

and alert interest in all the problems which have faced the Senate since she entered it. That is somewhat unusual on the part of a Senator coming into the Senate for so short a time, as was known to be her tenure when she was appointed.

We all regret to see you leave, Senator GRAVES. We wish for you long life and happiness and prosperity, and now that you have the privilege of the floor, we hope that you may grace this Chamber with your visits frequently in the future, though you may not be a Member of the Senate.

PREVENTION OF AND PUNISHMENT FOR LYNCHING

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from Kentucky whether he intends to have the session this afternoon continue further.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator desire to address the Senate on the pending bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to address myself to the bill, but I should prefer to go on tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's situation. It is nearly time for a recess, and I shall therefore accede to his suggestion that we suspend at this time. Does the Senator desire to be recognized and to take the floor tomorrow?

Mr. RUSSELL. I might say, Mr. President, that while I have been a Member of this body for 5 years, and this anti-lynching matter has been pending all that time, I have never addressed myself to the subject. I do not make the statement expecting that it will have any effect on the charge that I am filibustering, but I merely wish to state that I will speak to the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure we will all be delighted to hear the Senator's remarks on this subject tomorrow.

DEATH OF JAMES R. WICK

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I have just learned with the deepest regret of the death of one of our official reporters, James R. Wick. I always had for Mr. Wick a feeling not only of respect and regard, but of real affection. I never have known a finer man than Mr. Wick, and I speak feelingly when I make these few remarks.

In view of my background, I cannot resist the temptation to say what I have said many times in the Senate, that men here ought to take the greatest care of themselves. By no stretch of the imagination can the senatorial life be counted a normal one, speaking from the physical standpoint. Men here ought to give the greatest attention to themselves. I think Mr. Wick has done that; yet, because of the very abnormalities of life and the demands made upon him and upon Members of the Senate, great powers of resistance are essential. To come into this room and then rush down into some other room with different temperature, to withstand all the physical vicissitudes incident to activity in the Senate, is conducive to shortness of life.

According to my recollection, since I have been in the Senate 38 Senators have died in office. This is an uncomfortable record. The life led by our friend who passed away this very day has been the same sort of a life we all lead here. So it is with great seriousness I say to my colleagues that they should give every possible consideration to all those things which make for good health.

I am sure I speak for every Member of the Senate in expressing to the family of Mr. Wick the great sorrow we entertain over his untimely death.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I could not let this occasion pass without expressing my great sorrow and regret at the sad news announced by the Senator from New York. The death of Mr. James R. Wick is, of course, a great shock and surprise to us all, and to me it is a matter of much personal sorrow. Mr. Wick has shown so many kindnesses to me here in the Senate and has so expressed his friendship for my State of Vermont and for me that I felt a very close personal relationship to him. I would have the Senate in

a formal way at least express its sympathy to those who were close to him, and who must feel his passing with great sorrow.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair), as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE

As in executive session,

Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, reported favorably the following nominations, which were ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar:

Murray W. Latimer, of New York, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term of 5 years from August 29, 1937, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate; and

Charles D. Mahaffie, of the District of Columbia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term expiring December 31, 1944. (Reappointment.)

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) took a recess until tomorrow, January 11, 1938, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 10 (legislative day of January 5), 1938

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

Philip Flanner, of Wisconsin, to be State administrator in the Works Progress Administration for Wisconsin.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named sanitary engineers to be senior sanitary engineers in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the dates set opposite their names:

William H. W. Komp, January 21, 1938.

Lawrence M. Fisher, April 2, 1938.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 1938

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

With a calm and undrooping gaze, O God, we would lift our eyes unto the hills; our help cometh from the Lord. Thy breath is breathed through all the universe; Thy name is love. Again Thou hast spread over us the mantle of rest and peace; we therefore praise Thee. Give us understanding, O Lord, that we may know Thy testimonies and incline our hearts to the words of Thy mouth. As we walk life's common ways, let courage and hope whisper to the lowliest soul; the Lord God remember the hearts that go hungering through the world. We pray Thee that we may possess much of the fervor and the divine bounty of our Savior. Assure us that he that followeth after righteousness and mercy findeth honor and that a good name is rather to be chosen than great riches and loving favor than silver and gold. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 7, 1938, was read and approved.

SUNDAY 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.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief letter from the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars on the Ludlow proposed amendment to the Constitution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution by the clergymen of my city favoring the Ludlow resolution and my reply thereto.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech I delivered in the House of Representatives on January 11, 1928, and a resolution I introduced in the House a few days ago, plus an address by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and also including an editorial of about a quarter of a column appearing in the Washington Star of a few days ago.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I am not going to object to the speeches the gentleman made or the speech the Speaker made—but does not the gentleman think we have had enough editorials of the newspapers in this country printed in the RECORD? We are filling up the RECORD every day in this way, and I want to call the attention of not only the gentleman from New York but other Members of the House who have spoken putting in newspaper editorials to the fact I think the RECORD should contain an account of things that happen in the House of Representatives and we should not add newspaper articles.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Gaelic-American in answer to an attack made upon The Star-Spangled Banner.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when anybody attacks The Star-Spangled Banner, of course, that means something; but I do not believe the gentleman should come in here and ask that we should put all these newspaper editorials in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. SWEENEY. This is the first time I have made such a request.

Mr. RICH. And the majority leader should try to protect the RECORD in this respect.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the New York Times of yesterday, January 9, containing a statement issued by 14 church leaders in support of the Ludlow war-referendum resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including an excerpt from a radio address made by me on Saturday evening, and also include an editorial from the New York Times of yesterday substantiating my remarks.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not care whether the Member comes from the Democratic side or the Republican side, it is time we stopped these newspaper articles going into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I think the Members of the House of Representatives ought to do that themselves without having me get up here and try to stop it.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania object?

Mr. RICH. I think we ought to object to it—yes; I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will withhold his objection for a moment, the particular article I have in mind gives some indication of how the national income of this Nation can be increased materially within a reasonably near future. I believe it has some very good material that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as well as the rest of us, should read.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard to the request.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an article by Joseph S. Edgerton, an authority on aerial navigation, with respect to a large national airport.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BIGELOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a radio address delivered last night on the Ludlow amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of newspaper subsidies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing in the RECORD some quotations from Andrew Jackson's speeches and messages to Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-seven Members are present, a quorum.

REFERENDUM ON WAR

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule XXVII, I call up the motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of House Resolution 165.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana calls up a resolution, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution to make House Joint Resolution 199, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for a referendum on war, a special order of business.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That upon the day succeeding the adoption of this resolution a special order be, and is hereby, created by the House of Representatives for the consideration of House Joint Resolution

199, a public resolution which has remained in the Committee on the Judiciary for 30 or more days without action. That such special order be, and is hereby, created, notwithstanding any further action on said joint resolution by the Committee on the Judiciary or any rule of the House. That on said day the Speaker shall recognize the Representative from Indiana, Louis LUDLOW, to call up House Joint Resolution 199, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for a referendum on war, as a special order of business, and to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of said House Joint Resolution 199. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Member of the House requesting the rule for the consideration of said House Joint Resolution 199 and the Member of the House who is opposed to the said House Joint Resolution 199, to be designated by the Speaker, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit. The special order shall be a continuing order until the joint resolution is finally disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] at whose feet I often worship, has told us many times that a majority of the House can do anything it wants to do. A majority of the House can decide that this war referendum resolution shall remain entombed in the Judiciary Committee, where it has been for 3 years, but I hope the majority will see the justice and fairness of bringing it to the floor for final determination by all of the representatives of the people.

I hope this debate, and the further debate that will follow if the discharge resolution is adopted, will be conducted without criminations and recriminations. At a time when the national mind is deeply worried by war's alarms, all of us in both legislative and executive establishments are earnestly and conscientiously striving from our varying points of view to keep our country out of war. While groping for a remedy we should in all fairness give full faith and credence to one another and should examine and appraise every peace measure that is offered in a spirit of the broadest catholicity and in the light of reason. All of us should respect the views of those who differ with us just as we hope they will respect the sincerity of our views and purpose.

In the so-called resolution for referendum on foreign wars we bring to you what we believe to be a valuable contribution to the cause of peace. We believe that if given the opportunity, we can prove that it would be a practical and dependable means of keeping out of war. We ask you not to close the door against it at the very threshold but to allow it to come up before the House to be debated as a proposed permanent future policy, and amended, and then to receive the verdict of this great legislative body on a basis of its merit. The adoption of this resolution would mark an epochal advancement in the cause of popular rule. In the name of those who have to fight and die in war and to bear the indescribable burdens and costs and griefs of war, I plead with you not to kill this resolution, which holds so much of hope for the future of democracy, before it has fairly started on its journey. [Applause.]

The supporters of House Joint Resolution 199 have agreed to some amendments which we are willing to accept. These will be explained to the House later by Mr. FISH, ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] for 10 minutes in opposition to the resolution.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker and Representatives of the people, I must admit that it is with great reluctance that I leave my place as an impartial presiding officer of

the House of Representatives to take a place here on the floor to speak with reference to the pending proposal. It is with extreme personal regret that I cannot accept the views of many of my beloved comrades and associates in this House on this proposition. I ungrudgingly accord to them, of course, and all of them, the same high measure of respect and appreciation for their views that I am sure they will accord to me and those who believe with me upon this proposal. I measure my words when I say that in my opinion this is the gravest question that has been submitted to the Congress of the United States since I became a Member of it, more than 20 years ago. I shall not have the time, of course, to enter into any argument with reference to the advisability or the wisdom of the pending proposal; but I do assert and I feel that a proper analysis of the resolution itself and what it conveys in its ultimate application means a radical—and I use that word in the proper sense, of course—and revolutionary—and I use that in its usually accepted sense—attack upon the fundamental basic principle of a representative democracy for a free people. [Applause.] I loathe and abominate war and all of its horrors as much as any man in this House or out of it. I was here when we went through the World War, and I know the reactions upon its miseries and its exactions; but I am unwilling, my colleagues, to abandon—even though I recognize there is a great temporary sentiment among our people for the resolution—the wisdom and judgment of the framers of our Constitution who established the fundamental law, our Constitution, and depart from it in times like these, and say that no longer are the people of this country willing to trust their chosen Representatives in the Congress of the United States to reflect their views, or to protect the security of the Republic. [Applause.]

And those, my friends, are the views of the Chief Executive of this Nation, our Commander in Chief, a man who loves peace as passionately and devotedly as any man that breathes the air of God in America this day or anywhere else in the world.

I want to read you his words, in conclusion, upon this proposal, in a letter addressed to me in reply to a request I made of him for his attitude upon the Ludlow resolution.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 6, 1938.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In response to your request for an expression of my views respecting the proposed resolution calling for a referendum vote as a prerequisite for a declaration of war, I must frankly state that I consider that the proposed amendment would be impracticable in its application and incompatible with our representative form of government.

Our Government is conducted by the people through representatives of their own choosing. It was with singular unanimity that the founders of the Republic agreed upon such free and representative form of government as the only practical means of government by the people.

Such an amendment to the Constitution as that proposed would cripple any President in his conduct of our foreign relations, and it would encourage other nations to believe that they could violate American rights with impunity.

I fully realize that the sponsors of this proposal sincerely believe that it would be helpful in keeping the United States out of war. I am convinced it would have the opposite effect.

Yours very sincerely,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The Honorable WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

[Applause.]
[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MR. FISH. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the distinguished and honorable Speaker of this House, I have an abiding faith and profound confidence in the American people, and I believe in their right to make this awful decision as to whether they want to go into any foreign war. [Applause.]

I have been authorized and instructed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] and those supporting this war referendum resolution to offer certain perfecting amendments which have been approved by the supporters of this proposed peace amendment, as follows:

SECTION 1. Except in case of attack by armed forces, actual or immediately threatened, upon the United States or its territorial possessions, or by any non-American nation against any country in the Western Hemisphere, the people shall have the sole power by a national referendum to declare war or to engage in warfare overseas. Congress, when it deems a national crisis to exist in conformance with this article, shall by concurrent resolution refer the question to the people.

SEC. 2. Congress shall by law provide for the enforcement of this section.

SEC. 3. This article shall become operative when ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution.

Every public poll taken shows that approximately 80 percent of the people favor a referendum before being involved in a foreign war.

If the Congress refuses to even permit consideration of the Ludlow resolution, the greatest peace proposal before Congress during the 18 years I have been a Member of the House, there is only one answer, and that is to carry the fight by way of referendum into every congressional primary and election throughout the United States.

Why should the Congress be afraid of submitting this peace amendment to the will of the people? If there is another world war, and I anticipate one before 1940, the American people are entitled to say whether the United States shall stay out.

There has been all kinds of misleading propaganda against this resolution, even to the extent of claiming that alien influences are behind it. Such a statement is a reflection on a big majority of the war veterans of the House, who favor the resolution, including the only Member of Congress who won a medal of honor. I never have and never will compromise with either the alien Communist or Fascist in attempts to undermine our free institutions. Alien influences have nothing to do with this resolution, and, as a matter of fact, the Daily Worker, the official Communist newspaper, has openly opposed it editorially.

I know of no measure that has been so viciously attacked and in such a misleading manner.

I am for a Navy second to none, but I will do everything in my power to keep this country out of unwarranted foreign wars. I know of no better way of accomplishing this than to give the American people the right to vote upon the question themselves. If we set such an example, the people of other nations will want the same right in the future, whether they be in Italy, Germany, or Soviet Russia. Nothing could accomplish more for world peace and to destroy the war system than the passage of the Ludlow referendum resolution.

I am in favor of millions for adequate national defense, but not one dollar to send American soldiers to foreign lands to fight other peoples' battles, and I believe the American people should determine this issue themselves.

If the old nations of the world go stark, raving mad, arm to the teeth, and go to war, it is their war and not ours, and the American people should have the right to say whether we shall keep out of such conflicts. Those who will sacrifice in blood and treasure, those who will carry the muskets, and those who pay the bills have an inalienable right to decide whether they want to keep out of ancient foreign blood feuds and boundary disputes or if they want to police China or quarantine other nations.

I loathe and abhor war, and as a veteran and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I appeal to every Member of this House who believes in peace to vote to bring the Ludlow referendum resolution up for full and fair considera-

tion, for debate and amendment. A vote to stifle debate is not only a vote against peace but also a vote of want of confidence in popular government, in our free institutions, and in a government by the consent of the governed. What harm can there possibly be in letting the people back home, who will do the fighting and the dying, vote on the Ludlow referendum amendment?

Former Secretary of State Frank B. Kellogg, author of the Briand-Kellogg Pact to outlaw war as an instrument of national policy except for defense, which was ratified by 60 nations, approved the Ludlow referendum in 1935 in the following words:

I believe that if a national referendum were required before the United States should engage in a war except in the case of repelling an invasion, it would go a long way toward preventing any war. There is not likely to be an invasion of the United States. The only danger is that the United States may be dragged into a war in which she has little, if any, interest.

If the House actually denies an opportunity for consideration and debate of the Ludlow referendum resolution, the fight will only just begin, and will automatically become a popular issue in the congressional campaign. It will not down until it is settled right, and the people can determine by referendum this greatest of issues, involving us in a foreign war, an issue which may mean the preservation of our country and its free institutions.

Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, cannot afford to let the people down. The American people should have this inalienable right to decide this great issue of war or peace themselves. Eighty percent of the American people want the right to vote whether we shall enter into any more foreign wars. [Applause.]

MR. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this matter, the so-called Ludlow amendment.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MR. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

MR. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, either we are for or against democracy. That is the issue. To me democracy is absolutely necessary to spiritual evolution, to the fullest development and rapid advance of civilization.

The unbridled action of representative government is not democracy.

Let me quote the following statement from Thomas Jefferson:

Believing as I do that the mass of the citizens is the safest depository of their rights, and especially that evils flowing from the duperies of the people are less injurious than those from the egotism of their agents, I am a friend to that composition of government which has in it the most of this ingredient. An elective despotism was not the government we fought for.

Abraham Lincoln said:

A government of the people, by the people, and for the people. According to our ancient faith, the just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed.

The Kansas City Star of October 2, 1910, has a translation of stenographic notes by A. H. McCormick of a conversation by Lincoln with a general, as follows:

General, the day will come, but it will not be in your day or mine, when every State in this Union will have the initiative and referendum. When that day comes the people will rule; the people will rule.

James Russell Lowell says:

Democracy gives every man the right to be his own tyrant.

Emerson says:

Law is a memorandum of public sentiment.

The question now before the House is not whether or not in the future it will be wise or unwise to engage this country in a war against another nation. The only question now before the House is whether or not we shall be allowed to discuss and vote upon a resolution to give the people the right to

vote "yes" or "no" on a proposal to declare war on some other nation. The motion now to be voted on by us merely proposes to make it possible for us to discuss and vote upon the wisdom and desirability of providing by law that the people of the United States shall have a vote, the final say, in declaring any war. If this motion is voted down then we, the representatives of the people, cannot even have a vote upon or discuss the desirability of giving the people the right by law to have the final say by their votes as to whether or not their sons shall be sent off to foreign countries to engage in battle. Is that true liberalism? Is that even fair unqualified representative government not to speak of democratic representative government? Of course it is not.

The gentleman from New York would have us believe that to adopt the referendum would make it necessary to abolish representative government. Certainly that is not correct. In many States the people now can have a direct or referendum vote on any law passed by the State legislature, and yet such States have representative government and the representatives in their legislatures pass laws just as does Congress, the work of which is not subject to the initiative and referendum. It is the direct and final control of law-making by the people which constitutes a government a democracy. It is not necessary in order that the people shall have direct control of their lawmaking that they shall gather together in one crowd and vote by word of mouth. They can, under the referendum, vote as directly and effectively by marking their ballots in a booth.

No, my friends, the question after all is: Shall the people rule? It is their right to decide what kind of laws and government they shall have.

