

Congresses; member of Subcommittee No. 3 and Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization.

Joseph R. Bryson, Greenville, S. C.; educated in public schools; graduated from Furman University and University of South Carolina; private in World War I; member of South Carolina House of Representatives, 1921-24; served in the State Senate, 1929-32; elected to the Seventy-sixth Congress and reelected to succeeding Congresses; member of Subcommittee No. 2 and Subcommittee on Patents, Trade-marks, and Copyrights.

Fadjo Cravens, Fort Smith, Ark.; educated in public schools; University of Arkansas, University of Pittsburgh, and Washington and Lee University; elected to the Seventy-sixth Congress and succeeding Congresses; member of Subcommittee No. 4 and Subcommittee on Claims.

Thomas J. Lane, Lawrence, Mass.; educated in public schools; graduated from Suffolk Law School; World War I veteran; member of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, 1927-38; member of Massachusetts State Senate, resigned; elected to the Seventy-seventh Congress, and succeeding Congresses; member of Subcommittee No. 2 and Subcommittee on Patents, Trade-marks, and Copyrights.

Martin Gorski, Chicago, Ill.; educated in business college and Chicago Law School; assistant State attorney, 1918-20; master in chancery of the Superior Court of Cook County, Ill.; elected to the Seventy-eighth Congress and succeeding Congresses; member of Subcommittee No. 3 and Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization.

Michael A. Feighan, Cleveland, Ohio; graduate of Princeton University and Harvard Law School; member of Ohio State Legislature, 1937-40; minority floor leader; elected to the Seventy-eighth Congress and succeeding Congresses; member of Subcommittee No. 4 and Subcommittee on Claims.

Frank L. Chelf, Lebanon, Ky.; attended St. Mary's College, St. Mary, Ky., and Centre College, Danville, Ky., Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn.; prosecuting attorney, Marion County, three consecutive 4-year terms; served in World War II; elected to Seventy-ninth Congress; reelected to Eightieth Congress; member of Subcommittee No. 1 and Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Ed Gossett, Wichita Falls, Tex.; graduated from University of Texas and law school; served as district attorney of the forty-sixth judicial district, 1933-37; elected to Seventy-sixth and succeeding Congresses; member of Subcommittee No. 1 and Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization.

THE PRESENT WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

The Committee on the Judiciary as now constituted is subdivided into the following committees:

Subcommittees Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4:

Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization;

Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization;

Subcommittee on Patents, Trade-marks, and Copyrights; and

Subcommittee on Claims.

As of May 28, 1947, a tabulation of the bills and resolutions referred to the Committee on the Judiciary discloses the following:

HISTORY OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY 55

Tabulations of bills and resolutions referred to the Committee on the Judiciary

Introduced and referred to committee:	
House bills.....	1,527
House joint resolutions.....	87
House concurrent resolutions.....	5
House resolutions.....	2
	1,621
Passed Senate and referred to committee:	
Senate bills.....	28
Senate joint resolutions.....	4
	32
Total.....	1,653

IMPORTANT MEASURES THAT HAVE COME FROM COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY IN RECENT YEARS

- I. General laws, governing—
 - Rules of practice and procedure in both criminal and civil cases.
 - Administrative office of United States courts.
 - Foreign agents' registration.
 - Administrative procedure.
 - Juvenile delinquents.
 - Retirement for United States Supreme Court Judges.
 - Antikidnaping.
 - Antiracketeering.
 - Anti-pocket-veto.
 - Killing Supreme Court packing.
 - Portal-to-portal pay.
- II. Bankruptcy laws:
 - Chandler Act—the only complete revision of bankruptcy law.
 - Compositions:
 - Municipal.
 - Drainage and irrigation.
 - Corporate.
 - Railroad.
 - Farmers.
 - Wage earners.
 - Referees Salary Act.
- III. Labor acts:
 - Norris-LaGuardia.
 - Walsh-Healey.
 - Anti-strike-breaking.
- IV. Alien:
 - Alien registration and fingerprinting.
- V. War activities:
 - Antitrust.
 - First and Second War Powers Acts.
 - Small Business.
 - Wire tapping.
 - Sabotage and Espionage Acts.
- VI. Impeachment proceedings:
 - Set out at length below.

THE JURISDICTION OF THE COMMITTEE

Under the provisions of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 753, second session, S. 2177, entitled "An act to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government," and cited as the "Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946," it is provided as follows:

SEC. 121. (a) Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"RULE X

"STANDING COMMITTEES

"(a) There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees:

* * * * *
 "12. Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of twenty-seven Members.
 * * * * *

"(2) At the commencement of each Congress, the House shall elect as chairman of each standing committee one of the Members thereof: * * *

"(3) All vacancies in standing committees in the House shall be filled by election by the House. Each Member shall be elected to serve on one standing committee and no more * * *."

"RULE XI

"POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

"(1) All proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the subjects listed under the standing committees named below shall be referred to such committees, respectively: *Provided*, That unless otherwise provided herein, any matter within the jurisdiction of a standing committee prior to January 2, 1947, shall remain subject to the jurisdiction of that committee or of the consolidated committee succeeding generally to the jurisdiction of that committee.

