the large amounts of money loaned farmers through various governmental agencies. I have no way of comparing these figures with the amounts lent by all agencies prior to 1929. I daresay, if figures could be secured, it would be found that the amount lent through the Production Credit Corporation and the Farm Credit Administration is only a small percentage of the amounts loaned to farmers by banks, insurance companies, and private individuals prior to the catastrophe of 1929. The Government, through its lending agencies, has made rules so stringent, and the demand for securities so severe, that many who would like to secure farm loans have been unable to do so. Many a farmer who would like to negotiate a loan through the Crop Production Association is unable to get it because he cannot meet the severe conditions exacted by the Government. I believe the Government should use every force and power available to keep farm interest rates down, and there are plenty of powers available if they were used. So I name that as another real farm problem which is not even seriously considered at this time, and through this bill.

TRANSPORTATION COSTS A PROBLEM

Transportation is another ever-present problem to the average farmer. The wheat regions of the West are subject to an excessively high toll from transportation lines which move the wheat from local warehouses to mills and water terminals. When the World War was on, freight rates were on an average of about 50 percent less than they are today. Formerly, before the war, I could ship a bushel of wheat from my ranch to tidewater for 9 cents. Those rates have been advanced at different times until today it costs over 15 cents a bushel.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is supposed equitably to adjust transportation rates. They seem to be convinced that their chief duty is to recognize a rate schedule sufficiently high to earn money to pay interest and dividends upon inflated valuations. It has been estimated that if the water could be squeezed out of the stock and bonds of the transportation lines, freight rates could be reduced by one-third.

REAL FARM LEGISLATION NEEDED

I have set forth briefly what seem to me to be the real farm problems. I have done this to explain why I think the pending bill will be of very little value. Those few who receive the preferential benefits will have to struggle along under the same handicaps now making farming difficult and hazardous.

I sincerely hope some farm legislation of real value and widespread benefit can be offered this body. When this bill passes and becomes a law, I hope that the result will be beneficial. I would be sorry indeed to learn that this is offered and pressed for passage to still the demand for real farm legislation. This act cannot justly be called the "Farm Security Act of 1937." That is a misnomer. The act covers only a very small portion of a broad field. Farm security legislation has not yet come before this session. [Applause.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KINZER].

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe much argument is needed to impress the membership not only with the desirability but the necessity for making some approach to the problem here presented.

I am in entire agreement with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE] when he expressed his judgment with respect to the provision of the bill providing for the lending of Government money up to the full value of the land purchased by the tenant farmer, who is the man sought to be benefited. I have always thought that when you lent the full price, it was not a loan any more, but a sale, and if we are to follow the suggestion laid down by the Speaker, as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], we must realize there is an element of thrift, as well as one of ability, to be considered by the local committee, and I do not think it is wise for us to incorporate in the bill a provision to lend up to the full value, although the local committee may approve a loan for less than the value. If the desirable tenants have a will to accomplish something and to purchase a farm, they should have some part of the fund which is intended to be used, and, following the example of Denmark, 90 percent would be the limit of the loan.

As I have said, I am in entire accord with the suggestion of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE], and I think an amendment limiting such a loan to 90 percent of the purchase price is a good one.

I believe it is absolutely necessary for the Government to make a start and to grant some assistance, although with the amount of $10,000,000, when divided and spread over the entire Nation, will be very small for the first year. However, a beginning can be made, and, while this amount may not buy many farms throughout the country, it will be a start and provide an experiment which will be helpful in approaching a wise solution of the farm-tenant problem. [Applause.]

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, on September 21, 1936, the President addressed a letter to Senator BANKHEAD, of Alabama, suggesting preparation of plans to meet the farm-tenant problem, and in the letter stated:

> Thoughtful people everywhere have been gravely concerned with the steady increase in farm tenancy from 1880 to 1935. Since the earliest days of their history it has been an ideal of the American people that every American should have an ownership interest in land or in some other means of production.
>
> Despite this fundamental objective, we have seen farm tenancy increase relative to farm ownership decade by decade. An enduring agricultural civilization must be built on the firm foundation of home and farm ownership.
>
> Any long-time improvement of the welfare of the Nation and of farm people involves improvement of the tenancy situation.
>
> The tenancy problem in the United States cannot be solved overnight. But through Government financing of land purchased by tenants, other countries, notably Ireland and Denmark, have substantially increased farmer ownership of farm land.
>
> I think we need some such approach. It should give tenants who have demonstrated their ability to manage land an opportunity to buy farms on long-time terms at moderate interest rates.

On October 10, 1936, the President, in a speech delivered in Omaha, Nebr., said:

> It is a further part of our long-time farm policy to attack the evil of farm tenancy. In this we have already made a good beginning with lower interest rates and better prices. We are preparing legislation, in cooperation with farm leaders, to submit to the Congress in January to help solve this problem. We cannot, as a Nation, be content until we have reached the ultimate objective of every farm family owning its own land.

After the election, on January 6, 1937, the President delivered before a joint session of the two Houses of Congress his annual message, in which he stated:

> There are far-reaching problems still with us for which democracy must find solutions if it is to consider itself successful.

And further said:

> For example, many millions of Americans still live in habitations which not only fail to provide the physical benefits of modern civilization but breed disease and impair the health of future generations. The menace exists not only in the slum areas of the very large cities, but in many smaller cities as well. It exists on tens of thousands of farms, in varying degrees, in every part of the country.
>
> Another example is the prevalence of an un-American type of tenant farming. I do not suggest that every farm family has the capacity to earn a satisfactory living on its own farm. But many thousands of tenant farmers—indeed most of them—with some financial assistance and with some advice and training, can be made self-supporting on land which can eventually belong to them. The Nation would be wise to offer them that chance instead of permitting them to go along as they do now, year after year, with neither future security as tenants nor hope of ownership of their homes nor expectation of bettering the lot of their children.

The figures in the 1935 census of agriculture show that there are approximately 2,865,000 tenant farmers in the United States. These are farmers who rent all of the land they operate. They represent more than 42 percent of all the farmers in the country. In addition to these 2,865,000 tenants, we have about 689,000 part owners. These part owners are farmers who own part of the land they operate and rent part of it. They represent 10 percent of all our farmers. Hence, we are faced with the fact that 52 percent—more than half—of all the farmers in the United States rent all or part of the land they farm. An additional 1 percent of our farmers are hired managers. Consequently, only 47 percent of the 6,812,000 farmers, enumerated by the census of 1935, own all of their land.

Realizing the magnitude of the problem, the President appointed a special committee headed by the Secretary of Agriculture and composed of farm leaders, experts, and other distinguished citizens, and directed the committee to make a careful study of the problem to the end that certain recommendations for action might be made. Upon completing its investigation and study the committee filed its report and recommended the enactment of legislation at the present session of Congress. Early in this session H. R. 8 was introduced by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture and was referred to and received the attention of that committee. Extensive hearings were held and many officials, experts, farm leaders, interested citizens, and groups of citizens were heard, and the committee had the benefit of the findings of the committee appointed by the President. Several members of the committee appeared and gave us the benefit of their opinion as to the kind of measure which should be enacted.

In the Seventy-fourth Congress the House Committee on Agriculture held hearings on two bills, H. R. 7018 and S. 2367, but no action was taken at that time. The bill now under consideration is the outgrowth of these long and extensive hearings. I am sure, therefore, that the members of the Committee on Agriculture who have sat through these extensive hearings and protracted executive sessions are impressed with the profound importance of the basic and fundamental problem involved and of the absolute necessity for its ultimate solution.

This bill seeks to deal with a grave social and vitally important economic problem which is national in its scope. I am not afraid that the membership of this House will underrate the importance of the problem with which we are now dealing. I am not afraid that we will forget those in

the rural areas of our country who are not able to scratch out even a bare existence on small and infertile farms and in areas which have been devastated by floods and drought and erosion; those on the hillsides and on the ragged edge of swamp lands far from the stream of commerce and the eyes of the world. I am not afraid that amid the conflicts and bewilderments of the world in which we live that the Democratic Party and its leadership will forget the destitution and poverty of those who are helpless to help themselves in the rural sections of this great country, but, on the other hand, I believe that it will reach out the strong arm of this Government to lift them from their submerged insecurity and dire destitution and take them from submarginal lands and aid them in reaching the goal of every true American farmer—that of obtaining and owning a farm home upon which he and his family may earn a livelihood and enjoy some of the blessings of modern life. This administration possesses the power and the capacity for sensible decision and quick action. While we may not hope for an immediate solution of the problem with which we are now dealing, at least, we must take this step to bring help and hope to those who have in the past been forgotten.

While the amount herein authorized to be appropriated is wholly inadequate, it will at least eliminate in some degree the poverty and economic insecurity of a vital part of our population.

I am sure that no one would suggest that this is a solution of the problem which today faces these destitute rural people, yet at the same time it is an important part of a well-rounded program for agriculture. It will do much through the years to retard the growth of tenancy and to relieve a situation which has been accentuated by an economic collapse. I realize that even a gift of fertile farm land will not in itself mean security. We must in addition stabilize farm income and protect our farmers from wild speculations and extreme fluctuations in commodity prices and land values if we are to find an adequate answer to this pressing problem. The evils of farm tenancy are a national disgrace and land speculation and price fluctuation are the greatest foes of farm ownership. We have in the past few years had at least some degree of stability in commodity prices and land values and now in a modest way we are seeking to lessen the evils of farm tenancy and to improve our system of land tenure.

As a remedy for the present ills this bill is, of course, wholly inadequate and insufficient. For this reason I preferred certain provisions which were stricken from the original bill but as most legislation is the result of compromise I shall gladly support the measure as reported by the committee in the hope that some progress may be made and some security may be brought to those who will receive the benefits of the provisions of this measure. Even though we may not help many, we will at least give a ray of hope to those who are now helpless.

In order to impress upon you the importance of the problem, may I call attention to the fact that 2,865,155 farms were operated by tenants in 1935, and to the fact that between 1925 and 1935 tenancy has increased 40,255 annually, and during the years of 1930–35 increase has been at the rate of 40,158 annually? To further impress upon you the magnitude of the problem, if we assume that $4,000 per tenant farmer is to be invested, it would require, at the rate of increase during the past 5 years, an appropriation of $160,632,000 per year merely to take care of the increased number of tenants, to say nothing of the 2,865,155 other tenants in the country. Even if we could stop the increase and appropriate the sum of $50,000,000 annually to reduce the number of tenant farmers already in existence, spending $4,000 on each tenant farmer, it would require 230 years to eliminate tenancy in the United States. It is, therefore, plain to see that this is a problem of stupendous proportion and is one which will not be solved in this generation, yet all fair-minded men will agree that we should do something to help those who are most worthy in this great group of our citizens. We should adopt a long-time program, a practical program, which will make the tenants' climb to ownership easier and their security more certain.

Many of these tenants have once known and enjoyed the pride of ownership but, due to no fault of their own, were forced to fall back into tenancy. If our system is improved and agriculture is made profitable, these men and women will again take their proper places in American life. We must, therefore, improve and perfect the system under which they are to labor and give them another chance to prove their real worth. We must expand our foreign trade and develop our domestic markets, and give to those who labor in the field a degree of security yet unknown. This must be done if we are to check the growth of tenancy and save those who are now fighting to hold onto their farm homes. Many of our landlords are now only tenants, mortgagors in possession, working for those who hold encumbrances upon their farms. The plight of the American farmer is a challenge to our statesmanship. When our great President pointed out that one-third of our population is ill-clothed, ill-fed, and ill-housed, surely he had in mind that large group of our citizens who are poverty-stricken upon the farms of our Nation. In May 1935 approximately 1,000,000 rural families were on relief. If we assume that there are 5 in the average family, we have the spectacle of 5,000,000 people from the farms of America forced to accept public charity.