It is said that the people may make mistakes. Their elected representatives also sometimes make mistakes. As long as there is difference of opinion as to what is right and wrong in government the people have the right to the final decision by their own vote in the privacy of the election booth.

I say let the people rule and that is all that would be made possible by our providing for a referendum vote. To deny that is to deny the principle of popular government.

The same arguments which are made against this proposed referendum could likewise be advanced against proposals to let the people say by their votes whether they are for or against any law which may be passed by their representatives. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

MR. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. O'Day].

MRS. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is not the result of a sudden hysterical awakening on the part of the American people; it is a part of a great movement among all the nations of the world, all the peoples of the world—not of their rulers. It is a movement of the people, by the people, for the people, for all humanity, and for the salvation of generations to come. It has taken on the nature of a crusade, and, as such, it transcends all other loyalties.

MR. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. Izac].

MR. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, let me enumerate a few reasons why we should adopt the Ludlow amendment:

First. Because it will not tie the President's hands, since he has the right to use the armed forces in any part of the world as he sees fit. If this amendment is adopted, he will still be able to exercise these same functions as head of the Army and Navy.

Second. Because it would require at least one hundred 20-knot transports, escorted by a larger fleet than our own, to bring to our shores an invading force of sufficient size to be dangerous. No world power possesses 100 such ships, or anywhere near that number.

Third. Because if we did want to carry the war to foreign shores and send an army to fight there, it would take so long to prepare such an army and provide enough ships to carry that army, that the slight delay occasioned by a vote of the people would have no effect whatsoever.

Fourth. The number of war veterans in this House who today speak for this amendment should be conclusive proof that those who profess to speak for some of the organized veterans do not speak for the 4,000,000 veterans who are survivors of the World War.

I cannot help but view the present situation as fraught with momentous possibilities. Two hundred and eighteen Members of this House have acceded to the wishes of great numbers of their constituents, and have signed a petition to bring this so-called Ludlow amendment on the floor for discussion.

The question is whether or not we want to discuss the right of the people to be consulted before we raise and equip an army and send that army across the waters from three to six thousand miles away from American shores to fight a foreign enemy.

In olden times, humanity knew no rights. People were pressed into service and ordered to fight sometimes "for God," sometimes "for king," sometimes "for country," and sometimes for no reason at all. I hope we have advanced to a point where this philosophy may safely be discarded. In other words, I believe that in twentieth-century America the American people are sufficiently independent and sufficiently enlightened and sufficiently well acquainted with their own desires to be able to pass with some degree of accuracy on the question whether or not they are willing to sacrifice life or limb for any reason whatsoever.

Now because this question is so far reaching in its effect, I want to discuss it in its broader aspects and with especial reference to whether or not it devitalizes the national-defense policy of the United States.

In the 1850's, we took steps to open up the oriental countries with their tremendous possibilities. Even that long ago we were a producing Nation with a considerable surplus to be sold abroad. And our far-sighted statesmen realized that the day was fast approaching when Europe alone would no longer be able to consume what we produced in such large surpluses. Likewise the European peoples, being as highly developed as ourselves, were themselves supplying to one another, in an increasing degree, all that their people could consume. So it was logical that we should turn toward the Orient.

Now in the course of the last three-quarters of a century, we have seen a considerable opening up of the Orient and have profited, to a certain extent, by exports to the Asiatic nations. We have likewise received from them much in return. But do not let us forget that this trade has been accomplished under considerable handicaps and with considerable cost to ourselves.

Great old China, at various times in her history while passing from one dynasty or political system to another, has been unable to maintain complete order and a stable, respected, and unified national authority. One of the times that this chaotic condition has existed has, unfortunately, been during the past 40 years. Now, in order to safeguard the property and the money that have been invested by American citizens in that vast nation of 450,000,000 people, and to safeguard the lives of those Americans who either for commercial or missionary reasons have found it desirable to live there, we have demanded and have obtained for ourselves certain privileges in that country.

In the first place, we have been granted the privilege of extraterritoriality and the further privilege of keeping our men-of-war in strategic places along her shores and in her rivers and harbors.

Now, it must be realized that we have two objectives in China: One to save souls and the other to make dollars. And I want to assure my colleagues that it has proved a mighty costly undertaking even under the best of conditions, for we have 37 naval vessels over there now, which is a pretty heavy insurance to have to pay to safeguard the American capital invested in that country.

Many people feel that we should insist on people trading with us and permitting our exploitation of their national resources or of their trade possibilities; and that, of course,

is a question of policy about which everyone has a right to express himself. I know many contend that unless we can ship our cotton to the Orient and unless we can do business in other lines with all the nations of the earth, we will have a disastrous economic recession in this country.

Some talk of the necessity of protecting our right to trade wherever we want to in order to guarantee an adequate supply of strategic materials essential in peacetimes and indispensable in war. I will say that by the expenditure of a moderate sum, which I believe will not exceed \$2,000,000,000, we can amply provide for any shortage caused by interruptions of war or dislocations of trade.

But I believe that you cannot force other people to trade with you unless they want to, and I further want to point out that slowly but surely other nations are finding it possible either to replace the things they have in the past obtained from America or to substitute something just as good which they themselves can produce in ample quantities for their own needs.

I have only to mention the fact that China can produce enough cotton for all the Orient and will some day do so. Why, we even see it in Europe. The great northern plains of Italy are today a vast cornfield, whereas 20 years ago one never saw a stalk of American corn in all that land.

France, that used to buy great quantities of wheat from us and other nations, is today completely self-supporting. And it is illegal to import into that country a single bushel of wheat.

Other nations will probably be very glad to trade with us those commodities of which there is a surplus in their country to obtain from us what they themselves cannot produce. And I believe the most scientific and the most logical handling of this trade situation has been done by our present Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, in effecting the so-called trade agreements.

During the hostilities in China of the past several months the President has been accused of not following the mandate of Congress and invoking the neutrality law. I believe the proof of the pudding there is, Did he keep us out of war or not? For the Neutrality Act was undoubtedly enacted for that purpose.

Japan could not insist on our withdrawal unless she in turn went to war with us. And by our very presence we asserted our right to the continuance of the trade and other agreements which we had had for many years with China.

The question that naturally arises is not "What were we doing there?" nor "Why did we have those agreements?" but rather "What should our policy be in the future?" I believe I can outline a plan which will render it unnecessary for us to jeopardize the lives of great numbers of American boys, which would be the result of recourse to war, just for the express purpose of doing our share of trading with the Orient.

The idea of general world agreements to keep the peace or for any concerted action of any kind is apparently doomed to failure. But there are two reasons why most nations will be willing to listen when we care to assert ourselves. The first is that practically every nation, be it Japan, or China, or the nations of Europe, need some things that they can get from America better than anywhere else. True, the number of these commodities is decreasing every day as each nation becomes more self-contained. But this is still a good talking point in diplomatic relations. And second, and the biggest factor of all, is the fact that the United States actually controls the destiny of the Western Hemisphere. There is not a nation that has the power—and I trust none ever will have—to dispute with us our naval supremacy in the waters surrounding the two Americas. And as the world has been, as the world is likely to continue to be, there is no danger of a coalition of foreign nations launching themselves on a great adventure against the United States, leaving in their rear an equally powerful coalition of enemies anxious for just such an opportunity to deal a crushing blow to their former foes.

Now, the President has the right, and always has had as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, to use these

forces as he sees fit and as dictated by national necessity. If, for instance, Japan should intimate that the presence of American ships and American nationals and American traders could no longer be tolerated in Asia, he could reply that he deemed it necessary to deny similar activity to Japanese in the Western Hemisphere. The President can say to those powers that would deny us any privileges in their sphere of authority that he felt compelled to reciprocate in kind.

Some would have us believe that if we would make it possible for the people to be consulted when danger of foreign war is imminent that it would tie the hands of the President of the United States. Such an assertion is utterly ridiculous.

There is in my city of San Diego an expeditionary force of marines ready at a moment's notice to be sent to any part of the world where the President decrees.

We have a Navy which, thanks to our President, is rapidly being brought to full strength, and which can be sent anywhere the President dictates. The passage of this amendment would in no way restrict the liberty of action now possessed, and frequently exercised, by Presidents of the United States, but would in a way strengthen his right to use our professional armed services to detain an enemy force far beyond the borders of our Nation.

I have frequently pointed out here on the floor of the House that the United States fleet operating in that great area from the peninsula of Alaska to the Hawaiian Islands, and from thence to the Panama Canal, is fully capable and, unless we lose our senses and lessen its power, will always be capable of denying to Japan or to any other nation in existence the use of those waters for unfriendly purposes.

That is why I have consistently supported efforts to bring our fleet to a parity with the fleets of the leading nations. Likewise in the Atlantic—even the naval might of Great Britain is insufficient to span 3,000 miles of ocean and overcome our fleet which stands between her and the American coast.

In this connection, and to make doubly sure of our ability to shift our fleet from the Pacific to the Atlantic and vice versa, I am shortly introducing a bill asking for the building of the long-projected Nicaraguan Canal, giving us two canals through Central America.

Now why cannot we depend on those best equipped for the guaranteeing of American rights and the proper defense of our shores? We can. We must. We have, to my mind, the most highly efficient Navy in the world today—a Navy that is ready at an instant's notice to sacrifice itself rather than permit a single foreign foe to scar American soil or blot out an American life.

And if the time should come when the occasion seems to demand the sending of an army across the ocean to fight other nations on foreign land, I can see no reason why the people most interested—the very people who have to give themselves and their sons to the slaughter—should not be permitted to say whether or not it is their wish.

I, for one, am not willing to revert to the medieval custom of taking a man's dearest possession next to his honor—his life—on the pretext that there is no other way of settling international disagreements.

If we lived as do the European nations—veritably under the guns of each other, with the possibility of whole cities being wiped out in the space of an hour—I could appreciate the necessity for an entirely different national policy. But here we are, supreme in the Western Hemisphere, with the two great oceans separating us from concentrations of political and financial power, the waters of which guarantee a gap on the one side of 3,000 miles and on the other side of 6,000 miles.

By all means let us continue with an adequate Navy, doing business with our neighbors under voluntarily executed trade agreements, and with a neutrality policy which states our determination to stay out of other people's wars, and thus guarantee to the American people that peace which we all profess to want.

I predict, if this is done, the necessity will never arise where we have to resort to a referendum of the people, as contemplated by the Ludlow amendment.

However, in recognition of the correctness of the democratic principle involved, and my own deep conviction that the American people have a right in the determination of questions that mean life and death to them individually, I must support this measure. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I have taken this place many times in the past 24 years in order to call the attention of my colleagues to matters that I deemed of grave importance to my country. I have never taken the floor, however, at any time during those long years when I felt I had a more serious duty to perform than at the present time.

If the Congress of the United States in this hour of trouble in this unhappy world should vote to discharge the committee and submit this proposed constitutional amendment—and I measure my words when I make this statement—it would make the most tremendous blunder it has ever made since the formation of our Government under the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, by the signatures of 218 good men and good women we have already been misunderstood throughout the world to the point where it is embarrassing to our Secretary of State and to the President of the United States, who is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. The President of the United States, who knows more about world conditions at the present time than any man in the Republic, and the Secretary of State, who, next to him, is charged with our international affairs, state that this matter will not only embarrass this President but in years to come it would embarrass any who occupies that high position.

Mr. Speaker, hating war as I hate it, having been called upon 20 years ago to vote to send this country to war and being willing to do anything in my power as a citizen or as a public servant to keep this country out of war, I believe if the House discharged this committee and adopted the resolution, it would ultimately do more to plunge this country into war than any action the Congress of the United States could take. [Applause.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LUCKEY].

Mr. LUCKEY of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker and colleagues of the House of Representatives, we now have before us one of the most momentous measures that can ever come before a legislative body. Under the rules of this body we are allowed to debate exactly 20 minutes on the question of whether or not we will allow the Ludlow war referendum resolution to be discussed on the floor of this House of Representatives.

The most powerful and well-organized forces have been called into action to prevent this measure from coming up for open discussion and a vote. We can either gag ourselves against such an open consideration or we can bring the resolution up for an open discussion, subject it to amendment, and vote on it. If we are deprived of an opportunity to discuss this proposition and get a vote thereon, it will demonstrate to the American people that we are well on our way to dictatorship and that we are a democracy in name only. There is not one earthly advantage to be derived from preventing a full and free discussion of this resolution. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, in the name of American democracy I plead with you to give this measure its day in court.

For many years Congress has had before it proposals to add an amendment to our Constitution which would give each citizen the right to vote on whether or not we will send our boys to foreign shores to engage in other people's wars. The people of this country should be allowed to have the full facts on the case as they will be developed in an open debate. Both the friends and foes of this resolution have repeatedly pronounced it to be one of the greatest public questions of the day. Are we, then, to allow such a vital

question to be hushed up and hidden behind a cloak of silence? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BIGELOW].

Mr. BIGELOW. Mr. Speaker, there is no attack on representative government in this resolution. In an effort to save our country from the insanity of another world war I think we should have an appeal from the decision of the Congress to a direct vote of the fathers and mothers of America. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Judiciary Committee will not be discharged from consideration of the pending resolution by the action of the House today. It should be left in that committee for further hearings. The proper place for a full discussion of this matter is before the Judiciary Committee, where everyone can be heard. An amendment to the Constitution should not be written on the floor of the House. When you amend the Constitution you build for all time.

This resolution is either an idle gesture or one of tremendously serious importance. Personally, I believe it is a very serious matter.

Mr. Speaker, I saw the horrors of the war overseas. I have observed the result of the sufferings of that war ever since. In running for Congress and in taking my oath of office I accepted a great responsibility, the responsibility of protecting in every way possible the welfare of the Nation. I feel my responsibility at this time is to try to keep peace and endeavor to be prepared to keep that peace. This measure, in my opinion, would indicate a lack of preparedness. Every subversive influence in this country, as well as every potentially hostile nation abroad, would be extremely glad to see the Ludlow resolution passed. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize the fact that the issue before us for the present moment on this vote is very clear and simple. It is not on the war referendum. It is whether we as Representatives may consider and discuss and then vote on this war referendum. That is all there is to it. Are you going to deny us that right and still talk about being Representatives of the people in a democracy?

Right here let me remind my colleagues that this has become too much the practice in this body. First of all, a chairman of some committee may refuse to report out a bill, as was the case in the Ludlow bill, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee refused to permit its consideration. He is a most lovable Member and a good personal friend, but in this case, as in the refusal to submit the Court issue for discussion on the floor, he is a dictator, pure and simple. Or a small majority of a committee, as in the wage-hour bill, before the Rules Committee, may be the oligarchy which refuses the other Members of the House the right to discuss an important bill. Then we must resort to the undemocratic and slow method of securing 218 signatures to a petition on the Speaker's desk to force the bill from a committee. And how strange the reasoning of some leaders. In the wage-hour bill, the leadership used its influence to secure signers to the petition because they were favorable to the legislation, even going so far as to have their pictures taken with the last signer of the petition. But in the Frazier-Lemke farm bill, and the Ludlow petition, they did their utmost to discourage signers. Lastly, when sufficient signatures have been secured, the administration and leadership of the House bring pressure to bear upon Members so as to prevent a fair and full consideration of the issue on the floor of the House. What, may I ask, is the function of this body anyway? Is it to study, discuss, and go on record on

important issues presented in due form by regularly elected representatives of the people, or to do the bidding of a leadership which has lost its power of leadership because it drives instead of leads?

The Speaker—and we all personally love and respect him—well said that this is the most important and most momentous vote since he became a Member. It is not only a test as to whether Representatives may discuss and go on record but also will deny or permit discussion of the most important question before the American people, who have made their decision based upon their first-hand knowledge of how we were tricked into the World War. The Gallup poll shows more than 70 percent favorable to the Ludlow amendment.

I am aware that leaders of certain organizations have flooded the membership with telegrams and letters. But may I say that too many leaders of organizations today do not in any way represent the rank and file.

You have heard and read the proposed substitute for the original Ludlow amendment. In clear, concise statements it simply provides that we will not engage in any warfare across the Atlantic or the Pacific except by the express wish of the people whose sons must fight and die, and who must bear the burden of the taxation. Is not this democratic? It does change the Constitution in this respect, but have not the people at any time the right to change their Constitution by orderly procedure? And yet there are Members here who not only deny us the right to discuss this proposition, but deny the right of the people to pass on an amendment to that effect.

I have no animosity against any of my colleagues, but I thoroughly disagree with and denounce such action in the name of representative democracy. It is Hitlerism and Stalinism by a small group who temporarily sit in the Halls of Congress.

Should this resolution be defeated and then this Congress or the Seventy-sixth Congress engage in foreign warfare, I sincerely hope those who vote for such a war may be the first to be put into the trenches, regardless of age and regardless of station. If I should vote to engage in a foreign war without giving my constituents an opportunity to pass on this momentous matter, I would be the first to enlist and make my vote seem rational and sincere.

This is only the beginning of this fight, my friends. From ocean to ocean and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico this fight will go on until victory comes for the fathers who pay, the mothers who weep, the sons who fight, and the daughters who wait, and the children who become orphans by the greatest scourge of modern times—war. That is the only issue. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last I spoke at great length on this matter, and my views appear fully at pages 164 and 165 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 7, 1938.

First, may I say, Mr. Speaker, this discharge motion presents a rather anomalous parliamentary procedure under which we are proceeding to discharge a committee, the Rules Committee, from consideration of a matter which was never before that committee.

However, that irregular parliamentary procedure is very similar to the main proposal itself, the Ludlow referendum on war. If you are in favor of either, this discharge motion against an innocent Rules Committee or in favor of the Ludlow amendment, then you subscribe to the kind of democracy that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] had in mind, a "pure democracy," the opposite of representative government; in fact, it is the elysian fields of the demagog. There he besorts himself in his political nudism—the only friend of the "peepul"—indifferent to the fact of government or his own country. Once you have this "pure democracy," the next step is a dictatorship.