- "(1) Committee on the Judiciary.
- "1. Judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, generally.
- "2. Constitutional amendments.
- "3. Federal courts and judges.
- "4. Local courts in the Territories and possessions.
- "5. Revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.
- "6. National penitentiaries.
- "7. Protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies.
- "8. Holidays and celebrations.
- "9. Bankruptcy, military, espionage, and counterfeiting.
- "10. State and Territorial boundary lines.
- "11. Meetings of Congress, attendance of Members, and their acceptance of incompatible offices.
- "12. Civil liberties.
- "13. Patents, copyrights, and trade-marks.
- "14. Patent Office.
- "15. Immigration and naturalization.
- "16. Apportionment of Representatives.
- "17. Measures relating to claims against the United States.
- "18. Interstate compacts generally.
- "19. Presidential succession."

It considers charges against judges of the United States courts, impeachments, legislative propositions relating to the service of the Department of Justice, bills relating to the local courts in the District of Columbia, Alaska, and the Territories, the establishment of a court of patent appeals, relations of the courts of labor and corporations,

crimes, penalties, extradition, construction and management of national penitentiaries, matters relating to trusts and corporations, claims of States against the United States, general legislation relating to international and other claims, bills relating to the office of the President, to the flag, holidays, and celebrations, bankruptcy, removal of political disabilities, prohibition of traffic in intoxicating liquors, mutiny and willful destruction of vessels, counterfeiting, settlement of State and Territorial boundary lines, meetings of Congress and attendance of Members and their acceptance of incompatible offices.

This committee also has jurisdiction over joint resolutions proposing amendments to the Constitution. It also reports on important questions of law relating to subjects naturally within the jurisdiction of other committees.

REFERENCE OF PRIVATE CLAIM BILLS

SEC. 123. Paragraph 3 of rule XXI of the Standing Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"3. No bill for the payment or adjudication of any private claim against the Government shall be referred, except by unanimous consent, to any other than the following committees, namely: To the Committee on Foreign Affairs and to the Committee on the Judiciary."

The present form of this rule was made effective January 2, 1947, as part of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The old rule adopted in 1885 and amended May 29, 1936, provided that private claims bills be referred to a Committee on Invalid Pensions, Claims, War Claims, Public Lands and Accounts, in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and Judiciary. Tort claims are now handled under title IV of the Reorganization Act. Certain private bills, resolutions, and amendments are barred.

The jurisdiction as defined in the rule was made effective January 2, 1947, as a part of the above-quoted Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. It combines the Committee on Revision of Laws (created in 1868), Patents (created in 1837), Immigration and Naturalization (created in 1893), Claims (created in 1794), and War Claims (created in 1873).

It is thus seen that the Committee on the Judiciary (created in 1813) is older than all the committees it now includes, with the exception of Claims (created in 1794).

COMMITTEE ON THE REVISION OF LAWS

This committee dates from July 25, 1868. In reporting the resolution for its establishment, Mr. Elihu B. Washburne, of Illinois, explained that the new committee was intended to take the place of the old standing committee "on Revisal and Unfinished Business," which had existed since the early days and had become obsolete, while the Select Committee on Revision of the Laws had become of importance sufficient to warrant establishing it as a standing committee.

The Committee on Revisal and Unfinished Business was established in 1795, and was especially useful in the early years when business unfinished fell with the end of the session.

At first there was no rule defining the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Revision of the Laws, but in 1880 its jurisdiction was fixed "to the revision and codification of the statutes of the United States" and

this continued until January 2, 1947, when the Reorganization Act took effect.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

As created on September 15, 1837, in the first session of the Twenty-fifth Congress, its jurisdiction related to patents alone. At the time of the revision of 1880, the rule provided for the reference of subjects relating to patents, copyrights, and trade-marks.

The subjects of "copyrights and trade-marks" were added, on motion of Mr. John S. Newberry, of Michigan, in the second session of the Forty-sixth Congress.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization was established as a standing committee on August 18, 1893, and before that it had functioned as a select committee. The old rule, section 40 of rule XI, provided for reference of subjects relating to immigration or naturalization, to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. This committee had exercised a general but not exclusive jurisdiction over the subject of immigration. However, in 1882 (47th Cong., 2d sess.) the House in distributing the President's message referred to the Judiciary Committee "the construction of the law restricting immigration of laborers from China."

In the later practice the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization has confirmed its jurisdiction over the subject of naturalization. It established its claim to jurisdiction over the subject of naturalization in 1906; but up to 1893 the Committee on the Judiciary exercised a general and frequent jurisdiction over this subject.

THE COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

Prior to January 2, 1947, the Committee on Claims divided with that of the Committee on Elections the honor of being the oldest standing committee of the House. They were established on the same day, November 13, 1794, and to Claims was given the jurisdiction of all "matters or things touching claims and demands on the United States."