Even if we go back to 1929 there were about 398,000 farm families in this country which had a total gross income of less than $250 for a year. This included the products which they sold, traded, and consumed, their meat and bread, fruit and vegetables, and all that they had to eat. If we assume that the average size of the family was 5 people, we had 1,990,000 people, each one of whom had a gross income for the year of $50, or less than 8 cents a day. Of course, many of these farm families are twice as large as the figure used and, therefore, the income of many individuals would be less.

Census figures show 916,000 farm families with a total gross income of less than $400. Assuming that they are families of 5 people, this means $80 annually for each person in the family, or $40 annually for members of families of 10, and this is not unusual in many sections of the South.

Even in 1929 about 47 percent of all our farmers had an annual gross income, including the value of products grown and consumed on the farm, of less than $1,000. These figures include both landlords and tenants. Is this the true picture of real American life? Is it the American standard of living? But, you say, this bill will not bring about the stabilization of an adequate farm income or remedy the ills of which I complain. No, but it is an important step which must be taken without delay.

I realize that there are some who will say that this is a continuation of the Resettlement Administration. I know that some will say that the Resettlement Administration has spent huge sums of money, much of which has been wasted. While I hold no brief for the Resettlement Administration, its extravagance and its waste, I am unwilling to condemn its high objectives merely because those who first embarked upon the program were ill-advised and are guilty of faults and failures and follies upon which I am not willing to place my stamp of approval. The Resettlement Administration undertook many foolish, unsound, and extravagant projects, but even so I am unwilling to repudiate it or the man who issued the Executive order which brought it into existence. I am willing, therefore, and anxious to vote for this bill which authorizes the completion of the Resettlement projects which have been undertaken, to the end that that which has been invested may not be totally lost.

I know that there are those present who would like to see this bill defeated so that they could go to the country next spring with the cry that this Congress had repudiated the emergency program set up by the President for the rehabilitation of agriculture and the resettlement of some of our poverty-stricken farm people. I cannot, in the brief space of time allotted, discuss that which has been done by the

rural-rehabilitation section of the Resettlement Administration in bringing relief to poverty-stricken farmers, nor can I discuss the fine service which its Land Utilization Division has rendered in reclaiming submarginal land and correcting maladjustments in land use and in making farming more profitable. Even though the Resettlement Administration has made many mistakes, let us not burn down the house to get rid of the rats, but rather let us profit by the mistakes which have been made and go forward with a broadside attack upon the problem of rural slum clearance.

The bill which we are now considering, H. R. 7562, is a bill to encourage and promote the ownership of farm homes and to make the possession of such homes more secure, to provide for the general welfare of the United States, to provide additional credit facilities for agricultural development, and for other purposes. The bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to establish in the Department of Agriculture a Farm Security Administration to assist him in the exercise of the powers and duties conferred by this act. The act authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $10,000,000 for the first fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, not to exceed $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, not to exceed $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, to be administered by the Secretary through the Farm Security Administration in making loans to farm tenants, farm laborers, sharecroppers, and other individuals who obtain or who recently obtained the major portion of their income from farming operations for the purpose of purchasing efficient farm management units sufficient to enable a diligent farm family to carry on successful farming which the Secretary deems can be successfully carried on in the locality in which the farm is situated.

Realizing the wisdom of decentralizing the functions of Federal agencies, the bill provides further for the establishment of county committees which shall be charged with the duty and responsibility of receiving applications of persons desiring to finance the acquisition of farms by means of a loan from the Secretary under the provisions of this bill and with the duty and responsibility of examining and appraising the farm or farms which are to be purchased, and in general to pass upon the eligibility of the applicant, the character of the farm to be purchased, and the amount which the committee finds is a reasonable value of the property to be bought.

The Secretary is authorized to loan the full, fair, and reasonable value of the farm for an agreed period of not more than 30 years at a loan rate of 3 percent per annum and to make certain other provisions for the protection of the security which will require insurance, maintenance, and repair and prevent waste and exhaustion of the farm property and its fertility. The amount so appropriated shall be distributed equitably among the several States and Territories on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy.

REHABILITATION LOANS

Under title II of the bill the Secretary is authorized to make loans to eligible individuals for the purchase of livestock, farming equipment, supplies, and other farm needs, and for the refinancing of indebtedness and family subsistence. These loans are to be made at the rate of 3 percent per annum and shall have maturities not in excess of 5 years and shall be secured by a chattel mortgage, crop liens, and the assignment of proceeds from the sale of agricultural products.

No definite amount is authorized to be appropriated for this purpose other than unexpended balances available to the Secretary for loans and relief to farmers and such other sums as the President is authorized to allot to the Secretary out of appropriations for relief or work relief.

The Secretary is further authorized to assist in the voluntary adjustment of indebtedness between farm debtors and their creditors. Under the farm debt adjustment program which has been undertaken by this administration the farmers of the Nation have been saved millions of dollars.

RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND

Title III authorizes and directs the Secretary to develop a program of land conservation and land utilization including the retirement of lands which are submarginal or not primarily suitable for cultivation and charges him with the responsibility of improving, developing, and administering the property so acquired and authorizes him to sell, exchange, lease, or otherwise dispose of any such property upon such terms and conditions as he deems will best accomplish the purpose of the title.

Title III further directs the Secretary to pay to the county in which the land is held by the Secretary under this title, 25 percent of the net revenues received by the Secretary from the land during such year. This is a payment in lieu of taxes. The payment so made shall be made upon the condition that it is used for school or road purposes.

For the purposes mentioned in title III there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and not to exceed $20,000,000 for each two fiscal years thereafter.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Title IV provides for the establishment of the Farm Security Administration, the appointment of personnel, and general provisions with reference to the administration of the act, including local committees to be composed of three farmers residing in the county.

Title IV further authorizes the Secretary to continue the activities of the Resettlement Administration to the extent that may be necessary only for the completion and the administration of those resettlement projects, rural-rehabilitation projects for resettlement purposes and land development, and land utilization projects for which funds have been allotted by the President.

I desire to remind our Republican brethren of the fact that the Republican platform adopted in 1936 has this to say with reference to agriculture and with reference to the farm problem now under consideration:

> The farm problem is an economic and social, not a partisan, problem, and we propose to treat it accordingly.

Again I quote from the Republican platform:

> We propose—
>
> A national land-use program, including the acquisition of abandoned and nonproductive farm land by voluntary sale or lease, subject to approval of the legislative and executive branches of the States concerned, and the devotion of such land to appropriate public use, such as watershed protection and flood prevention, reforestation, recreation and conservation of wildlife.
>
> To provide for ample farm credit at rates as low as those enjoyed by other industries, including commodity and livestock loans, and preference in land loans to the farmer acquiring or refinancing a farm as a home.

In this connection I desire also to call attention to the Democratic platform of 1936 in which we find this language:

> We recognize the gravity of the evils of farm tenancy, and we pledge the full cooperation of the Government in the refinancing of farm indebtedness at the lowest possible rates of interest and over a long term of years.

Our hills and valleys and fertile lands are ladened with gifts quite beyond the comprehension of man. While it is true we have extended our geographical frontiers until now the stream of commerce flows into even the remotest sections of our great and common country, yet we are now face to face with a problem of further extending the social and economic frontiers of modern American life. Here is a problem and here is a field of human endeavor wherein the tingling thrill and all the tremor and throb of eager and earnest emotions can be used to the greatest and grandest advantage. While it is true that America stands out today as the greatest force in world progress, when we think of the problem of farm tenancy we must be conscious of a great lack of full and complete accomplishment. In passing this bill we are embracing a fundamental problem of first magnitude and stupendous proportions, yet it is a problem which Americans will and must some day solve.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, regardless of how much money might be appropriated by the Federal Government for the purpose of curing the evil of farm tenancy, I undertake to say that under present economic conditions that such would be an impossible task. Until there is a stability of price of the basic commodities and until the farmer's dollar has a purchasing power on a parity with all other industry, we are attempting to do something which may aggravate rather than clarify the issue, as I see it. Nevertheless I am for this farm tenancy bill as it stands at the present time, and I sincerely hope that the membership of this House will stand firm and pass this bill as reported by the Committee on Agriculture. I trust that under no circumstances will we submit to the terms and conditions of a bill which is proposed at the other end of the Capitol. Our committee studied the provisions of H. R. 8 for many weeks, which is in substance what is reported out by the Senate at the present time. Extensive hearings were held upon that bill, the result being that a majority of the committee favored the principles endorsed in the legislation before you. There are many problems in the Senate bill which are difficult of administration and should not be embodied in any bill which is designed in the first instance as an experiment to meet a national condition. I call attention to what seems to me glaring defects and not in keeping with the spirit of American institutions.

First. The restriction of alienation is unknown in America. It is common in European countries where dictators and monarchies prevail. I undertake to say that any time a man has the money to pay for his farm he ought to be able to get a deed for that farm and not wait for a period of 20 or 40 years, as originally proposed. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIERMANN] seeks to enforce this restriction and bases his argument on the fact that speculation in land will be restrained. If you want to keep the question of speculation out of the picture, why penalize the owner of one of these Government-loaned farms and permit the man next door who owns land to make a profit when there is a speculative boom in the country?

Pass the windfall tax which affects all land alike, as was suggested by the President's committee, reporting to the House Committee on Agriculture when we held our hearings.

Second. If you pass the Senate bill the Government will control the lease of every farm in every community in America. In other words, the remaining tenants in that community are going to compel the landlords to go along with Uncle Sam, who will be the greatest landlord in America in time to come. Every lease in the county will be centered around the leases which are being promulgated by the Government. If a landlord cannot compete with Uncle Sam he will be forced as a matter of self preservation to sell his land, and the Government will be the ultimate purchaser.

Third. On the question of taxes, the Senate bill provides among other things the following:

"Real property, other than real property to which subsection (a) applies, acquired, held, or leased by the corporation under this title shall be exempt from taxation by any State, Territory, or political subdivision."

Mr. NELSON. From what bill is the gentleman reading?

Mr. LUCAS. I am reading from the Senate bill that has been reported out. In other words, if the Government acquires a farm it is exempt from taxation so long as the title remains in the Federal Government. Think of such a provision being incorporated in a bill. Think of the bitterness and the rancor that will be engendered in every community as a result of this unfair discrimination. If that bill comes here upon a conference report, and our conferees permit the Senate Members to have their way, gentlemen who vote for it may have their political future somewhat jeopardized, especially if the United States Government is permitted to have its lands exempted, and the farmer down the road is compelled to pay the regular tax assessed by the assessor in that community.

Fourth. Death of the purchaser: Here we find plenty of problems from the standpoint of law, when one of these tenants dies, if the Senate bill becomes the law of the land. One of the best lawyers who came before our committee said he could not tell where the Federal jurisdiction started and where the State jurisdiction ended, or where the State jurisdiction began and the Federal jurisdiction ended. In that statement I concur. Whether the contract for a deed would be personal property or would be considered under the doctrine of equitable conversion is not clear.