That is what we are fighting here today. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU].

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States and the Administration leaders in this body have made

the point that a provision for a referendum is a threat to representative democracy. May I say to the Members of the House the proposed referendum presently being discussed, if approved, would not establish a precedent. A referendum was provided for in connection with the administration's farm program. This administration has supported referendums in connection with farm legislation. I submit to the Members of the House that if it is fair and if it is right to submit to a small group of the people, the farmers, the right to determine whether or not they should lead little pigs to slaughter, it is fair and it is right that all of the people should be permitted by a referendum vote to determine whether or not the sons and the daughters of these same farmers, among other citizens, should be led to slaughter upon the battlefields of foreign countries. [Applause.]

I appeal to the Members of this House to preserve democracy, to fight the forces which are opposed to democracy, the forces of communism and of fascism who oppose this resolution, and to help the friends of democracy, who are supporting the Ludlow amendment. I hope we will have an opportunity to consider this resolution today and that we will give the people the right to vote on the question of whether or not we are to engage in foreign wars. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 165).

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 188, nays 209, answered "present" 4, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 2]
YEAS—188

Aleshire	Dies	Johnson, Okla.	Rankin
Allen, Ill.	Dirksen	Johnson, W. Va.	Reed, N. Y.
Allen, La.	Ditter	Kelly, Ill.	Rees, Kans.
Allen, Pa.	Dixon	Kelly, N. Y.	Reilly
Amile	Dockweiler	Kinzer	Rich
Anderson, Mo.	Dondero	Knifin	Rigney
Andresen, Minn.	Dowell	Knutson	Robinson, Utah
Arends	Dunn	Kvale	Robison, Ky.
Ashbrook	Eckert	Lambertson	Rockefeller
Barry	Eicher	Lanzetta	Rogers, Okla.
Barton	Fish	Leavy	Rutherford
Bates	Fitzgerald	Lemke	Ryan
Beam	Fleger	Lord	Sadowski
Bernard	Fletcher	Luckey, Nebr.	Sauhoff
Biermann	Ford, Calif.	Ludlow	Schneider, Wis.
Bigelow	Ford, Miss.	Luecke, Mich.	Secret
Binderup	Fries, Ill.	McFarlane	Seger
Boehne	Fulmer	McGehee	Shafer, Mich.
Boileau	Genmann	McGroarty	Shanley
Boyer	Gilchrist	McKeough	Shannon
Brewster	Gildea	McLean	Short
Buckler, Minn.	Gray, Ind.	Martin, Colo.	Simpson
Burdick	Gray, Pa.	Mason	Sirovich
Cannon, Mo.	Green	Massingale	Smith, Okla.
Cannon, Wis.	Greenwood	Michener	Smith, Wash.
Carlson	Griswold	Mills	Stack
Carter	Guyer	Moser, Pa.	Stefan
Case, S. Dak.	Gwynne	Mosier, Ohio	Sutphin
Casey, Mass.	Halleck	Mott	Sweeney
Church	Hartley	Murdock, Ariz.	Taylor, Tenn.
Citron	Havener	Murdock, Utah	Teigan
Clark, Idaho	Healey	Nichols	Thom
Clason	Hendricks	O'Brien, Mich.	Thomas, N. J.
Cluett	Hildebrandt	O'Day	Thurston
Cochran	Hill, Wash.	Oliver	Tobey
Coffee, Wash.	Hoffman	O'Malley	Tolan
Cole, N. Y.	Hook	O'Neal, Ky.	Towey
Collins	Hope	O'Neill, N. J.	Treadway
Connery	Houston	Patterson	Umstead
Cravens	Hull	Patton	Voorhis
Crawford	Hunter	Pettengill	Welch
Crosser	Imhoff	Phillips	White, Ohio
Crowe	Izac	Plumley	Withrow
Crowther	Jacobsen	Poage	Wolfenden
Culklin	Jarrett	Polk	Wolverton
Dempsey	Jenkins, Ohio	Powers	Woodruff
DeMuth	Johnson, Minn.	Ramspeck	Zimmerman

NAYS—209

Allen, Del.	Bell	Brooks	Celler
Andrews	Bland	Brown	Champion
Arnold	Bloom	Buck	Chandler
Atkinson	Boland, Pa.	Bulwinkle	Chapman
Bacon	Boren	Burch	Clark, N. C.
Barden	Boykin	Byrne	Claypool
Beiter	Bradley	Caldwell	Coffee, Nebr.

Colden	Haines	Mahon, Tex.	Scrugham
Colmer	Hamilton	Maloney	Sheppard
Cooley	Hancock, N. Y.	Mansfield	Smith, Va.
Cooper	Harlan	Mapes	Snell
Costello	Harrington	Maverick	Snyder, Pa.
Crosby	Hart	May	Somers, N. Y.
Cullen	Hennings	Mead	South
Cummings	Hill, Ala.	Meeks	Sparkman
Curley	Hobbs	Merritt	Spence
Daly	Holmes	Mitchell, Ill.	Starnes
Delaney	Honeyman	Mitchell, Tenn.	Steagall
DeRouen	Jarman	Mouton	Sullivan
Disney	Jenckes, Ind.	Nelson	Summers, Tex.
Dorsey	Johnson, Luther A.	Norton	Swope
Doughton	Johnson, Lyndon	O'Brien, Ill.	Taber
Doxey	Jones	O'Connell, R. I.	Tarver
Drew, Pa.	Kee	O'Connor, N. Y.	Taylor, Colo.
Driver	Kennedy, Md.	O'Leary	Taylor, S. C.
Duncan	Kennedy, N. Y.	O'Toole	Terry
Eberharter	Kenney	Pace	Thomas, Tex.
Edmiston	Keogh	Palmissano	Thomason, Tex.
Elliott	Kerr	Parsons	Thompson, Ill.
Engel	Kirwan	Patrick	Tinkham
Englebright	Kitchens	Pearson	Transue
Evans	Kociakowski	Peterson, Fla.	Turner
Faddis	Kramer	Peterson, Ga.	Vincent, B. M.
Farley	Lambeth	Pfeifer	Vinson, Fred M.
Fernandez	Lamneck	Pierce	Vinson, Ga.
Fitzpatrick	Lanham	Quinn	Wadsworth
Flaherty	Larrabee	Rabaut	Wallgren
Flannagan	Lea	Ramsay	Walter
Flannery	Lesinski	Rayburn	Warren
Forand	Lewis, Colo.	Reece, Tenn.	Wearin
Frey, Pa.	Lewis, Md.	Reed, Ill.	Weaver
Fuller	Long	Richards	Wene
Gamble, N. Y.	Luce	Robertson	West
Gambrill, Md.	McAndrews	Rogers, Mass.	Whelchel
Garrett	McClellan	Romjue	Whittington
Gasque	McCormack	Sabath	Wigglesworth
Gavagan	McGrath	Sacks	Wilcox
Gearhart	McLaughlin	Sanders	Williams
Gifford	McMillan	Satterfield	Wolcott
Gingery	McReynolds	Schaefer, Ill.	Woodrum
Goldsborough	Maas	Schuetz	
Gregory	Magnuson	Schulte	
Griffith	Mahon, S. C.	Scott	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Cox	Creal	Dingell	Smith, Conn.
NOT VOTING—30			
Boylan, N. Y.	Eaton	Kopplemann	Patman
Buckley, N. Y.	Ferguson	Lucas	Randolph
Cartwright	Grever	McGranery	Smith, Maine
Cole, Md.	Hancock, N. C.	McSweeney	Smith, W. Va.
Deen	Harter	Martin, Mass.	White, Idaho
Dickstein	Jenks, N. H.	O'Connell, Mont.	Wood
Douglas	Keller	O'Connor, Mont.	
Drewry, Va.	Kleberg	Owen	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. Randolph (for) with Mr. Dingell (against).
 Mr. Kopplemann (for) with Mr. Smith of Connecticut (against).
 Mr. Eaton (for) with Mr. Drewry (against).
 Mr. Patman (for) with Mr. Lucas (against).
 Mr. Douglas (for) with Mr. Owen (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Cartwright with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
 Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Smith of Maine.
 Mr. Boylan of New York with Mr. Keller.
 Mr. O'Connell of Montana with Mr. Harter.
 Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Buckley of New York.
 Mr. O'Connor of Montana with Mr. Wood.
 Mr. Ferguson with Mr. White of Idaho.
 Mr. McSweeney with Mr. Deen.
 Mr. McGranery with Mr. Grever.
 Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Cole of Maryland.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called and failed to hear his name called?

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may be permitted to qualify despite the rule.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRINGTON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I had arranged for a live pair with my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. RANDOLPH. If the gentleman from West Virginia were present, he would have voted "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote of "nay" and answer "present."

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, I qualify and answer "present." Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. WHELCHEL, was in an automobile accident, as was the gentleman from California, Mr. COSTELLO, and has just arrived. I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to vote at this time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I have a pair with the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. KORPELMAN, who, if he were present, would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote of "nay" and answer "present."

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Montana, Mr. O'CONNELL, is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order, which is the announcement of the result of the vote.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is to announce the vote. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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 the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Alley Dwelling Authority for the District of Columbia, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1937.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 10, 1938.

FURTHER MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—EMERGENCY RELIEF APPROPRIATION ACTS OF 1935, 1936, AND 1937

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 Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts of 1935, 1936, and 1937, I present herewith a report of the operations under these acts to the end of the calendar year 1937.

This report includes detailed statements of expenditures made, obligations incurred by classes and amounts, and status of funds under each of the acts.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 8, 1938.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I ask unanimous consent that the business of the Committee on the District of Columbia in order on today may be dispensed with. I may state that the chairman of that committee is agreeable to my making this request.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I renew the request I made earlier in the day, and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a radio address by me on Saturday evening, together with a copy of an editorial in the New York Times of yesterday substantiating my own viewpoint to a certain extent.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the Ludlow resolution.

The SPEAKER. Under general leave, the gentleman has that permission.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including a radio address delivered by me and appended thereto two short resolutions which I have introduced.

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

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1939

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8837) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8837, the independent offices appropriation bill, 1939, with Mr. LANHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I know that following a matter in which so many Members have been so vitally and enthusiastically interested, it will perhaps be hard to claim the attention of the Committee for a routine speech on an appropriation bill.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, provides for 39 independent establishments of the Government. It is unlike any other appropriation bill that is brought to the floor of the House, because here are 39 widely separate and independent establishments of the Government that are provided for in this bill in the sum of nearly \$1,500,000,000. The gross amount provided in the bill is almost one-third more than it has ever been. This does not mean there is an increase of one-third in the total amount of the appropriations, but in this bill we have two or three of the new agencies of Government that have never been in the bill before. One is the Tennessee Valley Authority, and there are one or two other large items included in the measure. So the gross amount of the bill is very much more than the previous amount, but what you will be interested in is knowing that the amount appropriated for comparable activities is about \$118,000,000 less for 1939 than the amount appropriated for similar activities for 1938. So to this extent at least we bring you an encouraging report.

May I say at this time about the independent bureaus and offices of the Government that we so often hear them referred to as being necessary evils, bureaucracies, or what not; but if you will look at the index of the bill, you will find that some of the most important functions of Government, some of the functions of Government that lie closest to the hearts of the people, are provided for in this bill. If you will turn the 1,400 or so pages of hearings which our committee conducted, covering a period of nearly 1 month, you will find that the Government has drawn to its service some splendid, well-equipped men and women who are contributing their time and talent to the service of the Government.

This being the first appropriation bill, the committee feels that a great deal of whatever may be accomplished in the present session of Congress in the matter of trying to bring finances into balance will be accomplished on this bill; that is to say, the attitude of the Congress on this particular bill will be reflected throughout the session.

We have given this matter the most careful and considerate judgment of which we are capable. We commend the hearings to your consideration; and if the bill commends itself to you, we ask your assistance and your cooperation in passing the measure as the committee has brought it to you.

Mr. Chairman, in the matter of the state of finances of the Government, the present prospect is that we may expect a deficit of approximately \$950,000,000 for 1939. If you will look at the deficit since 1934, you will see it has gradually declined; and if we can hold the deficit in 1939 to \$900,000,000, a great deal will have been accomplished in meeting our objective. This is the smallest deficit since we embarked upon the recovery program.

If we can hold this deficit to what is set out in the President's message, \$950,000,000, I think it will be a step in the right direction. If you gentlemen have been sufficiently interested to follow the remarks that I have made in the last several years on the floor in presenting this bill, you will recall that I have never been so optimistic as to believe that we could wave a magic wand and bring the Budget into balance in 1 year. There are a great many people who are just as anxious as you and I to balance the Budget, who feel it would be tragical to try to do it in 1 year. This demonstrates how hard it is. Take this bill, for instance. I find some enthusiastic gentlemen who are anxious to cut down expenses and bring the Budget into balance who will advance this sort of an argument: "Take the independent offices bill or any other bill, and cut 15 or 25 percent off it; that is the way to do it," we will be told. Mr. Chairman, they seem to think that it is a smart act, or that you are doing something to chastise some bureau chief by cutting down the appropriations. I do not need to tell you that I am interested in trying to cut Federal expenses. My record speaks for that. Take what would happen in this bill under those circumstances. Suppose you take the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration and cut it 15 percent, what would that mean? It would mean that you would have to cut at least 10 percent of it, perhaps 12½ percent of it, from the direct compensation that you would be paying the veterans, and you would have to take 2½ percent from the administrative expenses, which would mean that you would take nurses and doctors and food and medical care away from the veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell me what has been done regarding the Veterans' Administration appropriation this year?

Mr. WOODRUM. We have allowed the Budget estimate; there has been no cut in it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is there a cut from last year?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes; it is about \$6,000,000 less than the current fiscal year.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Why?

Mr. WOODRUM. The amount that we are paying for pensions is growing less on account of the Spanish and Civil wars, because the veterans are passing away. That has decreased more than the World War pensions have increased, so it permitted a small decrease.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It has not been cut in any essential way?

Mr. WOODRUM. No.

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

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Do the hearings disclose that they are reducing the overhead cost of the Veterans' Administration to any extent?

Mr. WOODRUM. I think so. The gentleman knows that General Hines has given his personal attention and thought to the question of cutting the administrative costs as deeply as they can be cut without interfering with the direct service we are giving to the veterans. He is not willing, nor do I think the Congress would be willing, to economize on the services we are giving to the veterans.

That means the cutting of nurses and doctors and food or medical care, but the consolidation of facilities has enabled him to make some savings and, of course, as against that we have been opening new facilities which require the employment of more physicians and nurses.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman reviews as I do, from time to time, the files in veterans' cases, he will realize that there is a tremendous amount of paper work in connection with every veteran's case which certainly, in my opinion, goes beyond what is actually necessary. In that way the overhead cost could be reduced and it would not in any way reflect on any of the benefits we are now extending to the veterans of the various wars. I insist there is too much paper work in the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr. WOODRUM. I think there is a great deal in what the gentleman says. Mr. Chairman, I could go through each of these Bureaus in the same way as I have suggested in respect to the Veterans' Administration. Take the Social Security Board. That carries an appropriation of approximately \$250,000,000. Somebody said to cut that 10 percent, that we could do that without any trouble. A distinguished Member of this body seriously suggested to me that we make a 10-percent cut in that, and then he went ahead to tell me how many people they had on their rolls over here and how many people they had over there in Baltimore. I said very well, that a 10-percent cut would mean \$25,000,000. The whole administrative expenses amount to but \$21,000,000, so that by such a cut you would take all of that away, and \$4,000,000 away from the direct benefit payments. So I say, for this purpose, let us not be misguided into thinking we can apply an ax and chop here and there indiscriminately. That is what I call "hysterical economy" and you do not get anywhere by doing it. We have pared this bill down, and it is nearly \$4,000,000 under the Budget estimate. It is \$118,000,000 less than it was last year, and \$225,000,000 less than what the Departments asked the Bureau of the Budget to allow them for their 1939 expenses. There are some things that could be done which would help in this current fight to balance the Budget.

In the first place, I hope this session of Congress will get an opportunity to pass on the suggestion made in the President's message, which is but a repetition of the suggestion that has been made many times by many Presidents, that the Chief Executive be given the authority to veto individual items in appropriation bills. I do not think we could do any one thing that would help more to hold down unnecessary public expenditures than to give the Chief Executive that power.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In South Dakota the Governor has the power of vetoing individual items in appropriation bills, and it has proved very helpful.

Mr. WOODRUM. They have it in Virginia and it has saved us down there. I think most of the States have experienced that. I hope that if a constitutional amendment is necessary we shall submit it this session and give the President this right. It is a terrible thing to send an appropriation bill to the White House right in the closing days of a session and make the President exercise the alternative of vetoing a whole bill which if he signed would unbalance his Budget with unnecessary public expenditures; and I hope this Congress will give the President that power. I feel that if we do we shall take a big step in the direction of helping him balance the Budget.

There are in this bill two or three controversial items. I will only mention them for they will come up again for discussion under the 5-minute rule, and I do not want to take too much of your time. In the first place, as I have stated before, not wishing to reiterate at this time, we save money and we balance the Budget not by cutting off a few thousand dollars here and a few thousand dollars there, but by curtailing Government activities when we can. There are two points in this bill where substantial savings are sought to be made by the curtailment of governmental activities; one is in the Civilian Conservation Corps, the other is in the Tennessee Valley Authority; and I wish to discuss these two things for just a few moments.

The Civilian Conservation Corps was the peculiar function set up by the Government at the suggestion of the President of the United States—and I think it is fair to say that more than any other it is one activity as to whose ultimate merits we are nearly in unanimous accord. I think the Civilian Conservation Corps has been one of the finest things we have done through the help it has rendered young men in rehabilitating themselves, in finding a place where they could carry on during these troublesome times when so many were taken out of college and could not carry on in their normal way. I think much useful, permanent, public benefit has come from the functions of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Would it not be possible to effect economy there by placing most of the jurisdiction under the War Department? In this way more young men could be given a chance in the Civilian Conservation Corps without spending so much money. I think the Army has done a very fine piece of work; Mr. Fechner has too.