In the revision of 1880 the form of the rule was fixed providing for the reference of subjects relating to private and domestic claims and demands other than war claims against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

The jurisdiction of the committee did not continue so broad as when first established, as war claims generally have gone to another committee, to wit: that of War Claims.

COMMITTEE ON WAR CLAIMS

War claims were formerly considered by the old Committee on Revolutionary Claims, which dated from December 22, 1813. On December 2, 1873, the name of this committee was changed to "War Claims," and its jurisdiction was specified to be "all claims growing out of any war in which the United States has been engaged."

The Committee on War Claims, like the Committee on Claims, exercised the power of reporting appropriations for the payment of individual claims.

HISTORY OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The powers and duties of the Committee on the Judiciary were formerly fixed by section 4 of rule XI in the following words:

All proposed legislation shall be referred to the committees named in the preceding rule, as follows, namely:

Subject relating * * *

4. To judicial proceedings, civil and criminal law: to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There had been no change in the form of this rule since its adoption in the revision of 1880. This occurred on January 6, 1880, and was then rule No. 83. (See Congressional Record, 2d sess., 46th Cong., p. 205.)

From the date of the creation of this committee on December 7, 1813, until the aforesaid revision in 1880, the jurisdiction of the committee under rule No. 83 was determined—

to take into consideration all such petitions and matters or things touching judicial proceedings as shall be presented or may come in question and be referred to them by the House.

CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

The membership of the committee is fixed by clause A, section 12 of rule X, made effective January 2, 1947, as a part of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and reads as follows:

There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees:

* * * * *

12. Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of twenty-seven Members.

Previous to this the membership of the committee had been fixed by section 4 of rule X—adopted April 5, 1911, first session, Sixty-second Congress, pages 11–86—in the following words:

There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees, viz:

* * * * *

4. On the Judiciary, to consist of twenty-five Members.

At the time of its creation the committee consisted of seven members—Journal, page 19, Annals, volume 1, page 32. The committee consisted of this number until 1833.

In the first session of the Twenty-third Congress, on Thursday, December 5, 1833, the following is stated:

Committees of the House, Mr. Hubbard again moved his amendments to the fifty-fifth rule, which fixes the number and size of the standing committees of the House, so as to make those formerly containing only seven members now to contain nine, and those consisting of three, now to consist of five members. The amendment was carried and the rule as amended was adopted. An order was passed for the appointment of standing committees. December 9 committee appointed.

The number remained the same until 1869, in the second session of the Forty-first Congress, when on December 9—Congressional Globe, page 62—Mr. Welker introduced a resolution authorizing the Speaker to assign Representatives admitted since organization of the present Congress to any of the committees as additional members.

On March 3, 1873, third session of the Forty-second Congress, a resolution was introduced by Mr. Banks amending the Rules of the House

so that the standing committee with 9 members are to have 13 members—Congressional Globe, page 2132.

On January 6, 1880, second session of the Forty-sixth Congress—Congressional Record, volume 10, page 203—a report was adopted fixing membership of committees at 15 from the time forward.

On August 21, 1893, first session of the Fifty-third Congress—Congressional Record, volume 25, page 554—Speaker announced the appointment of 17 members to the Committee on the Judiciary.

On April 5, 1911, first session of the Sixty-second Congress—Congressional Record, volume 47, pages 55-80—House Resolution 30 provided for increase of committee membership from 15 to 21.

On December 11, 1925, first session of the Sixty-ninth Congress :

On motion of Mr. Tilson, by unanimous consent,
Ordered, That the membership of the Committee on the Judiciary be increased from 22 to 23 members until March 2, 1927 (Congressional Record, vol. 66, p. 725).

On December 12, 1927, first session of the Seventieth Congress—House Resolutions 53 and 54, Congressional Record, volume 69, page 491—election of 23 members of the Committee on the Judiciary announced.

On December 14, 1931, first session, Seventy-second Congress—Congressional Record, volume 75, page 465—House Resolution 54, providing for 23 members on the Committee on the Judiciary agreed to by the House.

On March 14, 1933, first session of Seventy-third Congress—Congressional Record, volume 77, page 43—House Resolution 43, providing for 25 members on Committee on the Judiciary agreed to by the House.

From the foregoing statement it appears that some of the changes in the size of the committee were effected by simply electing a larger number of members than prescribed by the current rule.

The present membership of the committee is 27, and in this membership 18 States are represented.

THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER

On February 6, 1930, Subcommittee No. 1, through its chairman, Leonidas C. Dyer, reported out (H. R. 14, 71st Cong., 1st sess.) a bill to make The Star-Spangled Banner the national anthem of the United States of America, and on March 3, 1931 (ch. 436, 46 Stat. 1508, U. S. C., p. 170), it was enacted :

The composition consisting of the words and music known as The Star-Spangled Banner is designated the national anthem of the United States of America.

Of the 23 men who then composed the Committee on the Judiciary, but 2 remain: Hon. Earl C. Michener, the present chairman, and Hon. Emanuel Celler, ranking Democratic member.

SOME OUTSTANDING MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Joseph Hopkinson, author of the patriotic anthem, Hail Columbia!; associated with Daniel Webster in the Dartmouth College case; counsel for Justice Samuel Chase in his impeachment trial before the United States Senate.