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

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Illinois 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Another matter of importance in the Senate bill involves the question of double jeopardy. In other words, if the tenant be charged with arson for burning the barn on Government property, he not only can be prosecuted in a Federal court but he can also be prosecuted in the State court. If he is acquitted in the Federal court, they can bring him to the county where the barn is located and prosecute him again for the same offense, just like they used to do in the prohibition days.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I boldly assert that any tenant in this country who is frugal, industrious, and thrifty, the type of tenant that the Government seeks to keep in the farm-tenancy program, will never go in partnership with Uncle Sam if he thoroughly understands the bill that has been reported out of the United States Senate today, providing it should be enacted into law. I undertake to say that if I had the opportunity of explaining that bill to the type of tenant worth while he never would sign a contract with Uncle Sam.

It is only the man whom we call the cove in the mountain, or the irresponsible tenant who never was worth anything to himself or to his community or to anyone else, who will take hold of a contract of that kind and attempt to carry on in behalf of himself and the Government.

Mr. Chairman, the buying of land by the Government and the resale thereof to tenants is the beginning of a dangerous philosophy of Government ownership of land. It is estimated that within 40 years the Government would have under their control or jurisdiction a million tenants. The next step will be to take them all in as they do under the powers of a dictatorship. I trust the time may never come when such may happen, but if the Senate bill should be agreed to, I can see the beginning of the end of independent and free ownership of lands in this Republic.

Mr. LANZETTA. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the bill, H. R. 7562, I ask unanimous consent to include a letter from the Secretary of the Interior to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. JONES] together with some tables showing purchases made by Puerto Rico from the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C.

HON. MARVIN JONES,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. JONES: My attention has been called to the fact that H. R. 7562, a bill for the Farm Security Act of 1937, introduced in the House on June 17, 1937, as a substitute for H. R. 6240, was reported out on June 18, 1937, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House; and that this bill, in its present form, does not extend to Puerto Rico, although it does extend to Hawaii and Alaska, and although the Senate bill, S. 106, the companion bill to the original bill, H. R. 8, for which 6240 was substituted, as reported to the Senate and now pending there, does extend to Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico with a population now estimated at 1,800,000 is, in population, by far the greatest of the organized Territories whose people are citizens of the United States. It is greatest in amount of purchases from the mainland as well as in population. It

purchased $86,352,000 worth of goods from the mainland in 1936, largely farm products. Its purchases were greater than those of any other area in the Western Hemisphere except Canada, and were greater than those of any country in the world, outside of Canada, except Great Britain, France, Germany, and Japan. Since 1931 Puerto Rico has risen from the tenth among world customers of the mainland United States to sixth place, increasing her purchases during that period from $60,637,000 in 1931 to $86,352,000 in 1936. She buys from the mainland nearly everything she consumes.

Puerto Rico is almost wholly agricultural, and because of her dense population it is peculiarly necessary that her land be utilized as fully and advantageously as possible. With a total acreage of about 2,240,000 acres, it is estimated that only about 1,220,000 acres are now under cultivation, which gives only about seven-tenths of an acre per person for the total 1,800,000 people in the island. Perhaps 500,000 acres more can be made available. After the disastrous hurricanes of 1928 and 1932 many small farmers, particularly coffee farmers on the hillsides, abandoned their lands and drifted to San Juan and the others of the larger cities of the island, accentuating slum conditions there and adding to the social problems. Their former lands rapidly go back to jungle or are exposed to erosion. It is imperatively necessary that aid be extended to such small farmers, to reinstate them on the land, to save the lands, and to ameliorate social conditions in the island's cities. The loans and credits contemplated by titles I and II of H. R. 7562 could well be utilized and would be of great help for these purposes. There are also some submarginal lands which should be utilized and developed under a program such as that contemplated in title III of this bill. Tropical products, such as vanilla beans, quinine, bamboo, and other tropical plants, as well as coffee, can be grown on these lands, products of a kind well designed to check erosion on the hillsides, and not to compete with mainland agricultural products.

Because of its dense population every social and governmental problem is accentuated in Puerto Rico. Here is a farm community with the density of a city suburban population. If Iowa were as densely populated as Puerto Rico it would have some 28,000,000 people. Texas would have around 130,000,000. This places a definite responsibility on the administration for the welfare of these American citizen farmers. Puerto Rico has not received more than its fair share of Government benefits during the period of the depression, in spite of the needs arising from this heavy population. Rather, it has received less, on a per-capita basis, indeed, less than one-half the average share of the States and Territories, as appears from the brief tabular statement hereto appended. Detailed figures are before your committee in the hearings on the sugar bill. (Hearings on H. R. 5326, present session, before special subcommittee, Mar. 15–22, 1937, serial B, pp 88–93 and 116.)

As was said in Secretary Ickes' letter to you of May 7, 1937:

"Since the great fundamental principle of American democracy is the equal treatment of all citizens, there is no need to dwell upon the moral or practical necessity of avoiding economic discriminations against the citizens of the United States who may be residing in insular parts of our country."

It is earnestly requested, therefore, that a committee amendment to this bill, H. R. 7562, be accepted that will extend its provisions to Puerto Rico. That purpose could be accomplished by the following changes in the present bill:

In section 1 (a), in line 1 on page 2, strike out the word "and", the first word of the line, and insert a comma in lieu thereof, and insert in the same line after the word "Hawaii" the words "and Puerto Rico."

In section 50, in line 14 on page 17, strike out the word "and", following "Alaska" and insert a comma in lieu thereof, and strike out the period at the end of the line after the word "Hawaii" and insert "and Puerto Rico."

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) CHARLES WEST,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

Puerto Rico:	
Imports from United States mainland, 1936—Sixth best customer; exceeds any other in Western Hemisphere except Canada; exceeded only by Great Britain, Canada, Japan, France, and Germany.	$86,352,000.00
Buys 92 percent of all its purchases from U. S. mainland.	
Population about 1,800,000; area only about 2,200,000.	
Benefits, all sources last 3 years, per capita	26.51
Plus, from retained customs duties and taxes, per capita	6.46
Total benefits	32.97
Average benefits per capita all States and Territories, same years	68.41
Average benefits all other territories, same years	55.72

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN].

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, I really had not expected to get any time on this bill, but I am very, very much interested in the problem. All my life I have operated a farm, and I am still operating it—at least, my family is operating it during my absence. That is the only way I had to make a living until I came to Congress, and now I spend the money I make here on the farm to pay for losses incurred. I am very much interested in this attempt to make a start at farm ownership. In Wisconsin a few years ago we had about 12 percent renters, and now it has crept up to nearly 40 percent. Certainly it was not through the fault of the majority of the farmers in that State. A majority of the farmers are either German or Scandinavian extraction, the type that certainly did not squander their money or who are shiftless farmers. They are the conservative, hard-working, up-to-date farmers, who have tried their best to make a living and who, through no fault of their own, have drifted into a condition where they are losing their farms by the thousands yearly that were operated for three or four generations by their people.

While this bill does not go nearly far enough, and the committee admits it does not go far enough, it is a step in the right direction.

We already have the Resettlement Administration with an office and personnel in every county looking after rehabilitation loans or grants. These local people in my State are for the most part very well acquainted with all the farmers that are in distress. They could pick out those worthy of consideration when applications are received, and drop those not worthy, without creating the expense of investigating each applicant. I believe that the Secretary of Agriculture should use the Resettlement county set-up.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN] certainly hit the nail on the head when he said that the price-fixing monopolies have driven the farmers of the country, especially the dairy farmers, to their present plight. I know that this is true in other lines as well. The packers control the price of the animals they buy as well as the price of their finished products. The gentleman from New York stated that in the case of the dairy industry the price of cheese for the whole United States is fixed at Plymouth, Wis. This is true. It has gone to such an extent, the monopoly is so great, that in 1931 the Department of Agriculture, with the consent of the Governor, appointed a special committee consisting of three producers chosen by the farmers and the cheese producers, three men selected by the processors, the packers, and the large cheese buyers, and the State appointed the seventh member to represent the State as a whole. I happened to be the unfortunate victim that had to act as umpire between the producer that wanted all he could get and the buyer that wanted it as cheaply as possible. We met at Plymouth every Friday, that being the day on which the price of cheese is fixed—every Friday at 2 o'clock in the afternoon there is a sham auction, and the highest bidder sets the price of cheese for the United States. But there is very seldom more than one bid for a certain type of cheese. A few of the big buyers get together around a table for lunch and agree on who is going to bid on the cheese that is to be auctioned off to the highest bidder at 2 o'clock. There never was any competition unless they happened to have a batch of cheese they wanted to unload on some little fellow who was foolish enough to overbid them; but they have taught the little fellows a few lessons, so that very seldom anybody dares to bid.

The State of Wisconsin tried to break up that ring with the fair-price committee mentioned, but it was impossible. The committee studied the situation for 9 months. We found it was a problem for the Federal Government, not the States. In spite of the fact that Wisconsin at that time produced 74 percent of the cheese in the United States, we found we could not solve it, for they said they would simply move their offices over into another State if we tried to interfere with them or molest them at all. So I say that the gentleman from New York has put his finger on the pulse of the evil: The monopolies fix the price both to the producer and the consumer. I blame the farmers, of course, for not organizing, so as to control their own commodity, their investment, and their labor.

No other industry in the world today allows the price of the product, their money, their investment, their brains, their toil, to be fixed by others. Agriculture is the only industry that seems willing to produce, and then take whatever price somebody will offer for their goods. The farmers, because of lack of foresight to organize and control their own production, allow a monopoly such as the National Dairy Co., which is a holding company and controls every major dairy distributing agency in the United States, to fix the prices of their products.

The United States Attorney and the Federal Trades Commission should have taken steps long ago to dissolve this gigantic dairy trust that holds a strangle hold on the price of dairy products.

But the farmers should become better organized so that they may some day say, "It costs me so much to produce these products, and unless you pay me that price, you cannot have it." Yes, producer and consumer must eliminate these unnecessary middle men for the benefit of all concerned. [Applause.] [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LORD].

Mr. LORD. Mr. Chairman, some of the provisions of the pending bill may be good, but there are many with which I do not agree. I believe, with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KINZER], that the purchaser of a farm should have some financial interest in it and should provide some portion of the purchase money.

To my mind, we need more to purchase small tracts of 5 or 10 acres for the tenants. Many of them cannot operate a large farm but could a small one.

What I am most interested in and what I want to talk about in the brief time allotted to me is submarginal land that in volume of thousands and thousands of acres are being taken from the tax rolls of this country. Most of this land in my district is timber land. Twenty-five percent of the profit derived from these lands is returned to the counties where located, for highways and for schools, but there will be no income. The net result will be that the withdrawal of this land from the tax rolls will add just that much more to the burden of the farmers in the districts throughout my State, New York, and what applies in New York applies to all States. The State of New York buys land for reforesting at a cost of $4 an acre. It is assessed for what it costs and pays the local rate of school and highway taxes; and I believe this bill should carry a similar provision, for just as soon as you take land out of taxation, take it off of the tax rolls, it adds a great deal more to the tax burden the remaining land must bear.

It is my intention to offer an amendment to correct this situation, and I hope it may have the support of this House. Some of this land the Government is buying costs as much as $20 an acre. In some instances where there are woodworking factories, acid factories, and so forth, they are dismantling the factories, and tearing down dwellings, and this all goes off the tax rolls. It is planned to keep this land for years, I suppose, and let the timber continue to grow, but during all this time it will be out of taxation. It seems to me this creates an unfair situation, and I ask your support of the amendment I shall offer at the proper time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, my only purpose in using this brief allotment of time is to endeavor to call to the attention of the House three amendments which I intend to offer when this bill is reached for consideration under the 5-minute rule, and which I intend to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks. It is manifestly impossible to discuss any of these amendments in the brief time I have at my disposal.