Mr. WOODRUM. The question of coordination of the C. C. C. under one authority, the distinguished gentlewoman will remember, was the subject of quite careful scrutiny when we had up the bill to make it a permanent corps; and there is in the country a very persistent and a very definite objection to putting it under the War Department, for reasons which will readily appear to the gentlewoman. It is thought that it should be kept separate, the disciplinary end of it to be handled by the War Department. Personally I do not believe there is much lost motion there. I think the savings that could be made from a \$350,000,000 appropriation by having it all under the War Department would be more or less inconsequential.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am afraid I am going to vote for an increase in the gentleman's appropriation bill.

Mr. WOODRUM. I am sorry to hear the gentlewoman say that, because I had hoped she would back up the President and help him balance the Budget, action she has been calling for many times.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is quite correct; but I feel that this is a most valuable activity for the improvement of morale and the molding of character.

Mr. WOODRUM. Most of us Budget balancers, of course, are willing to balance the Budget if it does not affect something in which we are particularly interested. But now we are being given an opportunity here to decrease a governmental function. May I emphasize that for a moment.

We have been talking for several sessions of Congress about reorganization of governmental activities. Well, it is mostly talk. When it comes to a question of major savings, savings that will really make a dent in the deficit, it is not done by reorganization. I am not for a moment saying that it is not desirable to have some reorganization, for I think a regrouping of some of the departments would make for some economy, perhaps, and increased efficiency. It possibly would do more for increased efficiency than anything else. It would avoid some duplication, and it is quite desirable; but from a Budget-balancing standpoint it does not make a dent in the surface.

Someone made the statement that we could put the Federal Housing Administration and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation together and save \$35,000,000 in administrative expenses. The expense of both of those departments is not that much, however. What usually happens when you put two departments together is that there is an increase ultimately in the outlay of money. So from the standpoint of saving money and holding down this \$7,000,000,000 Budget with which we are faced, and we will have a fight to keep it down to the \$7,000,000,000, when we get the opportunity to decrease governmental functions that is when we save money. In the Civilian Conservation Corps the President has asked us to provide funds for 1,200 camps.

Mr. Chairman, it must be remembered that when the Civilian Conservation Corps was set up it was for the primary

purpose of taking care of young men on the relief rolls, and young men from relief families, and instead of handing out a dole or a basket of provisions to the family, the young man who could not get employment would be given a job and would be permitted to send \$25 a month to the family in lieu of relief.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The relief rolls are very large now all over the country?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes; but we have changed the idea now. These young men do not have to come from the relief rolls. We have provided that any unemployed young man may get a job in the C. C. C. Up to the time that we continued the policy of taking them from the relief rolls we could not recruit the camps and some of the camps had to be closed. We did not have enough young men coming from the relief rolls to recruit 1,500 camps. So we changed the policy.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But some still come from the relief rolls, and I believe more could be cared for who are on the relief rolls.

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes; there are many who come from the relief rolls.

The argument is going to be made when the time comes that when you reduce the number of camps from 1,500 to 1,200 camps there will be some boys who want to enlist in these camps and will not be able to enlist. That is true and has always been true. That has been true all through our relief program. However, we have never sought to provide or attempt to provide work relief for the eight, nine, twelve, or fifteen million unemployed. What we have tried to do is work out a program which would take up some of the slack, with the hope the remainder of the men would find a place in industry.

The charge will be made here that unless you put the number of camps back to 1,500 and restore the amount of money that the President has taken out of the Budget, there will not be enough facilities to permit all of these young men who wish to enlist there to have jobs in the C. C. C. camps. That is quite true. But under this program there will be provision for an enrollment of 250,000.

The committee has not cut the Budget estimate. The committee has appropriated the full amount which the President requested for the Civilian Conservation Corps for next year, and we are told that the corps can be maintained on that amount of money, giving the boys the proper clothing and the standard of food to which they have been accustomed. That matter will come up for further consideration and discussion at the proper time and I imagine we will hear more about the proposition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman tell me what proportion of the population is taking care of the C. C. C. camps? In other words, what proportion is furnishing the funds for these relief agencies?

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not get the gentleman's question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The people that are earning and producing are necessarily taking care of the C. C. C. camps.

Mr. WOODRUM. Does the gentleman mean the families of the boys in the C. C. C. camps?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The number of workers who are furnishing the money in the form of taxes.

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not have that figure.

The other item in this bill in which we have made a substantial reduction is the Tennessee Valley Authority. We provide funds for a continuation of the study of the Gilbertsville Dam, but we take out the funds suggested by the Budget for the beginning of the construction of that dam. There will be found a full discussion in the hearings at page 927, if anyone is interested.

This dam at Gilbertsville is supposed to be one of the largest dams in the Tennessee Valley development. When the dam is completed the lake will be something like 6 miles wide and 184 miles long. It is supposed to be, and I have no doubt will be, an important and indispensable link in the Tennessee Valley development. But it is a hundred-million-dollar project and there is even yet a very wide difference of opinion among engineering experts as to where this dam should be located, whether it should be a high dam or a low dam, and so forth.

The committee felt that this was a project that came within the category of those mentioned by the President where at least a postponement of beginning upon this \$100,000,000 project would not ultimately hurt anything; therefore, we have taken out of the Budget something like \$2,000,000 for the beginning of the construction of that dam, but have given them an added amount of money to continue their engineering studies and surveys in order that they may come to a definite conclusion as to just what kind of a dam it should be.

Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee. If I understand the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations correctly, this is rather a delay than otherwise in the particular instance?

Mr. WOODRUM. That is the way the committee feels about it. This is to give the engineers an opportunity to further study the matter. I may say to the gentleman there is still a wide difference of opinion as to the effect of the dam, how it should be built, and where it should be built.

Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee. This other reduction heretofore referred to by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations does not affect the agency of the T. V. A. proper as its plans are now being carried out?

Mr. WOODRUM. Not at all.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Was a report of the Army engineers sought or obtained in relation to the Gilbertsville Dam, or were their views presented to the gentleman's committee?

Mr. WOODRUM. It was not, because our committee has not yet permitted them to begin construction. The whole matter is in the stage of investigation.

Mr. DONDERO. I was wondering whether the difference of opinion was between the Army engineers and the engineers representing the T. V. A.

Mr. WOODRUM. Our committee did not have that information, but the committee understands there is a difference of opinion between the Army engineers and the engineers of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee. Are sufficient funds available under this bill to continue surveys of other rivers in the adjoining territory with respect to the question of navigation and flood control?

Mr. WOODRUM. Does the gentleman mean the question to relate to Gilbertsville particularly or the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee. The Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. WOODRUM. We have made no curtailment of that feature of their program.

Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee. I am pleased to know that is the situation.

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

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS. May I ask the gentleman about what I understand was a curtailment of the money for the Tennessee Valley Authority for soil conservation and fertilizer development? Is it not true the amount asked was rather a

small amount? I should like to know why the amount was cut out?

Mr. WOODRUM. The amount is small, and the committee does not feel a reduction of this small amount in any way curtails their activities. I shall be pleased to yield to my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], because he has given special consideration to this, and he will answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman from California the amount was not cut out; it was merely cut down. We were guided in the matter by the duplication of effort we thought was taking place in the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils in the Department of Agriculture and in several other subdivisions of the Government. However, amounts remain for every item which was brought before the committee. In some cases we scaled down the amount, it is true, but some of the amounts we made higher than they were last year. We do not believe, however, we are crippling the work which is to be done.

Mr. VOORHIS. May I ask whether the work being done by the T. V. A. in connection with the development of the cheap phosphate fertilizer will be interfered with in any way?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We do not believe so.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so I may ask a question of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman from Illinois tell me whether or not a reduction was made in the appropriation for research or experiment in the manufacture of sodium chlorate, in which I am very much interested? In Nebraska and certain other States we need sodium chlorate very badly in the eradication of the bindweed. The Tennessee Valley Authority has been doing some experimenting along this line. Has this appropriation been curtailed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not believe so. The specific item has never come before the committee, and I do not know whether the appropriation applies to chlorate or not.

Mr. STEFAN. What effect will the reductions mentioned have on it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. These reductions are found in four items which were submitted to the committee. We let stand about as much money as they have been using over a year or so. For all practical purposes their demonstration and experiment work can go along just the same as before.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman realizes how important sodium chlorate is in the eradication of bindweed in some States in the Middle West.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. STEFAN. The Tennessee Valley Authority has been doing some experimenting along this line. We cannot buy the commodity in this country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They can go ahead and do just the same as before.

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

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is any part of the appropriation of last year or the current year for the Gilbertsville Dam for construction?

Mr. WOODRUM. None is for construction.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Congress has not heretofore appropriated anything for construction?

Mr. WOODRUM. Not for direct construction.

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

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

Mr. SHORT. The proposed site of the Gilbertsville Dam is in the earthquake area?

Mr. WOODRUM. In the earthquake area?

Mr. SHORT. Yes. There is some possibility there may be earthquakes in the area where the dam is proposed to be constructed.

Mr. WOODRUM. I may say to the gentleman that is a feature which has never been called to my attention. There are two or three sites in that particular neighborhood con-

cerning which there has been a difference of opinion as to where the dam should be located. The engineers of the Tennessee Valley Authority believe they have now found a place where the dam should be located, but there is still some difference of opinion whether the dam should be constructed, or just what effect it will ultimately have on flood control. I should be fair and say that my own individual opinion is that the Gilbertsville Dam should be constructed and is a vital and a necessary part of the development in that area, but I do not believe the project will suffer by putting it off a year, and I do believe it should be deferred a year.

Mr. SHORT. May I ask the gentleman from Virginia if it was the sentiment in the committee that the Government should not embark upon further expansion in the T. V. A. until certain fundamental legal questions have been definitely decided by the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. WOODRUM. I may say to the gentleman this question did not influence the committee in taking its action on Gilbertsville. We felt this project was as yet sufficiently in the elementary stage to hold it in abeyance for at least another year.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KRAMER. May I ask the gentleman if anything has been done in the way of investigating the necessity for the large amount of travel expense? I notice the various independent agencies report a large amount of travel expense on the part of employees of the agencies. In one instance to which I make particular reference an employee of an agency here was sent to Chicago to get some information.

He could have received the same information by transmitting a letter. He spent a considerable amount of time in Chicago, stopping at the Palmer House or perhaps one of the finer hotels, at an expense of \$5 a day; or has that allowance been increased to \$10?

Mr. WOODRUM. No; it is \$5 a day.

Mr. KRAMER. Even though it is \$5 a day I find that even in California there is a large number of these employees traveling back and forth or flying back and forth, and if we are to economize and balance the Budget the Government itself should set the example in its own departments by cutting down this expense which in many instances is unnecessary. I have had something to do with the matter, and I know that on the slightest excuse they will send a man to California or Chicago, or raise the telephone and put in a long-distance call when a letter would answer the same purpose. I would like to know what the gentleman's committee has done in this respect?

Mr. WOODRUM. The committee has done the best it could with the facilities it has at hand. As the gentleman knows, the facilities of the committee are very poor in trying to cope with the amount of work we have to do. I have said this for several years, and I will repeat the song and story by saying that no matter how much work the sub-committee puts on these 39 establishments, with an appropriation of one billion and a half dollars, where there are hundreds of thousands of dollars for travel and communication and for printing and binding, when we bring the item in here, the best we can say about it is that we hope it is an intelligent guess.

Mr. KRAMER. But so much of it is useless.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is the whole thing in a nutshell, I will say to the gentleman from California, and I hope the time is going to speedily come when the Congress will go into this matter carefully and realize what we are trying to do, so that we may not have to rely entirely on Government officials as to the amount of money they should have. There is one agency here in the bill with a travel item of \$275,000, and another agency has 6,000 employees in its regional offices, and, in addition to that, a number of State offices. They are performing important functions, and it is an important agency of the Government, and there is not any

member of the committee who would willingly do anything to cripple the service it is rendering to our constituents, but I have grave doubts about the necessity of all these regional offices and State offices and employees, but how am I ever going to know about it, I will ask the gentleman?

Mr. SHORT. It is a matter of administration rather than legislation.

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes; and, of course, back in the early days of the Congress when the total appropriation was \$1,000,000,000 divided among eight or nine committees, the committee could go into these matters, and my position has always been, and is now stronger than ever, that the Congress itself, not the General Accounting Office and not the Treasury, but the legislative body itself, should have its own personnel, its own experienced, well-paid, responsible personnel go into the field and go into the departments and get the information and sit at the committee table when we frame these bills so we may have a little evidence of our own and not have to rely entirely on building up our case by cross-examining the other fellow's witnesses.

Mr. KRAMER. If the gentleman will yield right there, that is just the point I want to make. Why is Congress could not appoint a committee to make an investigation of these various departments with respect to their expenses and find out just how far these expenses are really necessary, and, for instance, why this great amount of printing is necessary.

Mr. WOODRUM. The committee cannot do it. We have plenty of committees. We need well-trained, experienced, sophisticated auditors and investigators who can spend days and months in the Department and in the field working on and checking the records in order to familiarize themselves with what is going on, and then come back and bring the information to the committee. We have plenty of committees and we do not need any more. The Lord deliver us from any more committees. My good friend here, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], has the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. KRAMER. He does not seem to get anywhere.

Mr. COCHRAN. As the gentleman knows, I have been trying to get such assistance for years and have never been able to get the slightest assistance.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman is one of the ablest Members of the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. Not half as able as the gentleman himself.

Mr. WOODRUM (continuing). And stands for economy. He is an economist, and not only preaches economy but votes that way. [Applause.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Let me say to the gentleman from Virginia, I happen to know what went on behind closed doors when you were marking up this bill the other day. The Committee on Expenditures has been trying to do the very thing the gentleman from Virginia wants done, secure some outstanding investigators. We have been trying to do this for years, but we have been unable to get the least assistance. We have even tried, through the Rules Committee, to amend the rules so that we may have more power to get some of this information which the gentleman refers to, but we have never succeeded, and on two occasions I have appeared before the Rules Committee in the last 8 years.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

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

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

Mr. COCHRAN. There is another matter I want to ask about. The medical profession and the dental profession throughout the United States have been greatly exercised over the group health associations that are springing up in the Government service. Personally I do not believe there was any authority of law whatever for the spending for this purpose \$40,000 by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. It is certainly going very far to spend money in that way. It seems to me the Corporation officials should not have taken

this responsibility but should have come to the Congress and specifically asked for authority to do so. Does the gentleman feel the authority to spend money for group health associations is in the law?

Mr. WOODRUM. Not the slightest in the world.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the limitation that appears on the last page of the bill be sufficient to prevent this in the future—using any of the moneys appropriated in this bill, for advances for group health associations?

Mr. WOODRUM. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation say that they are not going to so expend any more money, that they have given this donation of \$40,000 and that they are through.

Mr. COCHRAN. How about some other of these independent agencies?

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not know.

Mr. COCHRAN. If we do not put some limitation upon them then one after another of the independent agencies might do the same thing. The physicians, surgeons, and dentists of this country are taxpayers. It seems to me we should protect them and not spend the taxpayers' money to form such associations thus taking bread and butter away from the medical profession. We cannot control the employees, I know. They can go out and form any kind of a group that they want to form, but so far as taking money that we appropriate for specific purposes for such a thing, and for heads of departments to turn that money over to employees' associations to further group health associations or anything of that kind, I say is wrong, and until the Congress specifically provides by law for it, they should not be permitted to do it.

Mr. WOODRUM. I quite agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. BEITER. Has the gentleman's committee had an opportunity to check and see whether the Home Owners' Loan Corporation has violated any other sections of the law? I have in mind now the men who are employed in the regional offices. It is my understanding that the men who are employed in the regional offices must be taken from the State in which the H. O. L. C. is located. Let us take the State of New York. I understand that some forty-odd persons are employed in the regional offices there that come from other sections of the country, particularly Connecticut and the New England States. Has the gentleman had an opportunity to check that?

Mr. WOODRUM. If the gentleman will recall, that provision was not enacted into law. I do not understand that is the law. The provision the gentleman speaks of, I think, was never put into the law. It was pointed out when that amendment was suggested that if you provide that everyone who works in, say, the New York regional office should come from New York State, and everybody who works in the Jersey City office should come from Jersey, immediately we would find people who live in either place and who commute. Also, take the situation in Bristol, Tenn. People who live on the other side of one of the streets there live across the State line. That would run into so many administrative difficulties that it would be impossible to administer it, but the authorities assured us that so far as it was humanly possible that rule was being carried out.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. I want to know who made the suggestion that the C. C. C. camps be cut by \$125,000,000. Did that originate in the gentleman's committee, or did it come direct from the President?

Mr. WOODRUM. It came direct from the President himself, over his own signature.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. The gentleman is the chairman of the committee, and in my judgment the committee is doing one of the worst things that could possibly happen to this country when they cut down the C. C. C. camps. In my judgment, and I am only one member of this body, I

think the C. C. C. boys and the C. C. C. camps are doing one of the finest things that this administration has ever done for the country, and I want to go on record as saying that.

Mr. WOODRUM. I quite agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. I am not in accord with cutting them down one penny.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is a difference of opinion. I am going to follow the President on that.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. I will follow the President so long as I think he is right, but when I do not think he is right, I shall follow myself.

Mr. WOODRUM. A great many people do that.

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

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. KRAMER. Something has been said with reference to the H. O. L. C. Now, with respect to various other departments, has there been any investigation of, say, the War Department or the Navy Department or the W. P. A. and these other agencies?

Mr. WOODRUM. They are not in this bill.