Franklin Pierce, a Representative and a Senator from New Hampshire and a President of the United States; declined the appointment of Attorney General of the United States; served in the Mexican War; commissioned brigadier general.

Thomas Corwin, a Representative and a Senator from Ohio; Governor of Ohio; Secretary of the Treasury; United States Minister to Mexico.

Allen G. Thurman, a Representative and a Senator from Ohio; associate justice and chief justice of the Supreme Court of Ohio; member of the Electoral Commission created to decide the contests in various States in the Presidential election of 1876.

Thaddeus Stevens, a Representative from Pennsylvania; chairman of the managers appointed by the House of Representatives in 1868 to conduct the impeachment proceedings against Andrew Johnson, President of the United States.

Isham G. Harris, a Representative and a Senator from Tennessee; Governor of Tennessee; President pro tempore of the Senate.

Stephen A. Douglass, a Representative and a Senator from Illinois; secretary of state of Illinois; judge of the Supreme Court of Illinois; defeated Abraham Lincoln for the United States Senate; unsuccessful candidate for nomination for President on the Democratic ticket in 1852 and 1856; nominated for President by the Democratic National Convention at Baltimore in 1860.

Daniel W. Voorhees, a Representative and a Senator from Indiana; United States district attorney for Indiana.

William McKinley, Jr., a Representative from Ohio and a President of the United States; major in the Union Army; Governor of Ohio; elected President of the United States in 1896; reelected in 1900, and served until his death.

James S. Sherman, a Representative from New York and a Vice President of the United States; elected Vice President of the United States in 1908; renominated for Vice President in June 1912 and died in October 1912.

Frederick H. Gillette, a Representative and a Senator from Massachusetts; assistant attorney general of Massachusetts; elected as a Republican to the Fifty-third and to the 15 succeeding Congresses; Speaker in the Sixty-sixth, Sixty-seventh, and Sixty-eighth Congresses.

Oscar W. Underwood, a Representative and a Senator from Alabama; floor leader of his party in the Senate, 1921-23; represented the United States as a member of the Conference on Limitation of Armament in 1921 and 1922.

John W. Davis, a Representative from West Virginia; professor of law at Washington and Lee University; president of West Virginia Bar Association; one of the managers appointed by the House of Representatives in 1912 to conduct the impeachment proceedings against Robert W. Archbald; Solicitor General of the United States; Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Great Britain; unsuccessful Democratic candidate for President of the United States in 1924.

George W. Norris, a Representative and a Senator from Nebraska; judge of the district court; one of the managers appointed by the

House of Representatives to conduct the impeachment proceedings against Robert W. Archbald.

George F. Hoar, a Representative and a Senator from Massachusetts; served in the State House of Representatives and Senate of Massachusetts; one of the managers appointed by the House of Representatives in 1876 to conduct the impeachment proceedings against William W. Belknap, ex-Secretary of War; member of the Electoral Commission to decide the contests in various States in the Presidential election of 1876; overseer of Harvard University; Regent of the Smithsonian Institution in 1880.

James Buchanan, a Representative and a Senator from Pennsylvania; one of the first volunteers in the War of 1812; one of the managers appointed by the House of Representatives in 1830 to conduct the impeachment proceedings against James H. Peck; minister to Russia; Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President Polk; Minister to Great Britain; elected President of the United States in 1856 as the candidate of the Democratic Party.

Hilary A. Herbert, a Representative from Alabama; colonel in the Confederate Army; served in the Cabinet of President Cleveland as Secretary of the Navy.

William P. Frye, a Representative and a Senator from Maine; attorney general of the State of Maine; elected President pro tempore of the Senate February 7, 1896; reelected March 7, 1901, and December 5, 1907.

George S. Boutwell, a Representative and a Senator from Massachusetts; State bank commissioner; Governor of Massachusetts; member of State Constitution Convention; first Commissioner of Internal Revenue; one of the managers appointed by the House of Representatives to conduct the impeachment proceedings against Andrew Johnson, President of the United States; Secretary of the Treasury; Commissioner to codify and edit the Statutes at Large; declined appointment as Secretary of the Treasury.

IMPEACHMENTS

Since, under the Constitution, impeachment proceedings must originate in the House of Representatives, and since the Committee on the Judiciary is the law committee of the House, all its members being lawyers, all matters of impeachment, and resolutions calling for investigation of such charges are referred by the House to the Committee on the Judiciary in the first instance.

In the nine impeachment proceedings which have resulted in trial, since the formation of the committee in 1813, the Committee on the Judiciary has done much to develop, clarify, and state the law of impeachment and in this respect has performed a great and lasting service to the country as a whole.

While the House of Representatives has the sole power of impeachment the Senate has the sole power to try all impeachments. However, the jurisdiction of the Senate does not attach until articles of impeachment have been exhibited to it by the House.

The several sections of the Constitution applicable to impeachment proceedings are hereinafter set out.