Two of my amendments, construed together, have for their objective the removal of a condition provided in this bill which I think you will agree with me ought to be corrected: This bill as it is drawn and as I construe it would subject the equity of the borrower who might secure money for the purpose of purchasing a farm to levy and sale under civil process for the payment of debts. The amendments to which I have made reference undertake to provide that for a period of 5 years the equity or interest which the borrower may have in the land purchased shall not be subject to levy and sale under civil process without the consent of the Secretary of Agriculture. There are other objectives sought to be achieved by the amendments, but that is the principal one.

I think you will agree with me where a man has become overburdened with debt, perhaps, and is given a new chance by reason of the extension of the benefits provided by this legislation, and enters upon a farm purchased for him by the Government of the United States and manages to make some payments thereon, as a result of which he acquires an equity in the farm, we should not permit him to be sold out within a year or two after his equitable interest may have been acquired under processes in favor of creditors whose debts may have been existing at the time when the farm was purchased for him by the Government. We ought to give him at least 5 years in which to straighten out his affairs and we should provide that during the 5 years any interest or equity he may acquire in the land shall not be subject to levy or sale under civil process.

I understand it is insisted by some members of the committee that that matter would be taken care of by the homestead laws of the various States. That unfortunately is not true so far as my own State is concerned and I am satisfied it is not true with regard to many of the States of the Union. In my State a debtor may waive his homestead rights by written instrument executed for that purpose, except as to $300 worth of household and kitchen furniture, wearing apparel, and provisions; therefore, under the terms of this bill and under the laws of my State a sharecropper or tenant, perhaps heavily involved, who might be given the opportunity provided by this bill and allowed to purchase a farm, could be sold out as far as his interest or equity in the farm is concerned at any time after it may have been acquired to satisfy the claim of any creditor holding an obligation of that kind which he may have reduced to judgment. It would be true, of course, that if the instrument taken by the Government were a trust deed, the amount of the Government's debt would first have to be tendered or paid by the creditor, but the farm could nevertheless be sold out from under a borrower who might be in good faith meeting all of his obligations to the Government.

The amendment also prohibits the assignment of the interest of the sharecropper or tenant not for a period of 20 years, but for a period of 5 years after his acquisition of the property, except by consent of the Secretary of Agriculture. It does not go as far as the amendment which has been proposed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIERMANN]. It does, however, afford to the sharecropper or tenant who may have been accorded the opportunity to buy a farm at least 5 years' protection from land sharks or speculators who possibly might inveigle him into parting with the interest which he may have acquired.

Mr. Chairman, I invite the membership of the House to read the language of the amendments which I have not discussed in detail, as they will appear in today's RECORD. I sincerely trust that after you have done so and have given to the subject matter the consideration which I feel it deserves you may feel justified in supporting them.

The amendments which I have referred to are, as follows:

Line 16, page 3, after the word "committee", insert "or any person related to such member within the fourth degree of consanguinity or affinity."

Page 4, line 1, after the words "shall be secured by", strike out the remainder of line 1 and line 2 and insert "instruments vesting the legal title to the farm in the Secretary of Agriculture for the use and benefit of the United States as its interests may appear, and the acquisition of title to such farm or of rights and interest therein by the borrower shall be strictly in accordance with the terms of the instruments executed in connection with such loan."

Page 5, line 3, after the word "payable", strike out the period and insert a colon and the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That the borrower shall not for a period of 5 years after the loan is granted, nor at any time until 25 percent of the loan has been repaid, have an assignable interest in the farm, unless the Secretary agrees that such an interest shall vest in him, nor shall he have any equitable or other interest subject to levy and sale under process in favor of creditors under the laws of any State for such period of 5 years."

No Member of this House is more deeply interested in this proposed legislation than I am, or will work more consistently for its passage, whether my amendments are adopted or not. I shall simply offer them because I feel that they will improve the bill. My first amendment relates to the provision in section 2 (c) that no county committee shall certify for purchase and sale to a tenant any farm in which any member of the committee has any property interest. My amendment broadens this so as to exclude from consideration farms owned by close relatives of the committeemen, and without it a committeeman might have the Government take over for sale to a tenant or sharecropper a farm owned by the committeeman's wife, brother, father, or other near relative. The propriety of so amplifying this restriction is clearly apparent. No committeeman should be allowed to profiteer for himself or family in carrying out his duties under this program.

The two amendments—one in line 1, page 4, and the other in line 3, page 5—are necessary if any restriction is to be imposed upon the alienation of the sharecropper's or tenant's equity in the farm bought for him, either by his voluntary act or by sale under civil process. Under the bill as drawn, the title to the land is to vest in the borrower, who may secure his loan by executing a mortgage "or" deed of trust. If he executes only a mortgage, there can be no question of the right of judgment creditors to sell his equity for the satisfaction of their debts. If he executes a deed of trust, under the laws of my State, such creditors could have levy made upon the land after first paying or tendering the amount due the Government. With either instrument it does not appear possible for the Government to prevent voluntary sale by the borrower of his equity, and the only restriction sought to be applied to such procedure is the right of the Secretary in such an event to declare the balance of the loan immediately due and payable. This would not interfere with a transaction in which the purchaser of the borrower's equity might be able and willing to pay the balance due the Government, and thus secure complete title. The temptation of a borrower who had been hard pressed all of his life if he found himself in possession of a farm which had increased in value since the Government's loan was made to him, or in which by his own payments he had acquired a substantial equity, to sell out, take a few hundred dollars profit, and rejoin the tenant class, might be overwhelming in many instances. Since the purpose of this bill is to seek to bring about the eradication of tenancy, and have the men who work the farms own the farms, it certainly seems to me that provision ought to be made for at least 5 years against alienation of the borrower's equity, either voluntarily or involuntarily. This I do not understand that we can do unless the title is placed in the Government when the Government furnishes the money to buy the farm. If that is done, then the Government may fix by contract with the borrower such restrictions as to the character of interest which may vest in him, and when it may grow to be of a type subject to alienation, as it feels are proper. The amendment on page 5 will therefore not be offered unless the amendment on page 4, providing for the acquisition of title by the Government, is agreed to. If that amendment is agreed to, there can be no doubt as to the validity of the restrictions sought to be imposed by the amendment on page 5.

It will be noted that the amendment on page 5 does not preclude alienation, either voluntary or involuntary, if the consent of the Secretary can be secured. That will insure proper consideration of cases where under unusual circumstances it might be proper to permit such alienation.

I have long been interested in the problem of the tenant farmer. I have heretofore been heard many times in his behalf on this floor, in connection with farm legislation of various types. In my judgment, he usually gets the hot end of the poker in legislation proposed for farm relief. I do not think this bill will solve his problem. It is, however, a bona-fide, conscientious effort to start toward solving it, and so far as I am concerned, I shall support such a step, although it may go only a little way. The solution of that problem is essential to the welfare of our entire country.

Statistics have been placed in the record showing the growth of farm tenancy and share cropping to a point where 52 percent of the farmers of the United States are farming lands which in whole or in part are owned by others. This condition cannot continue and the agricultural population of the country remain, as it has always been, the backbone of American citizenship. Nowhere is the problem of greater importance than in my own State and in my own congressional district.

The importance of tenancy in the Seventh Congressional District in Georgia varies considerably from county to county, but it is relatively important throughout the area. Only about one-third of the farmers are tenants in Dade County while almost three-fourths of them are tenants in Bartow and Polk Counties.

The following table indicates the importance of tenancy in the Seventh Congressional District in Georgia. It shows the number of owners and tenants and the percentage of tenancy by counties for 1935.

Counties	All farmers	Owners	Tenants	Percentage of tenancy
Bartow	2,373	710	1,655	69.7
Catoosa	1,182	571	610	51.6
Chattooga	1,450	512	930	64.1
Cobb	3,292	1,388	1,902	57.8
Dade	555	355	199	35.8
Douglas	1,423	539	884	62.1
Floyd	2,835	1,032	1,795	63.3
Gordon	2,632	936	1,693	64.3
Haralson	1,982	831	1,148	57.9
Murray	1,581	664	916	57.9
Paulding	2,088	860	1,227	58.8
Polk	1,933	590	1,338	69.2
Walker	2,616	1,402	1,203	46.0
Whitfield	2,031	984	1,044	51.4
Total	27,973	11,374	16,544	59.1

The following table shows the percentage of tenancy in the entire State of Georgia:

Year	Percentage of tenancy	Year	Percentage of tenancy
1880	44.9	1920	66.6
1890	53.5	1930	68.2
1900	59.9	1935	65.6
1910	65.6		

The increase in my State from 44.9 percent in 1880 to 65.6 percent in 1935 of farm tenancy should alarm every citizen who is really interested in agricultural welfare. It is with a grateful heart that I support the efforts now being made by this administration to at least make a start toward the solution of this problem.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, we have under consideration H. R. 7562, which purports to encourage and promote the ownership of farm homes, and for other purposes. I have enjoyed and feel that I have been greatly benefited by the speeches I have heard on this bill. Splendid speeches have been made by Mr. JONES, chairman of the Agriculture Committee; Mr. HOPE, the ranking Republican member; Mr. BANKHEAD, the Speaker of the House; Mr. WADSWORTH, of New York; Mr. LEMPKE, and others. All of these speeches have been free of partisan appeal and have been very informing.

The policy declared for in this bill—to make farm owners out of tenant farmers—is most appealing. Inasmuch as I was brought up as the son of a tenant farmer, it will be seen

at once how deeply interested and how sympathetic is my attitude toward this legislation.

The declared purpose is to aid the unfortunate and the meek and lowly. There are many wonderful men and women who, because the breaks were against them, have been forced to drag their lives out in poverty as tenant farmers. To my way of thinking, there is nothing that can add so much to create and maintain a fine, patriotic citizenship as for the citizens to own their own farms and homes.

According to the census reports, the total number of farms in the United States is 6,812,350. The average size of the farms is 154 acres, and the average value is a little less than $5,000. There are 2,865,000 tenant farmers. It can be seen at once that almost half of the farms of the United States are being operated by tenant farmers or sharecroppers. The total farm population is approximately 32,000,000. Nearly 16,000,000 of these are made up of the tenant farmers and their families. It can be seen at once the bigness of the tenant-farm problem.

The platform of the Republican Party last year expressly declared in favor of farm-tenancy legislation, and the Democrats made similar promises. I am supporting this measure because of the principle involved and the policy declared.

LESS THAN A GESTURE

The thing that worries me, however, is the meager sum authorized to be appropriated. This bill carries no appropriation at all—it merely authorizes Congress in the future to appropriate $10,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1937, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1938, and $50,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1939. It authorizes the appropriation in all for the next 3 years of only $85,000,000.

On first thought this appears to be a considerable sum, but if you should divide $85,000,000 among 16,000,000 people it would allow to each one of them less than $5.50, not taking anything out for overhead and the administration of the fund; or if you should divide it among a little less than 3,000,000 farm-tenant families it would give to each family less than $30 over a period of 3 years, or an average of less than $10 per year. It can be seen at once, so far as taking care of this big problem is concerned, this measure is less than a gesture.