Mr. KRAMER. In this bill you do not have provision for the investigation of these various other departments, but they just fly all around the country like geese, unnecessarily, and they transfer help from Washington to California.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman cannot blame them for going to California surely.

Mr. KRAMER. I know that, but they are sending out help from Washington to California when they have employees there who are out of work and who could fill the bill as stenographers or clerks.

Mr. WOODRUM. Of course, they cannot all live in Virginia and some of them have to go to California.

Mr. KRAMER. Oh, I know that the gentleman from Virginia would like to go to California.

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

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I notice that we are still carrying authorization to use \$28,000,000 in the H. O. L. C. According to information I have, the number of foreclosures has not anywhere near reached the total they anticipated when they were up here a year ago. The amount of money, therefore, that is expended for the administration, collecting, and handling of properties ought to diminish. It seems to me we have reached the point where there could be a further cut than is proposed; that is, the cut to \$28,000,000 might be put on this organization, and they still could function efficiently.

Mr. WOODRUM. I may say to the gentleman from New York that two matters are involved here: First, as of course, the gentleman knows that any cut made on that would not affect the amount appropriated because they use their own funds.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The other point is that the gentleman will see they have made a very substantial reduction in personnel and have been making a pretty substantial reduction right down since the time they quit making loans. We went into that, we think, pretty carefully and fully. I think certainly the majority of the committee felt that it would be dangerous to cut them any more until we at least knew more about it. That is one of the expenses of which I spoke to the gentleman, one of the expenses these regional officers have which they say is absolutely necessary to service these loans. So far as we know they are, but we would like to know more about it; and I think by the time the next bill comes here we will know more about it.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. The gentleman has referred to the need for some better agency, some greater help, in ferreting out the real needs of these departments. Last year the gentleman spoke of the same thing. Familiar as he is with

the problems of the Appropriations Committee, I am sure he would receive a great deal of help if he would prepare and introduce such a bill.

Mr. WOODRUM. I may say to the gentleman from Colorado that I had the matter up with the Appropriations Committee this year, and the matter is under advisement; and that is where I will leave it. It has not been done, but it is under advisement.

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

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. RICH. This bill carries \$1,410,478,515. Last year the bill carried \$1,152,000,000. I appreciate the attitude of the gentleman from Virginia toward cutting down governmental expenditures. Notwithstanding the fact that we have added a couple of new functions to those provided for in this bill in former years, expenditures for this particular group of activities have tremendously increased, they are entirely too large. From the statements made by the President, he has four times increased the amount of the deficit for this year until now it is over \$1,000,000,000. Before he gets through with it in June it will be over \$1,500,000,000 if at the beginning of this session we start bringing in appropriation bills carrying such increases as the present one. This bill is over the estimate for last year.

Mr. WOODRUM. It is not over that.

Mr. RICH. I am not trying to criticize the subcommittee, because I know the gentleman's committee and I know that the gentleman himself wants to keep expenditures down; but I know that we have men on the Appropriations Committee who would not keep anything down, and I know we have men in the House of Representatives who are not going to cut down any of the expenses of government.

It is high time that somebody in the administration took charge of the Appropriations Committee, took charge of the Members of the House of Representatives, and did what the gentleman from Virginia would like to do. I take off my hat to the gentleman from Virginia because he is trying to reduce expenditures, but cannot the gentleman, in the name of common sense, get other Members on his side of the House to join him?

Mr. WOODRUM. I am going to talk with them about that. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICH. I hope the gentleman will, and I hope he will be successful. I ask again: Where are you going to get all this money?

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Why does not the gentleman from Pennsylvania be fair and give us the names of the men on the Appropriations Committee whom he wants taken off the committee? The gentleman stated that there were some members on the committee who ought to be taken off.

Mr. RICH. I know, and the gentleman knows men on the Appropriations Committee who do not care a rap.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Be man enough to name them.

Mr. RICH. Not only are there such men on the Appropriations Committee but there are others in the House. They do a lot of talking about cutting down expenditures on every one of the measures, but you cannot get them to do anything; they do not start to cut them down. [Applause.]

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. The gentleman says a whole lot but he is not man enough to name the people.

Mr. RICH. I am on the Appropriations Committee, and I tell the gentlemen that I would like to reorganize the committee.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. But the gentleman is not man enough to name them.

Mr. RICH. I am a member of the committee. I hear them talk about not spending, talk about saving, but they never cut anything down; instead they vote for increases.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. That is all right, but the gentleman is not man enough right now to name the men he wants taken off.

Mr. RICH. If I were chairman I would change the whole committee.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Yes; but the gentleman is not big enough to name the man.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to express my appreciation to the majority Members of the subcommittee for the unfailing consideration which they have accorded at all times in connection with the consideration of the pending bill. It has been a great pleasure to work with them under the able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum]. I want also to express my appreciation to the able clerk of our subcommittee [Mr. Orr], who has supplied the committee, as usual, with faithful and efficient assistance without which it would have been impossible to bring this bill before the House for consideration at the present time.

The totals carried in this bill are the largest that the bill has ever carried. Eliminating deficiency items the totals carried in recent years were substantially as follows:

1935	\$617,000,000
1936	777,000,000
1937	880,000,000
1938	958,000,000

For 1939 the bill now under consideration provides for the regular agencies \$1,410,000,000; for regular, emergency, and permanent appropriations of \$1,571,000,000.

I insert at this point a table which I have prepared breaking down the totals carried in the bill for 1938 and 1939.

	1938	1939
Comparison, 1938-39:		
Regular agencies	\$1,529,357,315	\$1,410,478,515
Contracted authorization	4,000,000	4,340,000
Total	1,533,357,315	1,414,818,515
Emergency agencies	61,871,180	57,317,288
Permanent appropriations	96,422,685	98,829,860
Total	1,691,651,180	1,570,965,663

¹ Including reappropriations of \$74,767,082 and deficiency items.

You will note that the total for permanent appropriations for which the Budget figure has been allowed shows an increase of something over \$2,400,000. The total for the emergency agencies for which Budget figures have also been allowed shows a decrease of about \$4,554,000. The difference between this figure and that which appears in the report is due to a typographical error in respect to the appropriation for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation last year, which should read \$30,000,000 instead of \$32,000,000. The total for the regular agencies shows a reduction over the Budget figure of \$3,730,000 and a decrease as compared with comparable items for the present year of about \$118,500,000.

To be exact, the total carried in this bill, taking into consideration all classes of appropriations, shows a reduction as compared with the Budget figures of \$3,732,020, and as compared with comparable items for the present fiscal year of \$120,685,517.

I call attention in this connection, however, to page 2 of the committee report, on which are listed the principal items of reduction. If you will add together the reduction requested by the President for the Civilian Conservation Corps of about \$124,000,000, the reduction for the Railroad Retirement Board under new legislation of about \$24,000,000, and the reduction for the Veterans' Administration, due largely to the termination of payments under 20-year military and naval insurance policies of about \$38,000,000, you will find reflected a total saving of about \$186,000,000. It follows mathematically that the other 35 items in the bill reflect an increase rather than a decrease of about \$66,000,000.

The whole saving in the bill is more than reflected in the three items to which I have referred. In fact, it is more than reflected in the single item for the Civilian Conserva-

tion Corps. If this item should be restored, either by Congress, or, as has been suggested, by a subsequent appropriation for relief purposes, the apparent saving in this bill would, of course, be wiped out.

Mr. Chairman, the scope of this bill is greater than it has ever been before, not only because of the fact it carries about \$1,600,000,000 but because it carries appropriations or authorizations of expenditures for 38 separate agencies of Government, 29 regular agencies and 9 emergency agencies, including the C. C. C., the T. V. A., and a small item for the Pan American Exposition which appear in the bill for the first time.

Obviously in the time available today it is impossible to treat these items comprehensively. All that can be done is to refer to a few considerations, which it seems important to emphasize for the Members of the House as a whole.

LACK OF PROPER ACCOUNTING AND AUDIT

Mr. Chairman, I refer first to the work of the General Accounting Office. This Office asks for an appropriation of \$5,306,540, the same figure as allowed for the present fiscal year. In addition it hopes to receive, as it received this year, about \$4,400,000 out of relief funds.

The Comptroller General is, of course, the agent of this Congress in respect to Federal expenditure. Several times in the past I have pointed out instances in which to my mind proper control over Federal expenditures has been lacking insofar as the General Accounting Office was concerned.

I call attention at this time to the fact which appears in the Record that there are no less than 25,000,000 rental and benefit payments under the Department of Agriculture, extending over a period of 4 years, and aggregating no less than \$1,281,723,478, which have not been audited. The Department of Agriculture has simply failed despite requests from the Comptroller's office to furnish either contracts or vouchers in this connection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman has indicated that \$1,400,000,000 has been paid out and up to this time no audit has been made.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The figure furnished by the General Accounting Office is approximately \$1,282,000,000 worth of rental and benefit payments.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How long ago have these payments been made for which there is no audit?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Some as long as 4 years ago.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Does the gentleman mean to tell this Congress some of these payments have been made as long as 4 years ago and there has been no audit?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do. The record so indicates.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Be specific, now. Does the gentleman mean to tell this Congress the business of the United States has been going on for 4 years without being audited?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have tried to be as specific as I can. I may say to the gentleman I can only repeat that the record indicates that rental and benefit payments under the Department of Agriculture to the number of 25,000,000, aggregating approximately \$1,282,000,000, have not been audited by the General Accounting Office. Some of these accounts are as much as 4 years old.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. I should like to get the record on that.

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

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Is it a question of jurisdiction in this case? In other words, does the Department of Agriculture hold the law does not provide for audit by the General Accounting Office?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman that while I may not be informed in detail on this matter, it is my understanding that there has been available to the Department only one copy of each rental and benefit contract, and the Secretary of Agriculture has taken the position that it has been impossible up to this time for him to part with his copy of these contracts.

Mr. COCHRAN. Has not the Department of Agriculture been auditing its own accounts, as a matter of fact?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That I do not know.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am in agreement with the gentleman in respect of the General Accounting Office auditing these accounts, but I believe whether or not it is the fault of the law would be well worth investigating. If the law does not specifically provide the General Accounting Office shall not have control, then the General Accounting Office is certainly within its rights in demanding that it be permitted to audit such accounts.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman realizes this looks like a deliberate evasion, because it is clearly asked in the present farm bill that the funds may be spent by the Secretary of Agriculture without regard to any other audit by the Government. They intend to have this privilege, and they have used it, and are apparently getting away with it.

Mr. COCHRAN. This is exactly what I felt existed in connection with this matter the gentleman is now discussing.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will yield briefly.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts does not intend to indicate the Government is lax in its auditing of accounts, meaning not only this account but all accounts of the Government.

Mr. GIFFORD. If I may add to the gentleman's statement, I have often taken the well of this House and shown how lax even the Treasury Department itself is in respect of auditing.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts please designate some department which has not been audited?

Mr. GIFFORD. The Treasury Department itself.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts does not intend to make that assertion.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman will yield, does not the gentleman think the accounts ought to be audited, when many of the farmers of this country, to their great surprise, have received checks for agricultural relief, not knowing what the checks were for? Does not the gentleman believe under such circumstances it is about time somebody does audit the accounts of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. GIFFORD. If the gentleman will yield for just one more statement, may I ask the gentleman to read the report of the Treasury, wherein it is shown that seed loans to farmers, dated way back in 1921, have not been audited and are carried at their full value.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I cannot yield further, Mr. Chairman.

I want to point out in this same connection that there are 16 activities of the Government which are not required to submit accounts to the General Accounting Office and 12 activities which the Comptroller General indicates are required to submit their accounts but which are not in fact doing so. I insert at this point the names of these agencies, which he has given me.

LIST OF ACTIVITIES WHICH ARE NOT REQUIRED BY LAW TO SUBMIT ACCOUNTS TO GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Central bank for cooperatives.

Comptroller of Currency (assessments and insolvent banks, etc.).

Corporation of foreign security holders.

Federal home-loan banks.

Federal intermediate credit banks.

Federal land banks.

Federal Reserve banks.

Federal Reserve Board.

Gorgas Memorial Institute.
Inland Waterways Corporation.
Panama Railroad Co. (including Panama Railroad Steamship Line).

Production credit corporations.
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
Reconstruction Finance Mortgage Co.
Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.
Regional banks for cooperatives.

LIST OF ACTIVITIES WHICH ARE NOT SUBMITTING ACCOUNTS TO THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AS REQUIRED

Alien Property Custodian.

Electric Home and Farm Authority (partial).

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation (partial).

Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

Hospital funds of various services.

Insular government funds in United States Treasury, except Virgin Islands.

Smithsonian Institution (trust funds).

Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.

Various special deposits.

War Finance Corporation.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Very briefly.

Mr. MAY. While the gentleman is on the question of auditing accounts, I may call his attention to the fact that the Acting Comptroller General has just released a report with respect to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I was just coming to that point. As the gentleman from Kentucky has just indicated, the Acting Comptroller General has just published his annual report. If any of you have had occasion to read this report, you will see he indicates that several agencies recently created have failed to establish proper accounting control as required by law and regulation. He indicates that the result of this has been that hundreds of millions of dollars have been received and expended by the Federal Government or agencies thereof without having been covered into the Treasury, and for which a proper accounting and audit have not been had.

The Acting Comptroller General refers specifically to several agencies provided for in this bill. For instance, he quotes the following statement by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, as late as September last, I believe:

Having failed in this period of time to establish an accounting system to your satisfaction, we feel compelled to abandon the effort and to establish an accounting system and forms according to our own best judgment, which we believe under the law to be our duty.

The Acting Comptroller General comments as follows:

Such a statement can only be viewed as an acknowledgment of the unwillingness of the officials to provide adequate accounting records and to make a full and complete accounting for the funds of the Corporation.

The funds are not being covered into the Treasury, there is no accounting rendered to the General Accounting Office, and there is no independent audit of the transactions of the Corporation, a condition which should not be permitted to continue.

The contribution of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to the Group Health Association, Inc., has already been referred to, a contribution of \$40,000 out of money provided by the Congress for administrative expenses.

I refer in this connection to the statement embodied in the report of your committee as follows:

Entirely irrespective of the merits of the work proposed to be done under the Group Health Association, for which the Home Owners' Loan Corporation recently made a contribution of \$40,000, the committee is of the unanimous opinion that the expenditure was one not authorized by any law and that such expenditures should not hereafter be made without specific legal authority.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that proper control over expenditure is impossible under existing conditions, and I urge that a general survey be made by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, by the Committee on Reorganization, or otherwise in order to bring about, insofar as possible, a proper audit of all agencies charged with the expenditures of Federal funds.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield very briefly because I must hurry on.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. I simply want to ask the gentleman one question. Why has not this audit been made? The gentleman is elaborating in his speech on an audit of these expenditures, but he does not say why the audit has not been made.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If the gentleman from Delaware will read the report of the Acting Comptroller General, to which I have referred, I think he can satisfy himself very quickly. I cannot yield further now because I have other matters to refer to. I shall be glad to yield later if time permits.

PROPAGANDA

Last year, Mr. Chairman, I made some remarks about the enormous expenditures by agencies included in this bill for the purpose of propaganda or promotion. In this connection I quote again from the report of your committee as follows:

The committee views with disfavor the tendency to expend disproportionate sums for the printing of publications, often on high-priced paper and under expensive covers, or the preparation of press releases, magazine articles, broadcasts, motion pictures, etc., the primary purpose of which is to build up a public demand for the services of the agency issuing the publicity. There has been some improvement in this respect, but the committee believes a substantial reduction of outlay in this quarter can be effected by many of the agencies without diminution of service.

There has been some improvement in this respect, but in my judgment there is still an immense amount of waste of the people's money in this connection.

Without going too much into detail, I refer particularly to the Federal Housing Administration, which asks for a force of 17 and funds to the extent of \$300,000 for this purpose; to the Social Security Board, which has had a personnel of 69 and \$228,000; to Rural Electrification Administration, which asks for a personnel of 22 and about \$122,000, if we include printing and binding expenditure for the R. E. A. News, pamphlets, and folders; to the T. V. A., which asks for \$100,000 for rural electrification education; to the P. W. A., which asks for a personnel of 20 and an expenditure of \$49,000; and the H. O. L. C., which asks for a personnel of 15 and an expenditure of \$33,880.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield briefly.

Mr. CULKIN. Does the measure include any amount of money to reimburse people who were damaged by reason of the T. V. A. flooding land in the Tennessee Valley? I note a statement that Senator BERRY and his associates have a claim of \$622,000,000. Is any such estimate included in the bill?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That matter is still pending before the court or before appraisers, as I understand it, and is not included in the bill.

Mr. CULKIN. Was that included in any estimate of cost of the T. V. A. at any time?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not think so.

I call especial attention to page 862 of the hearings, where the Federal Housing Administration sets forth its promotional activities. During the present fiscal year the F. H. A. reports, among other things, weekly releases to 800 newspapers, a monthly publication to about 20,000 financial institutions, a clip sheet twice a month to 1,600 daily and weekly newspapers, and many special articles for newspapers and magazines. It also reports 328 network broadcasts, representing 82 hours of time over the Big Three chains; 147,339 broadcasts, representing 28,160 hours of time, over independent stations at an estimated commercial value of something like \$7,200,000. It also reports 350,000 motion-picture showings in commercial theaters to an attendance estimated at about 94,000,000, as well as various exhibits to about 869 home shows, and 1,031 fairs.

This from a single agency in a single fiscal year.

Mr. MICHENER. What agency is that?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is the Federal Housing Administration.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Did they do any sky writing?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The record does not reach as high as that.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. TABER. What was the object of all this expenditure?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It seems to come under the general head of promotion.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman says promotion. Does he mean promotion of the real objective or propaganda as to what it is going to do some day?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In my judgment, a great deal of the expenditure of this character by Federal agencies is clearly propaganda.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask the gentleman, in proportion to the amount he designates the F. H. A. is expending for publicity and propaganda, what would be his estimate as to the total expenditure for this same purpose throughout the administration?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This bill covers only 38 agencies of the Government. It is impossible for me to make any estimate of the picture as a whole that would be worth much.