HISTORY OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

63

CONSTITUTION

Article I

Section 2, clause 5 :

The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other officers ; and shall have the sole power of impeachments.

Section 3, clause 6 :

The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose, they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside ; and no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-third of the Members present.

Clause 7 :

Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust or profit, under the United States ; but the party convicted shall, nevertheless, be liable and subject to indictments, trial, judgments, and punishments according to law.

Article II

Section 4, clause 1 :

The President, Vice President, and all civil officers of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

GOOD BEHAVIOR

Article III

SECTION I. The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior, and shall, at stated times, receive for their services, a compensation which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.

SEC. II. The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury.

NATURE OF IMPEACHMENT

On January 3, 1913, in the Senate sitting in the trial of the impeachment of Judge Robert W. Archbald, Mr. Manager Henry D. Clayton, of Alabama, submitted on behalf of the House of Representatives a brief from which the following is an excerpt :

THE GENERAL NATURE OF IMPEACHMENTS

The fundamental law of impeachment was stated by Richard Wooddeson, an eminent English authority, in his Law Lectures, delivered at Oxford in 1777, as follows (pp. 499 and 501, 1842 ad.) :

"It is certain that magistrates and officers entrusted with the administration of public affairs may abuse their delegated powers to the extensive detriment of the community and at the same time in a manner not properly cognizable before the ordinary tribunals. The influence of such delinquents and the nature of such offenses may not unsuitably engage the authority of the highest court and the wisdom of the sagest assembly. The Commons, therefore, as the Grand Inquest of the Nation, became suitors for penal justice, and they cannot consistently, either with their own dignity or with safety to the accused, sue elsewhere but to those who share with them in the legislature.

“On this policy is founded the origin of impeachments which began soon after the Constitution assumed its present form.

* * * * *

“Such kinds of misdeeds, however, as peculiarly injure the commonwealth by the abuse of high offices of trust, are most proper—and have been the most usual—grounds for this kind of prosecution.”

Referring to the function of impeachments, Rawle, in his work on the Constitution (p. 211) says:

“The delegation of important trusts affecting the higher interests of society is always from various causes liable to abuse. The fondness frequently felt for the inordinate extension of power, the influence of party and of prejudice, the seductions of foreign States, or the baser appetite for illegitimate emoluments are sometimes productions of what are not unaptly termed ‘political offenses’ (Federalist, No. 65), which it would be difficult to take cognizance of in the ordinary course of judicial proceeding.

“The involutions and varieties of vice are too many and too artful to be anticipated by positive law.”

In Story on the Constitution (vol. 1, 5th ed., p. 584) the parliamentary history of impeachments is briefly stated, as follows:

“800. In examining the parliamentary history of impeachments it will be found that many offenses not easily definable by law, and many of a purely political character, have been deemed high crimes and misdemeanors worthy of this extraordinary remedy. * * * One cannot but be struck, in this slight enumeration, with the utter unfitness of the common tribunals of justice to take cognizance of such offenses, and with the entire propriety of confining the jurisdiction over them to a tribunal capable of understanding and reforming and scrutinizing the polity of the State, and of sufficient dignity to maintain the independence and reputation of worthy public officers.”

Elmore Whitehurst, Esq., formerly clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House and now assistant director, administrative office of the United States courts, in a brief prepared on this subject, has summed up, the Nature of Impeachments, in the following manner:

Impeachment came into our Constitution from England. There it was a criminal proceeding with all the accouterment of a criminal trial, and with a possible penalty upon conviction of a sentence of ignominious death with confiscation of property. When it reached the United States Constitution the criminal penalties were stripped from impeachment. Judgment upon conviction was limited to removal from office with a possible judgment barring the defendant from again holding office of trust or profit. Impeachment was changed from a criminal to a civil proceeding. Since there was no other precedents to guide, when the first impeachments came to trial in this country, English precedents naturally were followed. Thus it came about that for more than 150 years of our history the real nature of impeachment under our Constitution was obscured by confusion of thought brought about by the fact that impeachment proceedings were conducted as if they were criminal trials. The Judiciary Committee, particularly in recent years, has fought vigorously and successfully to establish general acceptance that impeachments in this country are not criminal trials but are solely ouster proceedings and should be tried as such.

Another very able statement of the nature of impeachment is found in the speech of Hon. Hatton W. Sumners in the House, in the Congressional Record, June 12, 1933.

Mr. Whitehurst has also set out the method of examination of impeachment charges, as follows:

It is the practice of the Judiciary Committee to make a preliminary informal examination of charges brought against judges. If, in the opinion of the committee, the action is warranted, a resolution is reported to the House authorizing and directing the committee to conduct an investigation of the charges and giving the power to subpoena persons and papers. An exhaustive examination into the charges follows the adoption of the resolution by the House. Hearings are conducted before a subcommittee at which the accused and the accusers are accorded

the privilege, usually exercised, to appear in person, to be represented by counsel, and to examine and cross-examine witnesses. The accused may testify in his own behalf. The evidence is printed, and after full consideration in executive session the committee makes its report to the House. If the judgment of the committee is for impeachment, articles of impeachment are drafted and presented to the House with the committee report. After debate, the House votes on the question of impeachment. If an impeachment is voted by a majority of the House, managers are appointed to conduct the trial in the Senate. The managers are agents of the House. In practice they are named from members of the Judiciary Committee by the chairman, who presents the names to the House in a resolution, which is ordinarily agreed to without debate. The managers present themselves at the bar of the Senate and demand the impeachment of the accused in the name of the House of Representatives and of all of the people of the United States. A summons is issued to the accused to appear and answer. The Senate organizes itself into a court of impeachment, and the trial is held in the Senate Chamber. The managers conduct the prosecution, while the respondent, as the accused is termed, is represented by counsel of his own choosing.