There are approximately 3,300 counties in the United States. If we should divide the $10,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1937, and ending June 30, 1938, it would give in the neighborhood of $3,000 of farm tenancy relief to each county in the United States. Of course, this bill sets up a new set of officeholders here in Washington and a committee consisting of three members in each county in the United States. It will add several thousand officeholders to the already overburdened taxpayers of the country, and if this group of officeholders handle these funds as other funds have been handled for the last few years, there will not be much left of the $10,000,000 for the coming fiscal year with which to loan tenant farmers to buy farms.

It is assumed that on an average each farm will cost not less than $3,000. If it costs as much as $3,000, there could not be one farm bought on an average for one tenant farmer in each county, and therefore not more than one tenant farmer in each county, during the coming fiscal year, would have a chance to get one of these farms financed by the Government. That would mean one tenant farmer out of approximately 1,500 would have a chance to borrow part of this money and buy and equip a farm with it the first year, and the second year there would be on an average less than three farmers in each county that would have a chance to buy and equip a farm, and the third year there would not be over five farmers on an average to each county that would be able to borrow of this fund and buy and equip a farm; and for the 3 years there would be less than nine farmers on an average in each county in the United States that would be able to borrow of this fund to buy and equip a farm; or, in other words, if none of this money was eaten up by an army of officeholders in the 3 years, these funds authorized in this bill would furnish $3,000 to approximately 20,000 farm tenants and sharecroppers of the United States to buy and equip farms.

We must bear in mind, however, there are now 2,865,000 of such tenant farmers and sharecroppers. In other words, in this year, under this bill, if all the money was turned over for the purpose of loaning to tenant farmers and sharecroppers not less than $3,000 each, it would only aid 1 out of every 143 tenant farmers and sharecroppers of the United States.

The Democrats promised the tenant farmers and sharecroppers that they were going to do something substantial for them. This bill, like other promises made by this administration during their campaign, proves that their platforms and campaign promises are made to run on.

Now let us see how this matter works out. Let us assume in Clay County, Ky., several hundred farm tenants make application for a loan under this bill. They must first find some fellow who is willing to sell his farm and get a title bond or some other written obligation from the owner of the land expressing the price to be paid. There will be a committee appointed by the authorities here in Washington for that county and every other county. The tenant farmers take their title bonds and turn them over to this county committee, and then this county committee goes out and examines these various tracts of land, and from all this number they could not select more than one for the coming fiscal year, and if they then approve one of the applications, this is sent to the Secretary of Agriculture at Washington, and he investigates the recommendation of the committee, and if he approves it, he will order an abstract of the title.

This whole procedure generally requires from 6 months to 2 years. It can be seen at once that perhaps not one tenant farmer, and it can be said without fear of successful contradiction, there will not be 200 tenant farmers in the Uinted States in the next fiscal year that will have completed the transaction and be in possession of farms under this bill.

Yes; this bill is less than a gesture. It will be a great disappointment to the tenant farmers and sharecroppers of the Nation. I am supporting it because this is the only bill the administration has permitted to come up. I want my constituents and the country to know that I favor the policy of help to the worthy tenant farmers and sharecroppers who desire to improve their condition.

The Department of Agriculture will administer this bill. They have administered the resettlement law. They spent $35,000,000 to resettle 3,500 families. This averaged $10,000 per family. If the overhead in administering this measure is as high as in administering that, practically all of these funds will be swallowed up by overhead expenses.

To those who are sincerely interested in this problem this measure is a very grievous disappointment.

HIGH TAXES MAKING TENANT FARMERS

We have pointed out how few farm owners this legislation in its present form will make. The H. O. L. C. has been in operation for a comparatively short time. The Government has already foreclosed on 99,937 homes through loans made by that Corporation. More than 26 farms out of every thousand in this country changed hands in 1936 through foreclosures, bankruptcy, and delinquent tax sales. In other words, the owners of 178,483 farms, involving nearly 25,000,000 acres and with a value of more than $860,000,000, changed hands in the year of 1936 on account of foreclosures, tax, and bankruptcy sales. It can be seen at once how inadequate the measure before us is. Under this bill we could not make more than 3,300 farm owners in the coming fiscal year, when, as a matter of fact, there will likely be sold through foreclosures, bankruptcy, and tax sales, more than 175,000 farms. It seems to me that we are saving at the spigot and losing at the bunghole.

I have before me a number of the weekly county newspapers of counties in my district. Page after page is filled with tax-sale advertisements of farms and homes for State,

county, city, and school taxes, several hundred in each county. And one of the editors comments on the fact that not a single owner was present to bid in his or her farm or home.

Of course, many of these are widows. People are becoming discouraged on account of the constant increase in taxes. The press announces that the State of Kentucky for State purposes will collect $10,000,000 more this year than it ever collected in any other one year in its history. The Federal Government, the States, the counties, the cities, and the towns and other taxing districts continue to increase their taxes.

I pointed out the other day in a speech that approximately one-third of the income of the American people on the average was taken in taxes. I would not have any unit of the Government to neglect those things that are essential and necessary for the welfare of the people, but all units of the Government should avoid squandering and wasting the peoples' tax money.

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Not just now. We now have about 100,000 foreclosures of Government loans by the H. O. L. C., and I understand that before another year there will be, perhaps, 160,000 farm foreclosures by the Federal land banks and other credit agencies of the Government. We are making many times as many tenant farmers and tenant home owners as we can possibly make of farm and home owners under this bill. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. The argument the gentleman just made would indicate that in many instances tenants are better off than the men owning farms. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The tax burden is being increased. Taxes are increasing more and more, and perhaps the farm owners and home owners are becoming discouraged in their efforts to hold their farms and their homes. Let us help to make farm owners out of tenant farmers, but at the same time let us help those who have farms to hold their farms and keep them from becoming tenant farmers. [Applause.]

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEARIN].

Mr. WEARIN. Mr. Chairman, at the time the Committee on Agriculture was discussing the subject of tenancy I submitted a statement that was included in the hearings. Later, I addressed the House at some length concerning pending legislation in that field. I have also discussed the question under various circumstances in many parts of the country. I make this statement in explanation of my interest in the matter for a long time past.

There is no question that the country is expecting this Congress to pass tenancy legislation of some sort. As I have stated before, I prefer to call it land purchase and resale legislation rather than tenancy legislation. I believe the psychological effect of the term is better.

Tomorrow at the appropriate time when the bill is being read under the 5-minute rule I expect to offer an amendment myself, which will involve a principle I feel is fundamental, and which has been demonstrated as being such in other countries where they have attempted to deal with this problem. My amendment will incorporate in the pending bill a provision whereby the Secretary of Agriculture shall receive the land now owned by the Federal land banks and shall resell such property to tenant purchasers on a long-term-contract basis. The amendment will not be long, nor will it be complicated. It can be printed on one typewritten page. It has been before this House for a long time, because I have written the various Members upon at least two different occasions on the subject, and have discussed it before the House upon at least one occasion. The principle thereof is incorporated in my bill H. R. 5239.

I simply take this opportunity of calling the attention of the membership to the fact that at the appropriate time the amendment will be placed before the House and I will attempt to discuss it as extensively as time will permit under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEARIN. Yes.

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the Federal land bank has in the past year sold two or three thousand farms to tenants in this country and has financed them?

Mr. WEARIN. I am fully aware of the fact the Federal land bank has sold a large number of farms to land purchasers who were financially able to buy them and to make down payments. However, I want to aid the tenants who are unable to qualify to that extent financially. They are the people who constitute the tenancy problem that we are trying to solve. [Applause.]

The amendment I propose to offer is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO TITLE IV, SECTION 41 (B)

(7) Acquire all real property in the United States that the Federal land banks now own outright without any redemption rights outstanding in former owners, which the said Federal land banks are hereby authorized and directed to transfer and convey to the Secretary of the Treasury, for which the said Federal land banks shall accept from the Secretary of the Treasury in exchange therefor Federal land bank stock of equal value. In the same manner the Secretary of Agriculture shall acquire within 6 months real property against which the Federal land banks at the time of the adoption of this act hold sheriff's certificates or judgments. For the purposes of such exchanges, the value of such real property shall be the "carrying value" as it appears on the books of the said Federal land banks on the last day of the month next preceding the adoption of this act; and the Federal land bank stock shall be valued at par. The Secretary of Agriculture shall acquire forthwith all real property so acquired by the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That the conveyance of such real property may be made under any procedure adopted by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Agriculture direct from the Federal land banks to the said Secretary of Agriculture without any intermediate transfer through the Secretary of the Treasury. The provisions of section 355 of the Revised Statutes as amended relating to restrictions on the acquisition of land by the United States shall not apply to such transfers and conveyances. The Secretary of Agriculture shall administer and dispose of such real property as hereinafter prescribed in this act.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, for the first time since becoming a Member of this House I have asked for time to speak. I have done so now because the measure under consideration strikes so near to the heart of the district and section which I have the honor to represent and because it is of such importance to our entire Nation. I believe that no other legislation has had such a widespread demand. During the recent past the press everywhere has been pointing out the need for it. Editors and preachers, students and teachers, farm leaders, industrialists, businessmen—leaders in every walk and profession—sensing the great need have argued for it. The Nation-wide demand for farm-tenant legislation makes it imperative that this Congress enact it.

This great cry for farm-tenant legislation is not unnatural, artificial, or arbitrary. It is the natural outgrowth of land-tenure conditions that are approaching, if not already at, the danger point. I think it requires no argument to back up a statement that home ownership by farmers is highly desirable. Only in that way can we obtain stability of our social order. Widespread farm tenancy is always a threat—it is a cancer that slowly but surely eats into the vitals of a democracy and undermines its very life. It has reached that cancerous stage in the United States.

The farm census of 1935 showed that of the 2,865,000 tenant farmers of this Nation 34.2 percent of them were single year tenants. This means that in the State of Mississippi, which has the highest percentage of farm tenancy—70 percent—every year 24 percent of the people in the farm community move on to other farms. In my own State of Alabama with a 64.5 percent farm tenancy, 22 percent of the farmers change farms every year. And it means that in my own county of Madison—one of the greatest agricultural counties in the Southeast—where 72 percent of the

farms are run by tenants, one out of every four families in any farm community, assuming the average to hold, moves every year from farm to farm. The result is inevitable—run-down houses, ramshackle barns, broken-down fences, abused soil—erosion and waste of the worst kind. In this way our Nation is being despoiled of one of its greatest natural resources.

But as bad as are the erosion of the soil and the waste of the improvements, that is not the worst part of it. The worst feature lies in the lack of community consciousness and civic mindedness in the tenant himself. How can he feel any pride in his community—in its schools, its churches, its movements for community betterment? He cannot, nor can the community, hope for any permanence in any worthwhile program or stability in its institutions with one-fourth of its people moving every year and a great part of the others moving every 2 or 3 years.