However, the Social Security Board indicates that its publicity service has prepared about 1,200 press releases, 200 special articles, 28 addresses, and 4 motion pictures, and the R. E. A. reports that in addition to its R. E. A. News, pamphlets, folders, and lantern slides, it has given a weekly service of 10 minutes radio script to from 100 to 120 different stations. All this in the face of statements by the R. E. A. appearing in the RECORD, which I quote, as follows:

Demands for projects have assumed such proportions as to outrun our resources four to one. We would be wasting our time if we tried to blow up very much of a publicity balloon, because the demand is so aggravatingly greater than we can take care of, that it is a great annoyance.

Mr. Chairman, from my point of view, disproportionate expenditure of this character is entirely unjustified. It should be eliminated or cut to the bone.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

On Thursday last I made some observations in regard to the Federal Communications Commission. I am not going to say anything more in regard to that agency at this time except to refer to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MCFARLANE] which appear in the RECORD of Friday last and which afford further evidence of conditions existing in this agency.

TARIFF COMMISSION

I want to say something now in regard to the Tariff Commission. That Commission asks for \$933,000, which is an apparent reduction, as compared with the appropriation for the present year of \$12,000. The request, in my judgment, might well be cut by at least \$25,000. I say this for two reasons. First, because the Commission shows an estimated saving in the present fiscal year amounting to \$37,000 and, second, because in my mind the testimony as a whole on behalf of the Commission raises squarely the question of the extent and value of its functions.

The record indicates that there has been no formal action whatsoever under the "unfair practices" section of the act, that there has been little apparent action under the "discrimination" section of the act, that there has been no affirmative recommendation under the so-called "flexible provisions" of the act, and that the State Department, the committee for trade agreements, and the committee for reciprocity information have taken over the lion's share of the work in the field of trade agreements.

If we look at the testimony in respect to the flexible provisions of the act, we find that an investigation in regard to furs was completed, but that no findings were made because, among other things, of the difficulty of making a comparison of costs between foreign and domestic articles. We find that investigations in regard to cotton velveteen, cotton hosiery, and wool knit gloves were suspended despite the fact that

quota arrangements entered into between American producers and Japanese exporters have apparently been exceeded. We find that the investigation in regard to pottery, the importation of which, according to the testimony of the Commission itself, has supplied no less than 43 percent of our domestic consumption, was dismissed after 4 long years, because of "serious questions of comparability."

One investigation is still pending. That is the investigation in respect to cemented shoes. That is an investigation in which I personally have been very much concerned, because of the fact that there are thousands of shoe workers and their families in the district which I represent who have seen the importations of cemented shoes increase no less than 1,500 percent in the past 2 years, and who fear the loss of millions of hours of employment in the event that the proposed trade agreement with Czechoslovakia is concluded.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Has the gentleman received any information from the Tariff Commission as to when there is likely to be a report on the cemented-shoe question and also whether or not there has been any understanding with the State Department that delay will be occasioned in the Czechoslovakia agreement until such time as that report has been received?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have not been able to receive a satisfactory assurance in either respect, and I want to say that the delay of the Commission in this connection seems to me to be particularly difficult to understand. Ever since July 9, 1937, the Commission has had before it a request from the New England Shoe and Leather Association for an investigation into the comparative costs of these shoes under the flexible-tariff provision of the act. Ever since that time they have known that a treaty with Czechoslovakia was proposed in respect to which this information would be vital. Ever since August 19, 1937, they have known that an investigation was mandatory because of the resolution adopted by the Senate. And yet, Mr. Chairman, it was not until December 3 that two representatives of the Commission, who admittedly have no special information as to the manufacture of boots and shoes, were sent to Czechoslovakia with a view to obtaining the costs of production in that country. On December 9, when the representatives of the Tariff Commission appeared before your subcommittee, it was clearly indicated that the Commission was not in a position to state a fair cost for domestic production, a fair cost for foreign production, or a fair cost for foreign production based on invoice prices.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. Has the Tariff Commission or any other authority given any assurance that these men going to Czechoslovakia will obtain from Czechoslovakian producers any valuable information for our purposes?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. They have given no assurance which is satisfactory to me; and it seems to me almost impossible for them to give such an assurance under prevailing conditions.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if it is not a fact that the Tariff Commission is absolutely dominated by the State Department and times its report on these questions according to the will of the State Department?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think their functions have become largely subservient to those of the State Department and the other two committees to which I have referred particularly in this field.

Mr. TREADWAY. In connection with the Czechoslovakian matter, is it not a fact that if the authorities there realized that we were sending agents to get information from them

they would put every obstacle possible in the way of getting that information?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I cannot see anything to be gained from the point of view of those producing shoes in Czechoslovakia in disclosing more than the minimum information in this connection.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes; I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman certainly does not want to convey the impression that the Tariff Commission is dominated in any way by the Secretary of State.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think, as I tried to state, that the functions of the Commission have become largely subservient in this field to those of the State Department, the committee on trade agreements, and the committee on reciprocity information.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman knows, of course, that I come from a great shoe center myself, the greatest shoe center in the world. I am just as much interested in this reciprocal treaty with Czechoslovakia from the standpoint of shoes as is the gentleman. Does not the gentleman feel that our commercial attaché in Czechoslovakia should have this information in reference to the cost of production in that country?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think he should, and it seems to me inconceivable that we should not be able to arrive at a fair basis of comparative costs of production in the period of time which has elapsed since July 9, 1937.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I just wanted to make an observation on this shoe matter with reference to the answer of the gentleman from Missouri. I think if anybody from the Tariff Commission is going over there to investigate cost of production they should get somebody who has familiarity with the shoe business, who knows the technique of shoemaking, who knows something about costs, inventories, and other matters affecting the industry; but apparently that has not been done thus far so that the information we have gotten does not necessarily represent expert opinion on the subject by any means.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, from a more general standpoint, the action of the Commission in this connection seems to be consistent with the statement of the Commission which also appears in the RECORD and which to me is an amazing statement; namely, that the Tariff Commission, although the adviser of the State Department and others responsible for our so-called trade agreements, has made no investigation of foreign costs of production for items in respect to which protection has been slashed under trade agreements concluded with countries from which we obtain no less than 43 percent of our entire importations. It would seem, Mr. Chairman, that the administration is content to slash protection with its eyes shut but is unwilling to increase protection no matter how essential it may appear to be except after most laborious and at times apparently fruitless investigation.

If a trade agreement is concluded with Czechoslovakia prior to a determination of comparative costs of production; if it is concluded in such terms as to preclude the possibility of increased protection against the importation of cemented shoes, those responsible for the action, in my judgment, will not only fly squarely in the face of the manifest intent of the Senate in adopting the resolution of August 19, but they will proceed without information which is vital for the proper protection of the thousands of workers and their families dependent upon the boot and shoe industry of the Nation. This comment, it seems to me, applies as well to other items and other trade agreements.

Incidentally, in view of the order which has just been more or less dragged out of the Department of Labor, as I understand it, to the effect that no Government agency will purchase shoes in respect to which a minimum wage of

less than 40 cents has been paid, it will be exceedingly interesting to see whether if this trade agreement is concluded, the same stipulation is insisted upon in respect to shoes produced in Czechoslovakia or any other nation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Does the gentleman want to go on record in this Congress as disagreeing with and not being satisfied with the reciprocity agreements that our country has made with foreign countries?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thought my position was clear in that respect.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Please answer me directly.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am answering the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Say yes or no.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will say yes to the gentleman. I am glad to go on record as feeling that much in connection with those treaties has not been helpful to the Nation.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Then you are against reciprocity agreements?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am certainly against the present methods.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Then the gentleman is not in agreement with the present regime?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have opposed the present methods of putting the so-called reciprocal-trade agreements into effect.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Tell me yes or no.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I answer the gentleman in the affirmative as emphatically as he desires.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. I thank the gentleman.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, there is another matter about which I wanted to say something, and that is the Tennessee Valley Authority appropriation carried in this bill. The Tennessee Valley Authority asks for \$40,000,000, plus authority to contract obligations to the extent of \$4,000,000. This compares with an appropriation last year of \$40,166,270 and a contract authorization of \$4,000,000.

The ultimate cost of this project is now estimated at about \$505,000,000. Of this amount \$190,000,000 has been appropriated to date and \$170,000,000 obligated.

The project contemplates the construction of 12 dams, 3 of which are now constructed, 4 under construction, and 5 not yet embarked upon. It also contemplates the construction of power stations or substations, as they are called, and hundreds of miles of transmission lines. It also includes a fertilizer and soil-conservation program, a national-defense program, and certain other expenditures for regional studies of other items.

The proposal of the T. V. A. presented to your committee includes, among other things, a substantial increase in the sums to be made available for preliminary investigations in respect to the dams at Watts Bar and Coulter Shoals. The request is for \$671,000 as compared with an appropriation for this year of \$265,000 or thereabouts.

There is also included expenditure in reference to dams constructed or under construction of some \$28,000,000.

It includes an item of about \$3,000,000 for the start of work on the Gilbertsville project. It includes about \$5,760,000 for substations and transmission lines which the Authority is unable to define or specify at this time. It includes about \$3,000,000 for fertilizer and soil conservation, \$211,000 for national defense, about \$218,000 for regional studies, and about \$40,000 for other expenditure.

Your committee has recommended two reductions in this appropriation. First, in regard to fertilizer and soil conservation it has recommended reductions aggregating about \$300,000 in respect to items which will be found on page 1020 of the hearings, the committee being careful to avoid cutting the actual manufacturing operations of the Author-

ity. The reductions have been made in items covering chemical engineering, research, and experimentation; controlled soil and fertilizer investigations; research and development of farm equipment; and reforestation and erosion control. No reductions have been made in regard to major plant and demonstration units, phosphate rock production, manufacturing operation, or farm unit and large-scale test demonstrations.

About \$3,000,000 will be allowed for this program if the committee's position is sustained. The committee does not believe that the work in this connection will be hampered by the cut recommended.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Listening to the remarks of the gentleman, I am impressed with the possibility, indeed the probability, that expenditures by the T. V. A. for soil conservation, forest conservation, and other investigations relating to the fertility of soil must of necessity duplicate the work of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman that that was taken into consideration in connection with the action taken by the committee. It was felt there was some duplication and this afforded an additional justification for the reductions to which I have just referred.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman state to the committee and give the committee an explanation, if he can, what use the \$211,000 out of the \$40,000,000 is to be put in the interest of national defense?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman that on page 1034 of the hearings he will find a complete breakdown of the item which is authorized. Generally speaking the item includes maintenance of idle property, construction and rehabilitation, general equipment and inventories, and mineral investigations.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is that all under the head of national defense?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the reduction recommended in respect to the Gilbertsville Dam, may I say the committee eliminated about \$2,600,000 requested to start the actual construction of this dam. It increased by \$100,000 the amount requested for preliminary investigations in this connection, the thought being that the construction might well be deferred for the time being, while at the same time a more adequate investigation of the feasibility of the project might be conducted.

The action is consistent with the message of the President of the United States to the Congress in which he appealed to the Congress to—

Join hands with the Executive in curtailing any Federal activity which can be eliminated, curtailed, or even postponed without harming necessary Government functions or the safety of the Nation from a national point of view.

The cost of this project is estimated at \$112,000,000. In other words, to start this project now is tantamount to increasing the national debt to that extent. Moreover, the project is a tremendous undertaking, and it is highly important we be sure that the right course is followed in constructing whatever dam may be constructed at this point. The dam contemplated is 8,600 feet long, it is 150 feet high, and is going to have a normal reservoir area of 160,000 acres. It will create a lake which will have a shore line of something like 2,000 miles, and is intended to control the river for a distance of approximately 185 miles.

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

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

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman tell us if there are any deposits of marble in the area which will be inundated?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I assume the gentleman has in mind the deposits of marble which are now the subject of contention before a court or a board of appraisers. I think these deposits have already been flooded by the Norris Dam.

May I emphasize, Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a real difference of expert opinion as to whether or not the type of dam suggested for Gilbertsville is in fact the right type of dam to erect there. At the recent hearing in Chattanooga I understand Colonel Putnam, a former district engineer in Chicago, testified to the contrary, recommending a low-dam construction from a navigation standpoint, at a large saving to the Federal Government. In the course of the same hearing I understand Mr. Ford Kurtz, formerly of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and resident engineer of the United States Nitrate No. 2 steam plant, also testified to the contrary from a flood-control standpoint, recommending detention reservoirs at and above Chattanooga at a large saving to the Federal Government.

At page 1068 of the hearings Members will find a statement by Capt. Donald Wright, river pilot and editor of the Waterways Journal in St. Louis, before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, emphasizing the dangers from a navigation standpoint of the proposed Gilbertsville project. It is also urged, I believe, that the decision of the Army engineers in respect to the Ohio River system of control, with some 87 detention reservoirs, is evidence against the construction which is now contemplated.

I may point out in passing, in this connection, that the T. V. A. a year ago was itself uncertain as to what is the most desirable location for this project, that it examined no less than five different locations, and that, as appears in the letter from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] at page 1076 of the hearings, the T. V. A. officials increased between September and December of this year by approximately 24 percent their estimate as to the volume the project contemplated.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, will he state before he concludes if the sums requested for the development of the river have been broken down to show what amounts may be chargeable to navigation, flood control, and power?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I regret to say they have not been broken down in this manner. I will come to that point in just a moment.

It seems to me there is clearly no urgency in starting this particular project. The record indicates the population served amounts to only about 2,000,000. Navigation over the river is only 2,000,000 tons, about 54 percent of this being Government freight. From the power angle there is already available a surplus of about 150 percent, as compared with present demands.

It seems to me the course of wisdom to postpone the start of this construction and satisfy ourselves, preferably through a check by the Army engineers, or some other independent body, that we are not making a mistake and proceeding along lines which are not for the best interests of the country.

Mr. Chairman, the T. V. A. is, of course, charged with unfair competition with private industry. It is charged with competing unfairly, both directly and indirectly, through municipal distribution plants financed at less than cost by P. W. A. and through power produced at less than cost by T. V. A. It is also charged with making available at public expense low rates for large industry, which can move into the T. V. A. area, with consequent loss of employment for thousands of workers in the coal mines, as well as other workers.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield very briefly.

Mr. TABER. Did the committee make any study of the operation of the contract between the T. V. A. and the Aluminum Co. of America and the Monsanto Chemical Co., which provides the T. V. A. shall furnish electricity without any regular monthly charge as is required of other people?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman I believe there is no detailed analysis of these contracts, but the situation to which the gentleman refers, and which he and I examined to some extent in the spring when the T. V. A. was before the subcommittee on deficiencies, still persists.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am sorry, I cannot yield.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make one final point with respect to the T. V. A. I wish the Members of the House would read a part at least of the testimony before your subcommittee and see if they are satisfied with the responses given to the questions submitted by members of the committee.

Regardless of the charges to which I have referred, and which, of course, raise fundamental questions of policy, I submit that Congress and the country are entitled to an administration of T. V. A. which is both cooperative and competent. I submit that any engineering concern undertaking this work or any part of it could have promptly estimated an allocation of costs to power, flood control, and navigation, as suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE]. I submit that any concern proposing to carry power to this or that community, as the T. V. A. has done, could surely have stated what power was available in a community as well as the demand for power in that community. I submit that any businesslike organization would have made a balance sheet of its operations and would have had its accounts audited. And yet, Mr. Chairman, after more than 4 years of operation T. V. A. is unable or unwilling to make any allocation of its costs as between navigation, flood control, and power in respect to any one of the projects constructed or to be constructed. T. V. A. is unable or unwilling to give any statement as to power facilities or power demand, before T. V. A., in the communities which it is now serving or is about to serve with power. T. V. A. is either unable or unwilling to present to the Congress a balance sheet of its operations, and it has failed to obtain any proper audit of its expenditures for the year 1934 or any subsequent year. The question arises in my mind as to how long a situation of this character is to be tolerated by Congress.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. The facts just disclosed by the gentleman from Massachusetts would certainly warrant an investigation, a thorough and full and complete investigation, of T. V. A. activities.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I agree with the gentleman, and I understand such an investigation has been proposed.

Mr. SHORT. I take it the gentleman from Massachusetts would prefer to have that investigation made by an impartial body rather than turned over to the Federal Power Commission?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I would be very happy to have it made by an impartial body.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am sorry I have not the time.

Mr. Chairman, there are many other things that might be discussed in connection with this bill, but my time is exhausted.

Under leave to extend, I insert at this point certain brief comments in respect to other agencies:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The testimony of the Civil Service Commission appears on page 358 of the hearings. It shows, among other things, an increase in the personnel of the Federal Government since 1932 of 263,000, or more than 50 percent. The figures furnished by the Commission are as follows:

Employees	1932	1937 (June 30)
Classified	467,181	532,073
Unclassified	111,070	309,591
Total	578,231	841,664

The total does not include the legislative, judiciary, Army, Navy, District of Columbia, or about 30,000 employees in the C. C. C.

THE NATIONAL RELATIONS BOARD

The testimony in behalf of the National Relations Board appears on page 729 of the hearings. Explanation of the Board in respect to complaints as to its partisanship and incompetency is included. The manner in which the complaints of experienced labor officials is dealt with by the Board merits consideration.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The testimony in behalf of the Securities and Exchange Commission will be found on page 670 of the hearings. The statement of the Chairman of the Commission in respect to charges recently made by those interested in or subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission is also worthy of notation.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The testimony in behalf of the Railroad Retirement Board appears on page 596 of the hearings. The Board is now operating under the 1937 legislation. It estimates that 85,000 workers will be eligible to benefits in 1939, with an addition of about 15,000 a year thereafter. The average annual annuity is \$68.16 a month.