IMPEACHMENTS

In the 158 years of this Nation's existence under the Constitution the Senate of the United States has sat as a Court of Impeachment in 12 cases.

Prior to the creation of the Committee on the Judiciary three of these had been disposed of, to wit:

That of William Blount, a Senator of the United States from Tennessee, in 1798-99; John Pickering, judge of the United States District Court for the District of New Hampshire, 1803-4; and that of Samuel Chase, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, 1804-5. The charges against Blount were dismissed for want of jurisdiction, Pickering was removed from office, and Chase acquitted.

The first Court of Impeachment to be held after the creation of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House in 1813 was that of James H. Peck, judge of the United States District Court for the District of Missouri. This trial lasted from Monday, April 26, 1830, to Monday, January 31, 1831.

The case of Judge Peck originated as a result of a memorial by an individual, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and was by that committee reported to the House with a recommendation in favor of impeachment.

On March 23, 1830, Mr. Buchanan, chairman of the committee, submitted a report from the Committee on the Judiciary recommending the impeachment of James H. Peck.

Judge Peck was impeached in a single article containing a number of specifications on the ground that he had grossly abused his power as a judge in sentencing an attorney to 24 hours' imprisonment and suspension from the bar of his court for 18 calendar months for writing and publishing a moderate criticism of one of Judge Peck's decisions in a case in which the attorney had appeared on behalf of the plaintiff, with the result that the attorney was practically prevented from further participation in the case. The respondent was acquitted by the Senate on all of the articles presented against him on the ground that he was justified in assuming that he was legally clothed with the power that he had exercised, and that the element of malice had not been established. The vote was 22 to 21 against conviction.

Five managers were selected by ballot, three of whom were members of the Committee on the Judiciary; they were Mr. Buchanan, of

Pennsylvania; Mr. Storrs, of New York; Mr. Wickliffe, of Kentucky; Mr. Spencer, of New York; and Mr. McDuffie, of South Carolina, the three first named being members of the committee.

On April 26, 1830, Messrs. Buchanan and Storrs appeared before the bar of the Senate and impeached Judge Peck in the following manner, to wit:

Mr. President, we have been directed in the name of the House of Representatives and of all the people of the United States, to impeach James H. Peck, judge of the District Court of the United States for the District of Missouri, of high misdemeanors in office, and to acquaint the Senate that the House of Representatives will in due time exhibit particular articles of impeachment against him and make good the same. We have also been directed to demand that the Senate take order for the appearance of the said James H. Peck to answer to said impeachment.

While Judge Peck was acquitted, nevertheless, as a result of this trial the act of March 2, 1831, defining and limiting the power of judges to punish for contempt was passed. It is entitled "An act declaratory of the law concerning contempt of court," and was enacted to remedy the wrongs this case disclosed. The history of this act is interesting and important. One of the main questions in the case was whether the power of the Federal courts to punish contempts was derivable from the common law or whether it was limited by the act of September 24, 1789, the seventeenth section of which provided that all the said courts of the United States—

shall have power to administer all necessary oaths or affirmations, and to punish by fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of said courts, all contempts of authority in any cause or hearing before the same.

Upon the one hand, the contention was that the Federal courts were of limited jurisdiction, and unless a statute or constitutional provision could be found conferring power, no such power could be exercised. Upon the other hand, the claim was made with great vigor and zeal that all courts have the inherent right to protect themselves and to maintain their authority by punishing for contempt all who disturb the court or who directly or indirectly defy its orders and decrees or do anything to bring court or judge into disrepute. It was claimed that all the power to punish contempts of every kind possessed and exercised by the courts in England before the revolution was possessed by and could be lawfully exercised by the Federal courts. Nothing was settled by the result of the trial of Judge Peck. To meet the doubt and settle the uncertainty as to the power of the Federal courts to punish contempt, Mr. Draper, a Member of the House, introduced the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be directed to inquire into the expediency of defining by statute all offenses which may be punished as contempt of the courts of the United States.

To which the following amendment was added:

And also to limit the punishment of the same (Gales & Seaton, for 1831, p. 559).

The act of 1831 was reported by Mr. Buchanan from the Committee on the Judiciary in pursuance of this resolution.

In the decision of the Supreme Court in *Ex Parte Robinson* (19 Wall. 211) there is found a very clear statement as to the nature and character of the offenses punishable under this act.