From the farm census of 1935 we learned that there were 3,899,000 farm owners as compared with 2,865,000 farm tenants in the United States as a whole, or that a little more than 42 percent of our farmers were tenants, and that in the South, where tenancy ran highest, it reached 54 percent average, with the peak in Mississippi at 74 percent. In my own State, with an average of 64.5 percent, 13 counties have 75 percent or more of tenants. The percentage for Alabama, county by county, is shown by the following table:

	Number farms	Number tenants	Percent tenancy
Autauga	2,761	1,833	68.0
Baldwin	2,676	664	25.0
Barbour	3,691	2,785	75.0
Bibb	1,955	1,075	55.0
Blount	4,897	2,536	52.0
Bullock	3,100	2,574	83.0
Butler	3,857	2,540	64.0
Calhoun	3,289	2,054	62.0
Chambers	4,131	3,016	73.0
Cherokee	3,442	2,254	65.0
Chilton	3,978	2,237	56.0
Choctaw	3,104	1,825	59.0
Clarke	3,953	2,036	52.0
Clay	3,313	1,767	53.0
Cleburne	2,192	1,178	54.0
Coffee	4,273	3,170	74.0
Colbert	2,726	1,798	66.0
Conecuh	3,795	2,125	56.0
Coosa	1,998	1,127	56.0
Covington	4,218	2,623	62.0
Crenshaw	3,484	2,388	69.0
Cullman	7,376	3,737	51.0
Dale	2,946	1,844	63.0
Dallas	7,025	6,056	85.0
De Kalb	6,684	3,523	53.0
Elmore	4,549	2,925	64.0
Escambia	2,913	1,380	47.0
Etowah	4,182	2,455	59.0
Fayette	3,189	1,676	53.0
Franklin	3,741	2,179	58.0
Geneva	3,732	2,640	71.0
Greene	3,917	3,334	85.0
Hale	4,666	3,606	77.0
Henry	2,823	2,084	74.0
Houston	4,595	3,191	69.0
Jackson	5,517	3,250	59.0
Jefferson	6,491	3,349	52.0
Lamar	3,210	1,862	58.0
Lauderdale	5,170	3,180	61.0
Lawrence	4,855	3,408	70.0
Lee	3,301	2,440	74.0
Limestone	6,266	4,521	72.0
Lowndes	4,329	3,664	85.0
Macon	3,942	3,117	79.0
Madison	7,034	5,085	72.0
Marengo	6,412	4,986	78.0
Marion	4,345	2,436	56.0
Marshall	6,316	3,725	59.0
Mobile	1,905	450	24.0
Monroe	4,182	2,744	66.0
Montgomery	4,464	3,443	77.0
Morgan	4,912	2,996	61.0
Perry	4,394	3,378	77.0
Pickens	4,490	3,137	70.0
Pike	3,699	2,890	78.0
Randolph	4,138	2,258	55.0
Russell	3,168	2,402	76.0
St. Clair	3,612	2,141	59.0
Shelby	2,728	1,487	55.0
Sumter	4,697	3,796	81.0
Talladega	4,255	2,921	69.0
Tallapoosa	3,794	2,515	66.0
Tuscaloosa	5,297	3,102	59.0
Walker	4,700	2,035	43.0
Washington	1,580	549	35.0
Wilcox	4,554	3,644	80.0
Winston	2,554	1,166	46.0
Total	273,455	176,247	64.5

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the district which I represent—the rich Tennessee Valley in north Alabama. It is composed of seven counties along the Tennessee River as it crosses Alabama—seven great agricultural counties with fertile soil and high production. But farm tenancy is a problem there as the following table shows:

County	Number farms	Number tenants	Percent tenancy
Colbert	2,726	1,798	66.0
Jackson	5,517	3,250	59.0
Lauderdale	5,170	3,180	61.0
Lawrence	4,855	3,408	70.0
Limestone	6,266	4,521	72.0
Madison	7,034	5,085	72.0
Morgan	4,912	2,996	61.0
Total	36,480	24,238	66.4

I submit, ladies and gentlemen, that such statistics indicate an alarming condition in our social order calling for remedial legislation. And it becomes even more alarming when we consider its growth. In 1880—the earliest date at which we have available information—the tenancy percentage was only 25.6. Today it is 42.1. How it has steadily increased is shown as follows:

Year:	*Percent tenancy*
1880	25.6
1890	27.9
1900	35.3
1910	37.0
1920	38.1
1925	38.7
1930	42.4
1935	42.1

The problem as to the South cannot be explained away by the presence of the Negro, for from 1920 to 1935, while the number of Negro farm tenants in the Southern States decreased by 102,000, the white farm tenants during the same period increased by 148,000.

Mr. MAHON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MAHON of Texas. I may say on that point that less than 2 percent of the people in my district are Negroes and 61 percent of the farmers are tenants, which clearly shows this is not a Negro problem.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

We are all more or less familiar with the land-tenure problem that vexed Ireland for so long a time. We recall how in 1867 it led to an open revolt which, although a failure, forced England to the enactment in 1870 of a land law for Irish farm tenants. At that time 97 percent of the Irish farmers were tenants and only 3 percent were owners. Since the enactment of that farm-tenant measure for Ireland there has been a steady shifting of those figures until today the figures are exactly reversed, with 97 percent land owners and 3 percent tenants.

Many people feel and some of them have said that the present measure outlines a program entirely too modest—that it would be better to postpone its consideration until a more adequate program could be initiated. I for one should have preferred a larger authorization and a wider program. But I am convinced that we must make a start. This measure is a start in the right direction. Farm tenancy is a problem that cannot be worked out in a year or a few years, nor can it be cured or covered by a single law enacted by this Congress. It will call for a program involving experiments, changes, amendments, patience, and years of work. Again turning to Ireland, the one law of 1870 did not work out the problem. As I recall, a new law was passed a few years later—1881—and others followed in 1885, 1888, 1891, 1896, 1903, 1909, and 1935—a long, changing, growing program, but one that has proved effective. I believe that we can expect a similar development in this country. I believe that it is time to start.

Personally, I wish to congratulate the Agriculture Committee of this House for reporting this bill out—for giving us something to start on. It is not all that I should wish.

I should like to see under title I a proving period—a time for testing and selecting the new owners—supervising them to be sure that they might be capable of becoming an owner; also I should like to see a method of assuring protection from land speculators and from the vicissitudes of land booms and depressions. But as I study this bill, aside from the part dealing with submarginal lands, I believe it will do three things that are badly needed:

First. It will check that ever upward swinging curve of farm-tenancy increase.

Second. It will encourage and enable new farm ownership, instilling into such new owners a feeling of pride, a new feeling of ownership in the soil, in the community, in the social order, in the Government.

Third. It will rehabilitate and give security to the tenant, at the same time giving protection to the landlord and to that priceless natural resource—the soil itself. Many a landlord, himself hard pressed to maintain his farm, in an effort to get enough cash from the crops to support himself and his tenants, sees his soil being stripped, powerless to put into effect a program of rotation and soil building crops without turning away his tenants with no means of support. They have both become the victims of an economic condition from which they cannot escape by themselves. Rehabilitation will give relief to the landlord as well as to the tenant whom he is now carrying.

The program is not entirely untried and uncharted. The Resettlement Administration, during the last 2 years, has bought and placed tenants on nearly a thousand farms—experimenting with this same thing and testing the size and value of the economical farm unit. These experiments have been carried on in 10 Southern States. The table speaks for itself:

State	Number of farms	Average acreage per farm	Average price per farm	Average price per acre
Alabama	97	111.6	$2,439	$21.86
Arkansas	117	61.0	1,985	32.51
Georgia	115	104.8	2,067	19.72
Louisiana	94	62.3	2,311	37.10
Mississippi	143	51.9	2,026	39.01
North Carolina	103	76.7	2,882	37.58
Oklahoma	56	84.6	4,869	57.55
South Carolina	60	111.0	3,144	28.31
Tennessee	78	69.4	2,236	32.20
Texas	121	99.7	4,408	44.23
Total	984	81.4	2,723	33.46

A break-down of these experiments in the 18 counties of my own State where these farms were bought shows the following:

County	Number of farms	Average acreage per farm	Average price per farm	Average price per acre
Autauga	1	120.0	$3,000.00	$25.00
Blount	3	85.3	1,509.54	17.69
Butler	7	136.4	2,628.57	19.26
Calhoun	3	88.3	2,706.62	30.65
Chambers	2	58.0	915.98	15.79
Chilton	2	137.2	2,812.74	20.50
Coffee	5	100.0	3,300.00	33.00
Covington	6	120.0	2,125.20	17.71
Crenshaw	3	86.7	2,650.00	30.58
Cullman	6	62.6	2,065.25	33.00
Dale	5	89.3	3,572.00	40.00
Dallas	10	86.3	1,378.42	15.97
Lowndes	15	173.3	1,667.47	9.62
Madison	7	76.6	4,284.93	55.96
Morgan	1	60.0	2,175.00	36.25
Pickens	2	57.5	1,725.00	30.00
Tuscaloosa	14	127.1	2,757.33	21.69
Walker	3	116.0	2,914.12	25.12

Now, Mr. Chairman, speaking very briefly concerning the rehabilitation feature, I have seen this program as carried on by the Resettlement Administration at work and can testify as to its effectiveness. I have seen it actually bring new life and new hope to men whom the depression years had left floundering, helpless, and hopeless. I have seen them absolutely down and out, and I have then seen them become again self-respecting, self-supporting citizens of their communities. A carefully planned rehabilitation program can be most effective. In Alabama, as well as elsewhere, the Resettlement Administration has done a great work in this field, and here and now I wish to compliment that agency for it. The following table speaks eloquently and convincingly:

Rural rehabilitation—Alabama

	1935	1936	1937
Case load	13,259	13,451	12,000
Average loan	$225.00	$186.00	$235
Average cash farm income	$91.00	$226.27	[1]$460
Net worth	$3.03	$317.07	$362
Clients having:			
Mules or mares—percent	13.0	14.8	81.37
Steers—do	87.0	85.2	18.63
Milk cows—do	47.5	63.1	79.1
Hogs—do	61.1	77.5	83.3
Brood sows—do	19.2	22.5	42.1
Hens—do	79.1	90.9	95.6
Total net worth	$40,174.77	$3,043,557.77	$4,344,000

[1] Estimated.

Total increase net worth from 1935 to 1937, $4,303,825.23

I cannot add to the arguments presented by the above figures, but I do wish to call your attention to the increase in net worth of each family from $3.03 to $362 in a period of 2 years, and also to the almost complete reversal of percentage of those using mules and those using steers from 1935 to 1937. In 1935 only 13 percent owned mules with which to make their crops, the other 87 percent using steers. In 1937 we find over 81 percent using mules and less than 19 percent using steers. The number of milk cows increased from less than one to every two families to nearly four to every five families. The number having hogs increased more than a third; the number having brood sows more than doubled, while nearly every family now keeps poultry.

Someone might be interested to know that of the loans in Alabama during 1936 totaling $2,501,955.71, the amount of $1,646,887 has been collected, representing a percentage of 65.82 collected.

Under this program the United States Government has been doing a real rehabilitation work among the farmers. In a way it has been relief, but the cheapest relief that the Government could give. Far better than mere relief, however, has been the rebuilding of human character, initiative, and community interest.

In conclusion I wish to quote from an editorial by Mr. J. L. Meeks, appearing May 27, 1937, in the Tri-Cities Daily of Sheffield, Ala., one of the papers of which he is editor and publisher, as follows:

> The rising percentage over a period of years of farm tenancy surely tells us that this is no sudden problem. It has been growing in intensity until today it has become a sore spot on the body politic. We should have started seeking a solution 30 years ago. We did not. Certainly we must do so now * * *. Almost any kind of an initial program will be better than nothing * * *.
>
> A sound, well-administered program to break up the downward trend in farm-home ownership must become one of the principal proposals of the Federal Government in the near future or within a few more years, the present downward spiral continuing, we will become a nation of princes and paupers and a nation of aristocrats and peasants. And none of us want that to happen, what with European experiences fresh in our mind or now before it.