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

The testimony in behalf of the Social Security Board will be found on page 1078 of the hearings. The full amount requested for benefits payable has been allowed. The record indicates an estimated increase in personnel from 6,817 in 1937 to 9,066 in 1939. It also indicates existence of 12 regional offices and 324 other local offices. Particular attention is called to the contribution of some \$18,000,000 to what is described as an expanded Wagner-Peyser employment service in the several States and to the investment of taxes for old-age insurance and unemployment compensation, dealt with so effectively by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] on the floor of the House on November 24 last.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The testimony in behalf of the Veterans' Administration will be found on page 1 of the hearings. A reduction of \$38,000,000 in the total appropriation is explained in large measure by the termination of military and naval insurance payments. Additional beds to the extent of 10,498 are provided for in the bill, as well as additional hospital construction to the extent of \$4,500,000.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The testimony in behalf of the Commodity Credit Corporation will be found on page 788. The Corporation reports an actual loss of \$23,000,000 and an estimated loss based on present market values of \$75,000,000. It has on hand more than 3,000,000 bales of cotton and anticipates a total of between five and six million bales.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The testimony in behalf of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will be found on page 1184 of the hearings. The record indicates authorizations divided substantially as follows:

Loans and investments.....	\$9,200,000,000
Transfers.....	1,000,000,000
Relief.....	1,800,000,000

Of the \$9,200,000,000 loans and investments, the report makes a further division as follows:

Canceled.....	\$1,700,000,000
Disbursed.....	6,600,000,000
Repaid (72 percent).....	4,800,000,000

It is understood that the Chairman of the Corporation desires to cancel the items for transfers and relief. It would seem that this should be done in fairness to the Corporation as the items are nothing more than concealed appropriations.

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

The testimony in respect to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation will be found on page 1288 of the hearings. The last loan of the Corporation was made on June 12, 1936. Nevertheless, the Corporation asks for a personnel of 13,239 and an appropriation of \$28,000,000, as compared with a personnel of 14,942 and an appropriation of \$30,000,000 for the current fiscal year. Despite the fact that it is in liquidation, the

record indicates a Property Management Division costing \$5,000,000, and reflecting an increase of \$1,400,000 in 2 years; a Loan Service Division costing \$5,000,000; a Reconstruction and Appraisal Division costing \$3,000,000; 409 offices in the field; a large expenditure for legal services, partly in respect to personnel of the Corporation, partly in respect to other attorneys; and a printing and binding item of \$550,000. Justification of the Corporation is based largely on properties acquired by foreclosure and otherwise numbering today about 58,000 and estimated for 1939 at about 145,000. Those on hand are given a value of \$293,000,000. The organization seems top-heavy for its work in liquidation.

In conclusion, I want to endorse, 100 percent, the recommendation of the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], looking to a slight increase in the force of assistants in the Appropriations Committee. I spoke in favor of that principle several years ago on the floor of the House. I believe it would repay itself many times over, and I hope when in concrete form it comes before the House for consideration it will receive the unanimous approval of the House. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] has expired; all time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, namely:

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

Mr. Chairman, I cannot conceive there is a single Member of Congress who is not fully aware of the situation that not only confronts the President but the country. My barometer is personal contact, the press, and my mail. I can reach but one conclusion. If there is not cooperation from every class we will find ourselves receding until we reach a condition such as confronted us back in the real dark days after the crash of 1929. That there is much to be done you cannot deny.

When the President addressed us a few days ago I not only weighed his words with care but I studied his expressions, and therein I found even more than his utterances. I saw pictured a situation that is giving him a great deal of concern.

How could one more honestly and seriously have asked for cooperation, not only from us but from the people of this country? The question now is whether we propose to give the assistance which he seeks. So far as I am concerned my answer is "Yes."

Our first test comes on this bill. I have always said, and I repeat now, the Civilian Conservation Corps has been one of the most beneficial activities proposed by the administration. I am ready at the moment to make it a permanent organization, and I predict that it will not be long before it is made a permanent set-up. Its value to the youth of the country cannot be estimated. It has improved the morale as well as the health, physical and mental, of those who have been fortunate enough to have been selected for service. Words fail me in even attempting to praise the work of the Director, Robert Fechner.

It galls me to even think of reducing this appropriation, but I assert this is the first test of cooperation which the President asked. If we desert him at the outset, what will we do with his other recommendations?

You need not tell me of the value of the C. C. C.—that I know. You need not tell me that the improvements the corps is responsible for are lasting—that I know. You need not tell me deserving veterans and young men with dependents in my district will be affected—that I know. Even with this knowledge I am willing to recognize the necessity of making this outstanding organization suffer a reduction in appropriation in order to cooperate with the President.

I weigh my words when I tell you our action on this, the first appropriation bill, is being watched, and will be reflected throughout the Nation, if not throughout the world. It will be our answer to the President's appeal. If by any chance he is rebuked—and I think rebuke is the proper word—then the people of this country will say, "Why should we support and cooperate with the President when his overwhelming Democratic majority in the Congress refuses to do so?"

Support of his recommendations will go a long way toward securing the cooperation from all citizens, which is so much needed at the moment.

Like you, I have received hundreds of letters asking for a balanced Budget. The way to approach a balanced Budget is to stop spending. This cannot be done overnight, in a week, a month, or a year, but we will never reach the goal unless we start, and the hour has arrived to make that start. I am more interested, however, in letting the country know that we, especially members of his party, have ceased to let political expediency govern us in acting on legislation, but by our votes here serve notice that this Democratic Congress is going to do its share to bring about general cooperation, which the President so earnestly appeals for.

I have nothing but contempt for those who will wire and write us to reduce expenditures, and then when suggestions are advanced to reduce some appropriation in which they are interested, for selfish reasons, tell us to find some other way to cut, but leave this or that appropriation alone.

I represent a constituency that will be as much affected by reducing these appropriations as any of your people.

A few weeks ago when I tried to reduce interest rates on small loans under the housing bill, which is now in conference, a Member said my people lived in marble palaces. I did not get an opportunity to answer him, but I will tell you now the only marble palaces in my district are mausoleums erected in the large cemeteries which are in my district. The great majority of my constituents are employees, not employers.

A moment ago I stated this is our first test. It is most important that we stand behind the committee now. You will recall the chairman of the Committee on Roads, in answer to the President's request for a reduction in the annual appropriation for Federal aid for highways, said, in effect, he would go along if there was a general cut. If we now refuse to start the program, will he not be justified in refusing to agree to a reduction in the authorization for roads?

If we were confronted with the question of retaining either the C. C. C. or the highway appropriation—only one to survive—I frankly tell you I feel the C. C. C. would be of more value to the country, but still I propose to support the President and the committee and vote for the reduction recommended. If we get an opportunity to vote to amend the authorization for roads, I will vote to reduce that appropriation as the President has asked.

I know these are not what can be called popular votes, but it is the bitter medicine that makes us well when we are ill, not the sweet. There is not a Member of this House who cannot justify supporting the President in his efforts to reduce expenditures if called upon to do so.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much displeased with some of the increases in this bill. If I had my way I would reduce every appropriation except the so-called fixed charges, such as interest on the public debt, veterans' appropriation, and so forth, and not even think of voting increases, other than possibly for our national defense.

As chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and as one who knows something about the manner we have been running our Government for

25 years, I say now and without fear of contradiction, there is not a Government agency that is not overmanned. I have been giving a great deal of study to this question. It is my purpose in the very near future, as soon as the reorganization legislation is out of the way, to ask the members of my committee to do some very constructive investigation work with a view to bringing to light conditions that will prove my contention. The thought I have is to appoint subcommittees and start investigations that will include every Government agency. I will want the subcommittees to visit each agency and make a detailed investigation of its activities. If our committee had some outstanding investigators, I am sure we could disclose conditions that would save the Government millions of dollars. I know the Members have little time for investigations, but I am in hopes we can find some way to make some personal inspections that will be beneficial.

This is in line with the remarks made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] and other gentlemen of the House. I may say that they are exactly right in saying that we should have information with respect to appropriations other than the information furnished by the department heads when they come before our committee. We should make our own personal investigations. I would have my committee divided up into subcommittees and go from place to place to see what is going on, and by no means let the departments know in advance we are coming, because whenever you do that you are going to find there will be a set-up there that will show you how busy they happen to be at the moment. They will be digging out files and covering their desks with papers.

Mr. Chairman, this is a most serious question. As I have said, this is the first of the great appropriation bills. I have stood by the Committee on Appropriations time and again when it has hurt, and I am going to stand by them now, and I hope the House will follow the recommendations of the committee and reduce expenditures as the President has asked.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman has mentioned the C. C. C. camps and has referred to the work the camps are doing. Does not the gentleman feel it would be more equitable and fair to have each department of government, say, take a 10-percent cut rather than have the Civilian Conservation Corps take a cut of \$123,000,000 as proposed?

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman well knows from his experience as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and especially his experience when he handled the bill for the Department of the Interior last year on the floor of the House during the sickness of the chairman, it is absolutely impossible to have a 10-percent cut all the way down the line. For instance, suppose you ordered a 10-percent cut upon the interest on the public debt and we failed to pay 10 percent of the interest that would be due, the credit of this Government all over the world would be worth nothing. The same thing is true of the veterans' appropriation and other fixed charges.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Then the gentleman is willing for other departments of the Government to have a decided increase in this bill and have all or practically all of the cut taken by the Civilian Conservation Corps?

Mr. COCHRAN. So far as I am concerned I say to the gentleman that outside of fixed charges and possibly an increase in our national defense, and I am for adequate national defense, I say we should not increase the appropriations of any of the Government agencies at this session of Congress.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Would the gentleman go on record as advocating a cut of \$123,000,000 in the C. C. C. camps that are doing the finest kind of work?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am not only willing to go on record by voice, but by vote, in order to comply with the suggestion of the President of the United States, who pleads with us, as Democrats, who led us to victory, to help him start the ball rolling to reach a balanced Budget, and now is the time to start it, and if the gentleman throws him down on this appropriation, he will regret it in the future.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. I am not going to throw him down, but I am going to help 25,000 or 30,000 boys to retain their manhood.

Mr. COCHRAN. Help the Nation as a whole by cooperating with the President.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

For compensation of the President of the United States, \$75,000. For compensation of the Vice President of the United States, \$15,000.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I shall not object this time, but I hope no other Member will make any such request, because we are very anxious to proceed with the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to discuss, as I stated, in 5 minutes or less, the question of the vote this morning of some of us—and I speak only for myself—on the so-called Ludlow amendment. I am concerned lest some foreign nation or foreign individual or individuals may look at the size of the vote this morning in favor of bringing that bill to the floor and think that we have weakened in this country in our moral fiber in our self-defense. I voted to bring this bill out. Some 2 weeks ago or more I wrote a public letter to the *Hartford Courant* stating that I was opposed to the Ludlow amendment and giving my reasons therefor. I was still opposed to the Ludlow amendment this morning, and I would have voted against the Ludlow amendment had it come to a vote for or against it. However, believing that committees of the House should promptly consider matters as important as the Ludlow bill and bring them before this House for consideration and discussion, I voted to bring the Ludlow amendment out. There undoubtedly may have been other Members who voted as I did. Therefore, as I stated at the outset, lest some foreign nation or nations or individual or individuals think that the large vote this morning to bring the Ludlow resolution out showed we are weakening in our moral fiber in our own self-defense, I take the floor at this time to explain but not to apologize for that vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all printing and binding for the Central Statistical Board, \$1,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The Central Statistical Board was established about 2 years ago for the purpose of coordinating statistical work and perhaps reducing expenditures of the Government along that line. Frankly I have yet to see any results from the operations of that Board. The cost of gathering statistics has gone on increasing and increasing. In the Treasury Department alone I know of places where in the course of the 2 years it has increased \$250,000. There seems to be no result from this operation. I am wondering if the chairman of the committee would not feel that this Board would get along to better advantage if it were carried as it was last year at about half this figure.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, the work of the Board was greatly disturbed last year because of the fact that its appropriation was cut out entirely and its personnel had to

be recruited by borrowing personnel from the departments, but the gentleman will find in the hearings, if he has not already familiarized himself with them, that the Board has made a very creditable showing and I believe the gentleman's colleagues will agree with that. While the Board has not accomplished everything that we had hoped it would accomplish, it has done a great deal toward preventing the duplication of statistical research in many departments, which is of course the primary purpose of the Board, and in stopping a great many relief statistical projects they have more than justified their existence.

I believe there is real need for such an agency. In answer to the gentleman specifically, I believe the appropriation should be carried as we have carried it in the bill and I believe the subcommittee is unanimous in its opinion in that regard.

Mr. TABER. I shall not at this time offer an amendment to the bill because of things I know about and which will be brought out next week but were not called to the attention of the committee until Saturday.

Unless they meet the responsibility that is theirs, next year I shall move to strike out the entire appropriation. I think that this board has completely failed in coordinating the handling of the gathering of statistics on the part of executive Departments. It may have done something on the special alphabetical agencies, but insofar as the regular Departments are concerned it has been a complete failure.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman speaks of next year. I am wondering if the gentleman is certain he is going to be here next year.

Mr. TABER. Perhaps the gentleman can prophesy better than I. Maybe the gentleman himself will not be here next year.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

For all authorized and necessary expenses to carry into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1937, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the purchase and exchange of law books, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; rents in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the purchase (including exchange), operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles to be used only for official purposes; hire, with or without personal service of work animals, animal-drawn and motor-propelled vehicles, and watercraft; printing and binding; travel expenses, including not to exceed \$2,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Corps when specifically authorized by the Director; construction, improvement, repair, and maintenance of buildings, but the cost of any building erected hereunder shall not exceed \$25,000; and all other necessary expenses; \$226,331,000, of which \$133,467,000 shall be available only for pay, subsistence, clothing (and repair thereof), transportation, and hospitalization of enrollees: *Provided*, That an enrollee in the Civilian Conservation Camp, or member, or former member of the Military Establishment, who shall furnish blood from his or her veins for transfusion to the veins of an enrollee or discharged enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps undergoing treatment in a Government or civilian hospital authorized to treat such patient, shall be entitled to be paid therefor a reasonable sum not to exceed \$50.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment, which I have discussed with the gentleman from Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: On page 10, line 24, after "\$50", strike out the period and insert "for each of such transfusions undergone."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, it is quite plain from the language at the bottom of page 10 that the intent is to allow up to \$50 for each transfusion undergone, but it does not read so; it simply reads "a sum not to exceed \$50"; yet the man or woman might undergo a number of transfusions in any given year. I therefore offer this perfecting amendment, which will allow \$50 for each blood transfusion voluntarily undergone by each enrollee in the Civilian Conservation

Corps or member or former member of the Military Establishment who shall furnish his or her blood by transfusion to some sufferer needing it. I have discussed this perfecting amendment with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], in charge of this bill.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: On page 10, line 14, after the word "expenses", strike out "\$226,331,000" and insert "\$271,331,000"; also, after the word "which", insert \$178,-467,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the pending amendment is to reduce the appropriation for the Civilian Conservation Corps \$80,000,000 under last year's appropriation, instead of \$124,000,000 as proposed in this bill. Considering the great work these camps have done an \$80,000,000 cut is, in my judgment, entirely too drastic. I proposed in the committee and on this floor that the Civilian Conservation Corps take the same cut as other departments of Government.

Those who heard my remarks last Thursday on this matter of so vital importance to the people of this country, know that the committee has seen fit to make practically all the cut, all the saving effected in this bill, at the expense of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Mr. WOODRUM. Not the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, yes; the committee cannot escape its responsibility in connection with these appropriations. It is no excuse to merely say we followed the Budget estimates.

I suggested a few moments ago, when I interrogated the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], that I was perfectly willing that the C. C. C. camps should take a reasonable cut, but it occurs to me that for the Civilian Conservation Corps to have 300 and more camps abandoned at one time with a program being formulated to abandon at least 300 more next year and turn them over to some relief agency which is undoubtedly in the making, is not what I feel this Congress or the country wants done. Many of you remember that last year a proposal was made to reduce unreasonably the Civilian Conservation Corps at a time when there were 2,400 camps, all of them filled. Some of us made a desperate effort to prevent that cut at that time. We finally reached a gentleman's agreement that if those of us—and there were some 260 Members of Congress who had agreed to oppose any further cut—we were given to understand by leaders and others in authority that if we would drop our fight that we had the votes to win at that time that an agreement would be worked out whereby there would be a minimum of 1,500 camps. So the bill, you will recall, to make the C. C. C. camps permanent was sent to this body. That bill, like some other administration measures, was not prepared originally by a committee of Congress.

A bill was prepared and handed us to make a permanent institution out of the C. C. C. camps and the number was to be fixed at 1,500. Those of us who supported that bill did so in the belief that the Civilian Conservation Corps camps were to remain at 1,500; but like a clap of thunder from a clear sky there came to the committee from the Budget another proposal to cut not 10 percent, not 15 percent, not 20 percent, but 35 percent of the Civilian Conservation Corps camps, and they proposed to turn out between now and July 1, 50,000 to 75,000 boys on the highways and byways to look for jobs, they, of course, will be unable to find. That reduces the Conservation Corps enrollees from 300,000 to possibly 225,000, not 250,000 as the Budget told us, but 225,000 if the camps are to be maintained at the present high standard. It means simply that these boys have got to be fed. If they are not fed by the Civilian Conservation Corps they are going to be fed on relief.

Now get this straight so there will not be any misunderstanding about it: As these camps are abandoned they will be turned over to the relief agency to become "flop houses," and the Civilian Conservation Corps which has from the beginning up until now been a very popular institution will become the laughing stock of the Nation. What do you propose to do about it?

Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. We should put some provision in the bill guaranteeing that the money we appropriate for this purpose will be spent for this purpose.