Following the foregoing impeachment trial which has been set out somewhat in detail came the impeachments of West H. Humphreys,

judge of the United States District Court for the Middle, Eastern, and Western Districts of Tennessee; he was removed from office; the trial lasted from May 7, 1862, to June 26, 1862.

Next was that of Andrew Johnson, President of the United States; he was acquitted; the trial lasted from February 25, 1868, to May 26, 1868.

Next was that of William W. Belknap, Secretary of War; he was acquitted; the trial lasted from March 3, 1876, to August 1, 1876.

Next was that of Charles Swayne, judge of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida; he was acquitted; the trial lasted from December 14, 1904, to February 27, 1905.

Then followed the trial of Robert W. Archbald, additional circuit judge of the United States from the third judicial circuit and designated a judge of the United States Commerce Court; he was removed from office; the Senate sat as a court of impeachment from July 13, 1912, to January 13, 1913.

Next was that of George W. English, judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Illinois; he resigned from office November 4, 1926; the court of impeachment adjourned to December 13, 1926, when on request of the House managers, the impeachment proceedings were dismissed.

Next came the trial of Harold Louderback, judge of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California; he was acquitted; the trial lasted from May 15, 1933, to May 24, 1933.

The last time that the Senate sat as a court of impeachment was that of Halsted L. Ritter, judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida; he was removed from office; the trial lasted from April 6, 1936, to April 17, 1936.

These trials have vastly changed the concept of the real nature of impeachments in this country, but due to their great length, the mass of testimony, the law, and the rulings, plus the fact that this history of the committee has already been prolonged to undue length, they are not separately discussed at this time.

PROCEDURE IN IMPEACHMENT TRIALS

The accused may appear in person or by attorney, or he may not appear at all. In case he does not appear the House does not ask that he be compelled to appear, but the trial proceeds on a plea of "not guilty."

It has been decided that the Senate has no power to take into custody the body of the accused. The writ of summons to the accused recites the articles and notifies him to appear at a fixed time and place and file his answer.

In all cases respondent may appear by counsel, and in one trial, when a petition set forth that respondent was insane, the counsel of his son was admitted to be heard and present evidence in support of the petition but not to make arguments.

In trials before the Senate witnesses have always been examined in open Senate and never by a committee, although such procedure has been once suggested.

No jury trial is possible as a part of an impeachment trial under the Constitution.

The House of Representatives has consulted its own inclination and convenience about attending its managers at an impeachment. It

did not attend at all in the trials of Blount, Swayne, and Archibald; and after attending at the answer of Belknap, decided that it would be represented for the remainder of the trial by its managers alone.

At the trial of the President the House in Committee of the Whole, attended throughout the trial, but this is exceptional.

In the Peck trial the House discussed the subject and reconsidered its decision to attend the trial daily.

While the Senate is deliberating the House does not attend; but when the Senate votes on the charges, as at the other open proceedings of the trial, it may attend. While it has frequently attended in Committee of the Whole, it may attend as a House.

The question in judgment in an impeachment trial has occasioned contention in the Senate, and in the trial of President Johnson the form was left to the Chief Justice. In the Belknap trial there was much deliberation over this subject. In the Chase trial the Senate modified its former rule as to form of final question. The yeas and nays are taken on each article separately, but in the trial of the President the Senate, by order, voted on the articles in an order differing from the numerical order, adjourned after voting on one article, and adjourned without day after voting on 3 of the 11 articles. After a conviction, the Senate votes on the punishment.

The Constitution of the United States (art. 1, sec. 3, par. 7) limits the judgment to removal and disqualification.

In Congress impeachment proceedings are not discontinued by a recess, and the Pickering impeachment was presented in the Senate on the last day of the Seventh Congress, and at the beginning of the Eighth Congress the proceedings went on from that point.

But an impeachment may proceed only when Congress is in session.

TIME MARCHES ON

It is a far cry from the year 1813 to the year 1947. From the little Nation of 18 States to one of 48; from a population of 7¼ to 142 millions. Yet this is the span of the committee's existence. A committee which existed before the advent of the railroad, the telegraph, the telephone, the wireless, the electric light, the airplane, the ocean-going steamship, the automobile, the truck, and the tractor; a committee which came into existence before the War of 1812 had ended; a committee whose first members were to see the Capitol burned, and whose later members were to pass through the Mexican, Civil, Spanish-American, and World Wars I and II; a committee which has witnessed nine amendments added to the Constitution of the United States.

Yet quietly, effectively, and surely it has done its work as one of the truly great committees of the House of Representatives. The statute books of the Nation are filled with the results of its labors, hundreds of decisions of the Federal courts have dealt with the bills it proposed and which finally became the laws of the land. No laws more important to the property, the liberties, and the lives of the citizens of this Nation come before the House of Representatives than those which are referred to its Committee on the Judiciary and which in turn that committee reports back to the House for its decision.

A great and important responsibility.

In writing the history of the committee, the thought has been simply to tell the story of its origin, to trace the public services of its members

through the years, to invite attention to its jurisdiction, and to briefly mention a few of its legislative accomplishments.