The present measure is a start. I view it as only the beginning. I am happy to speak and vote for it, feeling that as time and experience show its good points and its defects we shall work out and develop an adequate farm-tenant program. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Farm Security Act of 1937."

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. DRIVER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7562) to encourage and promote the ownership of farm homes and to make possession of such homes more secure, to provide for the general welfare of the United States, to provide additional credit facilities for agricultural development, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—MEXICAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State recommending the enactment of legislation for the purposes described therein.

The recommendations of the Secretary of State have my approval, and I request the enactment of legislation for the purposes indicated, in order that the difficulty that has arisen in relation to the jurisdiction of the Special Mexican Claims Committee may be overcome.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 28, 1937.*

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following further message from the President of the United States which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

The Congress, by a joint resolution approved June 19, 1934, authorized me to accept membership for the Government of the United States in the International Labor Organization. Pursuant to that authorization I accepted such membership on behalf of the Government of the United States.

Representatives of this Government and of American employers and American labor attended the Twentieth Session of the International Labor Conference, held at Geneva June 4 to 24, 1936.

That Conference adopted three draft conventions and two recommendations, to wit:

The Draft Convention (no. 50) concerning the regulation of certain special systems of recruiting workers.

The Recommendation (no. 46) concerning the progressive elimination of recruiting,

The Draft Convention (no. 51) concerning the reduction of hours of work on public works,

The Draft Convention (no. 52) concerning annual holidays with pay,

The Recommendation (no. 47) concerning annual holidays with pay.

In becoming a member of the organization and subscribing to its constitution this Government accepted the following undertaking in regard to such draft conventions and recommendations:

Each of the members undertakes that it will, within the period of 1 year at most from the closing of the session of the conference, or if it is impossible owing to exceptional circumstances to do so within the period of 1 year, then at the earliest practicable moment and in no case later than 18 months from the closing of the session of the conference bring the recommendation or draft convention before the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies, for the enactment of legislation or other action. (Art. 19 (405), par. 5, Constitution of the International Labor Organization.)

In the case of a federal state, the power of which to enter into conventions on labor matters is subject to limitations, it shall be in the discretion of that government to treat a draft convention to which such limitations apply as a recommendation only, and the provisions of this article with respect to recommendations shall apply in such case. (Art. 19 (405), par. 9, Constitution of the International Labor Organization.)

In accordance with the foregoing undertaking, the above-named three draft conventions and two recommendations are herewith submitted to the Congress with the accompanying report of the Secretary of State and its enclosures, to which the attention of the Congress is invited.

I wish particularly to call to the attention of the Congress the draft convention (no. 51) concerning the reduction of hours of work on public works, and recommend that action be taken by the Congress on this draft convention at its earliest convenience.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 28, 1937.*

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE RELIEF BILL

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the relief bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it the intention of the gentleman to bring up the conference report the first thing in the morning?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN W. FISHBURNE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad privilege and duty to announce the death of a former Member of this House from Virginia. The Honorable John W. Fishburne, of Charlottesville, Va., departed this life on the 25th instant. He was a Member of the Seventy-second Congress and served here with distinction. He is well known to many Members of the Seventy-fifth Congress who served with him in the Seventy-second Congress. He was beloved by them, and I know they will all join with me in mourning his departure.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in an extension of my remarks certain tables referred to therein, and also a very short excerpt from an editorial relating to the pending bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks which I made today in discussing the rule on the pending bill and to insert in connection therewith certain amendments which I expect to offer to the bill when it is considered under the 5-minute rule.

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

There was no objection.

CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF INSECT PESTS

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes in order that I may acquaint the House with an insect-pest emergency existing in the West.

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

There was no objection.

GRASSHOPPER PLAGUE IN THE WEST

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1937, the President approved a joint resolution authorizing the

sum of $2,000,000 to be made available annually for the purpose of control and eradication of insect pests. On April 27, 1937, the President approved a joint resolution, being House Joint Resolution 319, appropriating $1,000,000 for this purpose. This appropriation has been completely exhausted, and now I am advised by agricultural extension agents that the grasshopper situation is getting out of control in the West.

The Senate has added an amendment to the work-relief bill, which included the eradication of insect pests and minor miscellaneous work projects, but that money will be available for labor only and not for poison mix.

To meet this situation, there being no money whatever available now, the $1,000,000 having been expended, as a last resource today I introduced a resolution appropriating another $1,000,000 for this very necessary work, and I sincerely hope that favorable action may immediately be had on the resolution.

In support of the resolution which I have just introduced, I may cite the fact, as stated in the Appropriations Committee report on H. J. Res. 319, that the authorization carried in the resolution of April 6, 1937, was based upon the Budget estimate theretofore submitted to Congress by the President, with his approval, and that the sum of $2,000,000 recommended was solely for the control and eradication of grasshoppers. The joint resolution as passed included Mormon crickets and chinch bugs, but the point I make is that the Budget estimate was for grasshoppers only and it was estimated that $2,000,000 would be required. One million dollars was appropriated. I regret very much indeed that recent developments have borne out the Budget estimate. The exhaustion of the $1,000,000 in 60 days speaks for itself.

The Bureau of Entomology advises me that Arkansas, Oklahoma, Montana, Colorado, South Dakota, and Wyoming are badly infested and that North Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas and other States are in line for invasion.

The agricultural-extension agent in Colorado wires me that 4,000 square miles in that State are badly infested and in a telegram dated June 26 he said they would take wing in about 10 days. He says, and I quote—

> The situation is getting out of control because of inadequate supplies and is very discouraging to farmers who have fought so vigorously and effectively to date.

He fairly begs for additional mixture and the Bureau of Entomology says there is no money to furnish it. A farmer who is running a mixing station in the infested area graphically describes the situation as follows—

> The 'hoppers are so thick that honestly the whole face of the earth seems to be moving when they are on the move.

And this means that they are only crawling at an estimated rate of 2½ miles per day. When they take wing there is no telling where they will go, so interest in the campaign of extermination is by no means limited to the present infested area, of which there is more than 4,000 square miles in southeastern Colorado, as against 700 square miles in any prior invasion.

The committee report accompanying House Joint Resolution 319 stated that "the campaign contemplates the States affected, the survey indicating possibility of parts of 24 States being involved." This robs the situation of the aspect of a merely local threat.

Mr. Speaker, I have contacted in the last 2 or 3 days every agency of relief with the result that apparently there is no relief except the appropriation of the additional $1,000,000 recommended by the Director of the Budget, an amount which, expended at this time, may save several times that amount in crop losses, not only in the infested areas but in adjacent sections which will shortly be invaded unless these pests are exterminated on the ground. I strongly urge immediate and favorable consideration of my resolution, not on my account, but on account of the distressed farmers and communities which have lost so much through drought the past 4 or 5 years.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made today with respect to H. R. 5860.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made this afternoon on the farm-tenancy bill and to include certain statistical tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEARIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein an amendment I expect to offer tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota, on account of illness.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Is it contemplated that we go on with this bill at that time or take up a conference report?

Mr. RAYBURN. It had been the thought to take up the conference report, and that is the reason for asking that we meet at that hour.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the general debate on the bill this afternoon in Committee of the Whole, our beloved and distinguished Speaker in the course of his remarks referred to some statistics which he expected to place in the RECORD as a portion of his remarks. During my discussion of the same bill I referred to some statistics. I did not have time to go into the details, but stated that if they were the same statistics to which the Speaker referred I would not ask to have mine made a part of my remarks. The statistics I have in mind are a break-down of the tenancy problem with reference to various States, showing the number of farmers in each State, the number of tenants and owners, and so forth, which are different from those which the Speaker intends to include within his remarks. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks certain statistics. I understand the Speaker had in mind statistics in reference to regional matters.

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

There was no objection.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred, as follows:

S. 2661. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Maine and New Hampshire for the creation of the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2662. An act authorizing the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Piscataqua River at or near Portsmouth, State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2681. An act to authorize the construction of the Colorado-Big Thompson project as a Federal reclamation project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

S. J. Res. 164. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution establishing the George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission, approved May 23, 1928, as amended; to the Committee on the Library.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.), in accordance with the order heretofore adopted, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 29, 1937, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing in room 219, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., Tuesday, June 29, 1937, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 6039 and H. R. 7309, known as the "Fishery Credit Act" bills.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

The Committee on Military Affairs will meet at 10:30 a. m., Tuesday, June 29, 1937, for the consideration of H. R. 7494, to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act authorizing the conservation, production, and exploitation of helium gas, a mineral resource pertaining to the national defense and to the development of commercial aeronautics, and for other purposes.'"

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Open hearing will be held before the full Committee on Naval Affairs at 10:30 a. m. on Tuesday, June 29, 1937, to consider H. R. 7216, assignment of officers for duty under the Department of Commerce. Important.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers will hold a public hearing in room 246, known as the Civil Service Committee room, in the House Office Building, at 10:30 a. m., Thursday, July 1, 1937, on H. R. 7504, to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing in room 219, House Office Building, Wednesday, July 7, 1937, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 7158, to except yachts, tugs, towboats, and unrigged vessels from certain provisions of the act of June 25, 1936, as amended.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Wednesday, July 7, 1937, on H. R. 5182 and H. R. 6917—textile bills.

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation in room 128, House Office Building, at 10 a. m., Wednesday, June 30, 1937, for the consideration of S. 2681, to authorize the construction of the Grand Lake-Big Thompson Transmountain water-diversion project as a Federal reclamation project, and H. R. 7680, to authorize appropriations for the construction of the Arch Hurley Conservancy District in New Mexico.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

682. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works, transmitting draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Virgil D. Alden; to the Committee on Claims.

683. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting draft of a proposed bill with reference to the exchange of two lighthouses in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

684. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for the fiscal year 1937 (H. Doc. No. 274); to the Committee on Appropriations.

685. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1932 and prior years in the sum of $756.61, and a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal years 1936–38 in the sum of $85,000, amounting in all to $85,756.61, and two drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations, for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 273); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

686. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 17, 1937, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Bayous La Loutre, Saint Malo, and Yscloskey, La., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935 (H. Doc. No. 275); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

687. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Civilian Conservation Corps for the fiscal year 1938, amounting to $350,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 276); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

688. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the railroad retirement account, Railroad Retirement Board, ammounting to $99,880,000 (H. Doc. No. 277); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

689. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, and approved by the Governor of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

690. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. HILL of Washington: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 3866. A bill to add certain lands to the Columbia National Forest in the State of Washington; with amendment (Rept. No. 1113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEROUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 5593. A bill to provide for the addition or additions of certain lands to the Fort Donelson National Military Park in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VOORHIS: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 5685. A bill to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating upon lands within the exterior boundaries of the Angeles National Forest in the State of California; with amendment (Rept. No. 1115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEROUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 7086. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to notify the State of Virginia that the United States assumes police jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Shenandoah National Park, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEROUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 7487. A bill to establish the San Juan National Monument, P. R., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept.