Mr. BOILEAU. Yes. That brings to mind the experience of last year. Last year we appropriated \$350,000,000. By Executive order that amount was reduced to \$315,000,000; in other words, \$35,000,000 of what Congress appropriated for this purpose was recovered into the Treasury.

If you are going to increase the appropriation, it seems to me, to be consistent, we must put language in the amendment to insure that the increase we put in will not be taken off by Executive order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I should be glad to see that done if it were possible to do so. I know many camps were abandoned last year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, camps were abandoned right in the midst of projects. They were abandoned after having been there for 6 months or a year and at a time when they were in the midst of a very useful and important project. They have been ordered abandoned in many instances with only a few hours' notice. There are now some 1,400 abandoned camps that were set up at the expense of an average of \$25,000 each. They are standing there, many of them on or near Federal or State highways, like signboards to the passers-by as a silent tribute to the extravagance of the New Deal. In a great majority of cases those 1,400 camps were abandoned before the projects were completed. In many instances they had hardly gotten under way. You will recall there were 2,900 camps at the peak of enrollment. There have been instances where they were right in the midst of a tree-planting program. I have reason to believe that Mr. Fechner would like to go back to such places and finish the job.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would not affect the overhead expense, but would take care of many thousands of young men who are begging for an opportunity to earn a livelihood. Remember that under this bill you are proposing to cut the rations for the enrollees to the extent of a million dollars a year, and I am unable to believe that any Member of Congress really wants to do that.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware, who I am glad to say is an enthusiastic supporter of the C. C. C. camps.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Will the gentleman also tell the Congress that in addition to what the enrollee is doing for his country, \$25 out of the \$30 goes for relief? We have to face the fact we need relief in this country today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is a very important consideration. You are not saving any appreciable amount of money here. Do not fool yourselves into believing you are saving this amount of money, because each of these boys is sending \$25 a month home to a father or mother, many of whom are aged, many of whom are unable to help themselves and nearly all of whom were actually taken off the relief rolls when their sons entered these camps. By your vote today you propose to place many of them back on relief.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that the C. C. C. camps have taken care of a great many boys. I question somewhat the benefits we have received, but it has really taken care of some of our boys and kept them off the streets. This has to end some time. We have got to put the boys to more useful work. It is proposed to reduce the highway fund that is being paid to the different States. I am hoping that we may save some money in this bill and reduce the expenditures so that we may continue the highway appropriations. If we could continue the highway work and take the boys from the C. C. C. camps and put them to constructing farm to market highways I think it would be much more beneficial to the young men and to the country. We need highways throughout all of the country. These boys can do this useful work and it will not cost any more than keeping them in camp. I am in hopes if we cut down the C. C. C. appropriation we will not have to cut down the highway appropriation and we will be much better off in this Nation than to cut down the highway fund and continue the C. C. C. camps.

[Here the gavel fell.]

C. C. C. PAYS DIVIDENDS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]. A reduction of 35 percent in the C. C. C. appropriation, coming on top of the reduction already made, means just exactly what the gentleman suggested—serious loss by stopping work in progress. On account of the last cut, the work in two camps adjoining my district was stopped. One project was a flood-control project. The work was stopped before the riprapping was completed, which means a great deal of the work done and money spent will be wasted unless it can be resumed before damage occurs.

The last gentleman spoke about highway construction. May I say that some of the most important road construction we have had in western South Dakota through the national forests has been done by the C. C. C. boys. This is paying dividends, because the construction of trails and roads through the woods means a great deal in the prevention and control of fires.

Mr. LORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LORD. In my section the C. C. C. boys are not allowed to construct highways. They may build roads and trails through the woods.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The roads they have built in my country have been very valuable. On account of these roads they have been able to control forest fires. During the dry years we had some of the most threatening fires that we have ever had. Only the presence of the C. C. C. boys and the control that they exercised prevented greater loss. If we can control the fires in our national forests it means a dollar and cents saving and benefit to the country.

January 1 saw an enrollment to fill vacancies that developed during the October-January period. Figures furnished me by the State director of social security showed there were over four times the number of applicants to fill the available vacancies. What are you going to do with the other boys? Turn them over to other relief agencies?

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma is very conservative. Compromising at the figure he suggests still means a cut of \$80,000,000. That is a heavier cut than is proposed for any other agency and we will lose the supposed saving in other ways. I therefore urge you to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]. It will save 150 camps.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. Chairman, I may observe in regard to the amendment offered by my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr.

JOHNSON] that the operation of the C. C. C. camps in our portion of the country has convinced me this is the best governmental agency we have for the relief of people in hard circumstances. I presume the people residing in the Midwestern section of the country have felt the depression more than those in any other section of the United States, due to the very severe droughts which have prevailed in that section for the last 4 or 5 years.

Let me illustrate what happened in my district. Last year when recruits were being sought for camps in the extreme Northwest, better than a thousand young men from my congressional district were recruited and taken to Oregon, Washington, and other Northwestern States to fill the quotas. The reason these young men could be recruited in my section of the country was that they could not find any work to do. The C. C. C. has really offered an opportunity for a young man who wanted to work, who had some energy, and who wanted to contribute to the support of his parents and home folks, to join one of the camps. We in Oklahoma filled the State quota and could have filled it several times. We sent a thousand or more men from my district to the west coast. If there is a further cut in C. C. C. operations in my district, it is going to mean, on the basis of the thousand men who were taken from my district to the west coast, and figuring four or five to the family who must resort to the dole, that four or five thousand additional people must be taken care of by the Government of the United States.

I do not know of a more unhappy cut the Committee on Appropriations could have recommended than the cut in the appropriation for the C. C. C. camps. I certainly believe, although it may not be so gratifying to the Budget, the Committee on Appropriations, or the President of the United States, we ought to take into consideration the facts which are facing the people in the various sections of the Union and try to do the right thing by them. The right thing would be not to decrease the number of camps but either increase them or let us continue to recruit boys whose families are in distress and who want work and cannot get it. We have no industries in Oklahoma. Just as sure as I am standing on this floor now, if you carry through this cut, you will force 5,000 or 6,000 people in my district back onto the dole.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MASSINGALE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The cost for each one of these boys per year is approximately \$1,200. Does not the gentleman believe this \$1,200 a year put into W. P. A. would do his people more good?

Mr. MASSINGALE. No; I do not. I believe the best thing that can happen to them is to employ them in the C. C. C. camps. These camps are doing a good service and are needed. Furthermore, the enrollees in the C. C. C. are able to and are required to contribute directly to their families.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that request cover this amendment only?

Mr. WOODRUM. Just this amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. I have no objection, Mr. Chairman.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I can subscribe heartily to everything which has been said on yesterday or today about the Civilian Conservation Corps, the fine work it has done, the splendid job Mr. Fechner has done, and the desirability of keeping the corps operating, but I want to take my lead from the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MASSINGALE], who just preceded me. We must remember the people of the country and try to do the square thing by them. Of course, the objective is not

to put boys in C. C. C. camps and keep them there, but to try so to reconstruct the economic condition of this country there will be profitable labor for them in legitimate business and industry all over the country. Unless somebody, some Congress, and some administration, some time or other, and not in the too far distant future, gets the idea in their heads you cannot keep on spending more money than you are taking in, there will be no industry or business to give these fine boys work anywhere. [Applause.]

I fancy, Mr. Chairman, you do not have to make any argument to the President of the United States about the value of the Civilian Conservation Corps, because it is his baby. This is one of the finest things he has ever done. The President states he would like to maintain the Corps during the next year at the level of 1,200 camps, which will furnish employment to 250,000 fine American boys. Of course, there will be young men who will want to enlist in these camps but will not be able to enlist in them, just as there are men who want to get on W. P. A. whom we have never been able to take on. The idea never has been to furnish a place for all of them, but to take a portion of them in order to take up some of the slack and relieve some of the unemployment, with the hope that others might find employment elsewhere. The President has asked us for 1,200 camps for 250,000 enrollees. There is to be no diminution in the quality of the food to be given these boys, and they are to have the same type of clothing. The camps will be kept at the same high standard.

I believe it would be a terrible thing and a very bad precedent to set to override, on the first amendment which is offered to this first appropriation bill of the session, the specific recommendations of the President, when we are trying here to reduce governmental activities. This is the only place you can save money, not by making a little indiscriminate, illogical 10-percent cut here and there. When you can cut out governmental activities without hurting the cause of recovery, then you are getting somewhere in the effort to balance the Budget.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Can the gentleman justify his position with regard to cutting down the number of C. C. C. camps, when the President has come out in favor of giving a billion dollars more for W. P. A. work, and when the gentleman knows in his heart the C. C. C. is the best project the administration has ever undertaken?

Mr. WOODRUM. I am trying to justify my position. I think the C. C. C. is a fine thing.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. Let the gentleman justify his position, then.

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not know whether I have done so or not, but I am trying to do it.

Mr. ALLEN of Delaware. The gentleman cannot do it, and he knows he cannot do it. He cannot justify his position.

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

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MASSINGALE. I may say to the gentleman from Virginia I realize his position; but if we are going to be face to face with the proposition of providing money for the W. P. A., the gentleman can, of course, make the same argument with regard to the W. P. A. appropriation he is now making with respect to this one. My people are going to suffer. I do not know what course we can take to apportion these things with exact justice. I merely want to call attention to the fact that my boys must rely upon either the W. P. A. or the C. C. C. to get anything to do. We cannot take them to the Atlantic seaboard and get them jobs in factories, because we are not situated as fortunately as the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read down to and including line 6, page 30, of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM. 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. LANHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the independent offices appropriation bill (H. R. 8837), had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes on tomorrow after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain that request unless the gentleman requests it after the conclusion of the legislative program of the day.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. That would mean finishing the bill we have under consideration now.

May I ask unanimous consent to proceed, then, for 3 minutes?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit the request of the gentleman from California.

The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, he may be permitted to address the House for 3 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the request mean that the remarks are to follow the consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. No; before that.

Mr. WOODRUM. Is it on any subject connected with the bill?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. No; I want to address the House briefly on the question of the Merchant Marine Act and how it affects the Pacific Coast States. There are several very important meetings being held on the Pacific coast on this question, and I want to get my views in the Record at this particular point. Of course, I could ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

Mr. WOODRUM. I have no objection, personally, to the gentleman speaking whenever he pleases, but I do not think he ought to speak on the bill before we go into its consideration tomorrow.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. It will not be on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

RALPH B. SESSOMS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5871) for the relief of Ralph B. Sessoms, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 10, after "(C-627929)", insert: "*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."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is no material change in the bill, which, as I understand, is a claim bill?

Mr. BEITER. There is no material change.

Mr. TABER. The only change is adding a provision limiting the fees to attorneys to 10 percent, which is the usual proviso and one that should have been in the bill before it left the House?

Mr. BEITER. That is right.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOLAND of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an address by our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] on January 8.

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

There was no objection.

THE LUDLOW RESOLUTION

Mr. HANCOCK of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANCOCK of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to explain why I was not present this morning to vote on the motion to discharge the committee from consideration of the Ludlow resolution.

Under the old schedule the Seaboard Air Line left Henderson at 6:58 a. m., arriving here at 12:36 p. m. Under the changed schedule, it left Henderson at 7:20 a. m. and arrived here at 1:05 p. m., and for that reason I was not present to vote on the resolution. If I had been present, I would have voted "yea," which would have been a vote to discharge the committee so that the resolution could have been considered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial commanding the Federal Trade Commission on its activities during the past year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made today and to include therein certain tables and information from the agencies included in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD made today, and to include some tables taken from the reported hearings on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, was unavoidably detained this morning and therefore unable to vote on the Ludlow resolution to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of the war referendum resolution. Had he been present he would have voted "aye."

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 11, 1938, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, January 11, 1938. Business to be considered: Hearing on S. 69, train-lengths bill.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on H. R. 8532, to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and for other purposes, Tuesday, January 11, 1938, at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, January 11, 1938, at 10:30 a. m., to hold hearings on a report recommending the improvement of the Houston Ship Channel and Buffalo Bayou, Tex.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in room 445, House Office Building, at 10:30 a. m., on Wednesday, January 12, 1938, for the public consideration of H. R. 8711 and H. R. 7369.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH'S Subcommittee on Public Utilities of the Committee on the District of Columbia will meet Thursday, January 13, 1938, at 10 a. m., in room 362 (caucus room), House Office Building. Business to be considered: H. R. 6811, streetcar capacity; H. R. 6862, maximum-fare investigation.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

976. A letter from the legislative representative, Veterans of Foreign Wars, transmitting the proceedings of the thirty-eighth national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held at Buffalo, N. Y., August 29 to September 3, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 466); to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

977. A letter from the executive director, Social Security Board, transmitting a copy of the Second Annual Report of the Social Security Board, covering the first full fiscal year of its operation (H. Doc. No. 474); to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

978. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the reimbursement of Donald W. Supernois, a fireman first class, United States Navy, for the value of personal effects lost while engaged in emergency relief expeditions during the Ohio Valley flood, in February 1937; to the Committee on Claims.

979. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for the fiscal year 1937 (H. Doc. No. 371); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

980. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed under the appropriation "Pay of special assistant attorneys, United States Courts," as required by the said appropriation act; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

981. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the legislative establishment, United States Senate, fiscal year 1938, \$160,000 (H. Doc. No. 473); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 8886) to provide for the erection of a monument or plaque as a memorial to Anson H. Smith, in a suitable public place at the site of Boulder Dam, in Mohave County, Ariz.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 8887) to designate United States Highway No. 6 as the "Grand Army of the Republic Highway"; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. STARNES: A bill (H. R. 8888) to provide for the establishment of minimum labor standards in employments in and affecting interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. PIERCE: A bill (H. A. 8889) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes" approved June 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 319); to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. PATMAN: A bill (H. R. 8890) relating to the ownership of preferred stock, common stock, capital notes, and debentures of banks the deposits of which are insured under the provisions of section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8891) relating to the publication in places where branch banks are operated of statements of resources and liabilities of banks, the deposits of which are insured under the provisions of section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAMSEY: A bill (H. R. 8892) to change and modify the rules of procedure for the district courts of the United States, adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States, pursuant to the act of June 19, 1934, chapter 651, by amending sections 412 and 724 of title 28 of the Code of Laws of the United States of America, and by adding thereto sections 430B, 430C, and 430D, pertaining to pleading and practice in the district courts of the United States, who may sue and be sued, the selection of jurors, the appointment of court stenographers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 8893) to amend the act approved June 28, 1934, to compensate widows and children of persons who died while receiving monetary benefits for disabilities directly incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service in the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. EICHER: A bill (H. R. 8894) to provide for the establishment of fair labor standards in employments in and affecting interstate commerce; to foster, regulate, and promote interstate and foreign commerce in the major agricultural commodities, to provide for the orderly marketing of such commodities, and the disposition of surpluses of such commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRINGTON: Resolution (H. Res. 398) to authorize the submission to Congress of a comprehensive plan for the construction of an impounding dam at or near Gavins Point on the Missouri River, near Yankton, S. Dak., and the establishment of an irrigation district below said dam, and the development of hydroelectric power and as a further aid in the control of floods, the return of subsoil moisture, navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma: Resolution (H. Res. 399) for the relief of Lora Hill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 557) to provide for the transfer of the Cape Henry Memorial site in Fort Story, Va., to the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HALLECK: A bill (H. R. 8895) granting a pension to Mabelle Birch Wallis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENDRICKS: A bill (H. R. 8896) for the relief of the Board of County Commissioners of Brevard County, Fla.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLS: A bill (H. R. 8897) for the relief of the Ouachita National Bank, of Monroe, La.; the Milner-Fuller, Inc., Monroe, La.; estate of John C. Bass, of Lake Providence, La.; Richard Bell, of Lake Providence, La.; and Mrs. Cluren Surles, of Lake Providence, La.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8898) for the relief of Quirino G. Polanco; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 8899) granting an increase of pension to Ruth A. Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHANLEY: A bill (H. R. 8900) to place Edwin H. Brainard on the retired list of the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TABER: A bill (H. R. 8901) granting an increase of pension to Frances K. Knoblock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8902) granting an increase of pension to Nettie M. Barker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELCH: A bill (H. R. 8903) for the relief of Frederick Rush; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8904) for the relief of Barney Boyle; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

3755. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of J. E. McDonald, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Texas, Austin, Tex., favoring Senate bill 2215, to extend section 75 of the Bankruptcy Act relating to the farm-mortgage moratorium; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3756. By Mr. THOMASON of Texas: Petition of the Women's Missionary Society of the Fort Stockton, Tex., Methodist Church, advocating passage of an amendment to provide for national referendum regarding declaration of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3757. By Mr. SHAFFER of Michigan: Petition of 10 citizens of Kalamazoo, Mich., favoring an amendment to article XXII of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3758. By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolution of the American Peace Movement, Inc., urging the adoption of House Joint Resolution 553, proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the power of Congress to declare war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3759. Also, petition of 40 residents of Richland County, Ohio, and adjoining county, favoring the Ludlow war referendum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3760. By Mr. THURSTON: Petition of residents of Lucas and Wayne Counties, Iowa, requesting the enactment of House bill 4797, to provide for grants to the States for assistance to needy incapacitated adult persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3761. By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of 57 citizens of Coshocton, Ohio, urging passage of Ludlow war referendum resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3762. Also, petition of 55 citizens of Richland County, Ohio, favoring the Ludlow referendum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3763. Also, petition of 14 citizens of Coshocton, Ohio, urging passage of the Ludlow war referendum resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3764. Also, petition of 38 citizens of Danville, Ohio, favoring the Ludlow war referendum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 11, 1938

(*Legislative day of Wednesday, January 5, 1938*)

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, January 10, 1938, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

SENATOR FROM ALABAMA

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand that the newly designated Senator from Alabama is present and desires to take the oath.