No. 1117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 7614. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes", approved March 4, 1911; without amendment (Rept. No. 1118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEMPSEY: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 7618. A bill relating to the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands situated in the State of Oregon; without amendment (Rept. 1119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 7646. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved June 22, 1936; with amendment (Rept. No. 1120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 641. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Assiniboine Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TOWEY: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6283. A bill to increase the punishment of second, third, and subsequent offenders against the narcotic laws: with amendment (Rept. No. 1122). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MOTT: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 2888. A bill granting a leave of absence to settlers of homestead lands during the year 1937; without amendment (Rept. No. 1123). 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. WOOD: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 3739. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of the Mack Copper Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. O'MALLEY: Committee on War Claims. S. 51. An act for the relief of Fred G. Clark Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DEEN: Committee on War Claims. S. 1242. An act for the relief of Stanley A. Jerman, receiver for A. J. Peters Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 7680) to authorize the construction of a Federal reclamation project to furnish a water supply for the lands of the Arch Hurley conservancy district in New Mexico; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. ROBERTSON: A bill (H. R. 7681) to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLDEN: A bill (H. R. 7682) to provide for making public certain statements with respect to income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFARLANE: A bill (H. R. 7683) with reference to the issuance of letters patent on inventions covering airplanes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MAGNUSON: A bill (H. R. 7684) to amend subsection (c) of section 8 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code, and to further define the jurisdiction of the circuit court of appeals and of the Supreme Court, and for other purposes", approved February 13, 1925, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 7685) to amend the Air Mail Act of 1934 to provide greater safety in the transportation of mail by air; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'TOOLE: A bill (H. R. 7686) to authorize the reinstatement of any veterans who were reduced or dismissed through the enactment of the Economy Act of 1933; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 7687) to regulate shipment of alcoholic beverages into the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7688) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Modoc, Shasta, and Lassen National Forests, Calif.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7689) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Shasta and Klamath National Forests, Calif.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7690) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Plumas, Tahoe, and Lassen National Forests, Calif.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DEMUTH: A bill (H. R. 7691) to encourage home ownership and make it secure, for the reduction of unemployment and the stimulating of business activity to reestablish American economic independence, and prevent the evils of tenancy as now prevails in farm and urban communities, to promote the health, the housing, and the social conditions, and the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. IGLESIAS: A bill (H. R. 7692) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Government of Puerto Rico certain real estate of the Navy Department; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7693) to authorize the Secretary of War to transfer to the government of Puerto Rico certain real estate of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL of Washington: A bill (H. R. 7694) to authorize postmasters and assistant postmasters to administer oaths in connection with certain immigration and naturalization documents; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 7695) to add certain lands to the Siuslaw National Forest in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PACE: A bill (H. R. 7696) to amend section 77 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to create a Fitzgerald division in the southern district of Georgia, with terms of court to be held at Fitzgerald, Ga., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 7697) to promote conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States by aiding in the development of facilities for water storage and utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLENBOGEN: Resolution (H. Res. 266) to make H. R. 6092, a bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1935, to reduce the rate of interest to 3½ percent, to extend the time of maturity to 25 years, and for other purposes, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 430) consenting to an interstate compact relating to flood control in the Merrimack River Valley; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 431) making an appropriation for the control of outbreaks of insect pests; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 7698) for the relief of Charles W. Fields; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KLOEB: A bill (H. R. 7699) granting a pension to Emma Hinton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 7700) for the relief of Maurice Victor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAAS: A bill (H. R. 7701) to authorize retirement annuity for Margaret L. Mullane, clerk, United States District Court, District of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 7702) for the relief of J. N. Sutherland, Lula E. Lucus, W. E. Cooper, J. D. Wallace, and J. F. Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'TOOLE: A bill (H. R. 7703) for the relief of Bernard Rothstein; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PACE: A bill (H. R. 7704) for the relief of Lucile Snider and Cliff Snider, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 7705) for the relief of Susie R. Stone; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHELCHEL: A bill (H. R. 7706) for the relief of Mrs. Earnest Smith and two small children; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7707) to honor the military service of Charles G. Clement; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7708) for the relief of John and Irma Yedlick; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2777. By Mr. BIERMANN: Memorial of Iowa farmers assembled at Ames, Iowa, June 24, in reference to proposed farm legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2778. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Petition in the nature of a letter of the Associated Clubs of the North End of Seattle and King County, Wash., Jennie L. Barnes, Seattle, Wash., secretary, pointing out the incomparable beauty of the great forests of the Olympic Peninsula of Washington, insisting that House bill 7086, Seventy-fourth Congress, is the only adequate bill to consider in the creation of the Mount Olympus National Park, deprecating the fact that the pending House bill 4724 has, for the sake of compromise, eliminated some of the most glorious parts of the forest area, and urging Congress to substitute House bill 7086, Seventy-fourth Congress, for House bill 4724 and forthwith enact the same in the interests of conservation; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2779. By Mr. COLDEN: Senate Joint Resolution No. 25, relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to protect the rights of the State of California to its tidelands and the coastal area lying seaward of the State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2780. Also, resolution adopted by the International Labor Defense Convention in Washington, urging the repeal of criminal syndicalism, sedition, anarchy, insurrection, and related laws, and numerous statutes outlawing the main activities of trade-unions, etc.; to the Committee on Labor.

2781. Also, resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., on June 18, 1937, opposing the adoption of the Byrnes amendment to the relief bill, which amendment provides that political subdivisions sponsoring Works Progress Administration projects must assume a 40-percent share of the expenditures therefor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2782. Also, resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County, Calif., on June 18, 1937, opposing the adoption of an amendment to the relief bill providing that Federal contributions for relief be matched by the States, or political subdivisions thereof, in any proportion; and urging that the Federal Government again assume full responsibility of transient unemployed and transient alien unemployed in the State of California; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2783. By Mr. CURLEY: Petition of the division of relief of the department of public welfare, Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of Senate Joint Resolution No. 85; to the Committee on Labor.

2784. Also, petition of the Minneapolis Council of Social Agencies, Minneapolis, Minn., concerning Senate Joint Resolution No. 85; to the Committee on Labor.

2785. Also, petition of the National Food Brokers' Association, endorsing the Robinson-Patman bill as enacted, and opposing any legislation effecting changes in this legislation; also urging Congress to permit the Federal Trade Commission to issue rules, regulations, and interpretations with respect to laws under its jurisdiction in a manner similar to the practices of the Interstate Commerce Commission and similar governmental agencies so that delays resulting under the present procedure of investigations may be avoided; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2786. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the American Labor Party of Bronx County, New York City, urging the passage of the Wagner-Steagall housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2787. By Mr. FORD of California: Resolution of the City Council of Los Angeles, opposing the adoption of the Byrnes amendment to the relief appropriation bill of 1937–38; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2788. Also, resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, opposing any new contributions from California in carrying out unemployment relief that will be greater than those exacted from any other State when the full load of unemployment within States and its total cost is considered; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2789. Also, resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, requesting that Senate bill 2164 be defeated; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2790. By Mr. HILDEBRANDT: Petition of the Detroit Local, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, endorsing House bill 4647; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2791. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: House concurrent resolution passed by the Legislature of Texas, urging passage of Senate bill 602, now pending before the Military Affairs Committee of the House; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2792. Also, petition of Mr. Raphael Levine, of Corsicana, Tex., favoring House bill 7131, to establish an office of motion pictures in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

2793. Also, memorial of Cres W. Watson, of Park Minter Camp, No. 32, Spanish-American War Veterans, Abilene, Tex., favoring House bill 5030; to the Committee on Rules.

2794. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the New York Women's Trade Union League, New York City, concerning the Celler bill (H. R. 3408) to repeal section 213 of the Economy Act of 1932; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2795. Also, petition of the Van Iderstine Co., Long Island City, N. Y., concerning the reduction of the existing import excise tax on whale oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2796. Also, petition of Guild & Garrison, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning sugar legislation in line with Secretary Wallace's recommendations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2797. Also, petition of Federal Mill, Inc., Lockport, N. Y., concerning the Black-Connery labor bills; to the Committee on Labor.

2798. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the New York Branch, National Customs Service Association, New York City, urging the enactment of the McCormack bill (H. R. 3); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2799. Also, petition of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Black-Connery bills (S. 2475 and H. R. 7200); to the Committee on Labor.

2800. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Memorial of the Mill River Grange, No. 514, of East Wallingford, Vt., opposing the transfer of the Forest Service and other conservation activities out of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2801. Also, memorial of the Lamoille Grange, No. 233, having membership of 194, opposing transfer of the Forest Service and other conservation activities out of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2802. Also, petition of the Prospect Grange, No. 429, Fair Haven, Vt., opposing the removal of the Forest Service and other conservation activities from the Department of Agriculture; to the Joint Committee on Governmental Reorganization.

2803. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to protect the right of the State of California to its tidelands and the coastal area lying seaward of the State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 29, 1937

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 15, 1937)

The Senate met, in executive session, 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 legislative proceedings of Monday, June 28, 1937, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6958) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and for other purposes, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. O'NEAL of Kentucky, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LEAVY, Mr. RICH, and Mr. LAMBERTSON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5860) making further provision for the fisheries of Alaska, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

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

H. R. 2291. An act to amend the act of May 25, 1933 (48 Stat. 73);

H. R. 6523. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7206. An act to permit the temporary entry into the United States under certain conditions of alien participants and officials of the World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts Silver Jubilee Camp to be held in the United States in 1937; and

H. J. Res. 375. Joint resolution to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. In order to assure the presence of a quorum, I ask for a roll call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Clark	Lee	Reynolds
Andrews	Connally	Lewis	Robinson
Ashurst	Copeland	Lodge	Russell
Austin	Davis	Logan	Schwartz
Bailey	Dieterich	Lonergan	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	Donahey	Lundeen	Sheppard
Barkley	Ellender	McAdoo	Shipstead
Berry	Frazier	McCarran	Smathers
Bilbo	George	McGill	Steiwer
Black	Gerry	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Green	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Borah	Guffey	Minton	Townsend
Bridges	Hale	Moore	Truman
Brown, N. H.	Harrison	Murray	Tydings
Bulkley	Hatch	Neely	Vandenberg
Bulow	Hayden	Nye	Van Nuys
Burke	Hitchcock	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Byrd	Holt	Overton	Walsh
Byrnes	Hughes	Pepper	Wheeler
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Pittman	White
Caraway	King	Pope	
Chavez	La Follette	Radcliffe	

Mr. LEWIS. I announce the absence of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. DUFFY], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING] are detained from the Senate on important public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON] is necessarily absent.

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

INCLUSION OF CERTAIN POSITIONS WITHIN THE MERIT SYSTEM: SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in legislative session, the Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 28, 1937.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: In signing the independent offices appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1938, I note that the appropriation for the Social Security Board contains a provision requiring Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation of experts and attorneys receiving compensation of $5,000 or more per annum.

I regret the inclusion of this provision in the bill. Aside from the hampering effect of the prohibition against receipt of compensation by such employees until confirmed by the Senate, particularly during periods when Congress is not in session, the method adopted for the selection of these employees seems to me unfortunate. In lieu of the present procedure for the appointment of these employees without regard to civil-service laws, I think it would have been preferable to bring the positions within the civil-service system. Under the reorganization of the work of the Civil Service Commission, as contemplated by the pending bill, S. 2700, it is expected that there would be developed improved methods for the examination and selection of such employees.

I am writing to express the hope that the Congress may see fit to enact legislation at an early date to place these positions under the merit system. I strongly recommend, as urged in my communication to the Congress of June 2, 1937, that all but policy-forming positions in the executive branch of the Government be included within the merit system.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The communication will be referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, without desiring to question the right of the Chair to make appropriate reference of the communication, may I suggest that in view of