This is only a foundation; to tell the complete story of the acts reported, together with the debates and legislative battles which ensued, will require a much longer statement.

As an illustration, on January 4, 1826, there began a debate on a bill reported from the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, by Daniel Webster, providing for three new circuits and three new associate judges which continued for 3 weeks, or until January 25. This is one of the great debates dealing with judicial organization, but, such are the limitations of time and space of the article that only a reference can be made to it here.

When the full story of the work of the Committee on the Judiciary is told it will be one of the most fascinating stories in the legislative history of the Congress.

PORTRAIT OF HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS, OF TEXAS

On Monday, May 2, 1947, the committee received and accepted from a committee representing the city of Dallas, Tex., an excellent portrait of the Honorable Hatton W. Sumners, the former chairman of this committee. A full account of the proceedings is found in the Congressional Record of Tuesday, May 2, 1947, on page A2165, under the extension of remarks of Hon. Raymond S. Springer, a member of the committee and chairman of Subcommittee No. 4.

Mr. Speaker, on May 1, the good people of Dallas, Tex., presented to the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives an excellent portrait of the Honorable Hatton W. Sumners, who for some 15 years served as chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives. Judge Sumners, as we have ever affectionately called him, has rendered outstanding service as a great statesman during his entire service as a Member of Congress from his congressional district. This great man will be long remembered for the fine contributions he made to constitutional government in our Nation.

Hon. Ed Gossett, a Member of Congress from Texas, who is a member of the Judiciary Committee, was in charge of the ceremony. Hon. Sam Hobbs, of Alabama, made the very excellent address of acceptance of this most gracious gift; and because Judge Hobbs is a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee, and because of his excellent address delivered in accepting the portrait of Judge Sumners, I extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include the excellent address delivered by our colleague, a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee of the House, and the friend of every Member in this great law-making body, Hon. Sam Hobbs, which address is as follows:

"Mr. Chairman, Mr. Nathan Adams, Mr. D. A. Hulsey, Mr. Ben Critz, and Mr. Waverly Briggs, representing the people of Dallas in this presentation of the portrait of Hon. Hatton W. Sumners to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, it is my happy privilege as the designated spokesman of our committee to accept this princely gift from his friends and former constituents.

"Before I proceed, I cannot refrain from expressing my own and my party's deep appreciation of the gracious insistence of the chairman and the majority members of our committee that I as a member of the minority should represent the committee in accepting the portrait.

"Having been born in Dallas County (though in Alabama, not Texas), and having begun the practice of law in his native Tennessee, and having had the priceless privilege of sitting for 12 years at the feet of this Gamaliel, at least partially qualifies me to accept your gracious gift and attempt to voice the thanks of this committee to you men of Dallas.

"There is one amendment to the statement just made which I must concede. None of us who served on this committee under the leadership of Judge Sumners ever had a chance to do much sitting. Particularly is this true of me, for from the outset, because of my peculiar qualification, I was chosen as errand boy. I

was in Alabama when I was elected by the House as one of the managers on the part of the House to present the evidence substantiating the articles of impeachment against Judge Halsted Ritter. Upon my return, realizing that the House had acted upon the recommendation of Chairman Sumners, I called on him to express my thanks. When I had done so, he said: 'Now, boy, don't you get the big-head. Randolph and I talked it over. We knew that we had all the brains necessary to do this job. But we decided that we needed an errand boy and that you had the biggest feet in the committee, so we put you on to run errands.'

"Isn't it true that some of the genius of any executive manifests itself in putting others to work? We worked our hearts out for him, and in doing so, learned to love him fervently. Isn't that the way of life? Isn't the only way we really learn to love by serving?"

"That was certainly true of him. He loved you all from the beginning, but that love deepened into a consuming passion by serving you. You put him to work. You kept him at work for half a century—glorifying Dallas. Not only in the mores of the chamber of commerce, but also as your representative, your minister plenipotentiary, and your envoy extraordinary. 'Birds of a feather flock together,' is just as true of congressional representation as in the choice of personal friends. The Nation knows and loves your district because you were the kind of people represented by Hatton Sumners. We know you not, but know you well. We love you, because we first loved him. And from the depths of that fervent devotion we know how to appreciate this new representation of your Representative, who, at the height of his power and glory, relinquished the official authority you had given him, to wear the crown of private citizen—the only king this Nation knows. In that appreciation our words are weighted with unique significance when we say we thank you.

"PROUD OF OUR CHAIRMAN

"We of this committee are proud of each of the 40 men who have led us as chairman. Thanks to our distinguished colleague, Hon. Louis E. Graham, who has done prodigious research and written a history of this committee, we have the facts. Beginning with Charles J. Ingersoll, whose brother, Joseph R. Ingersoll later became chairman (the two Ingersoll brothers being the only two members of the same family who have had this distinction, Hugh Nelson, John Sergeant, Daniel Webster, Philip P. Barbour, and James Buchanan and running through the list to Hatton W. Sumners, who served longest, and the distinguished gentleman who now adorns the chair, Hon. Earl C. Michener, each has exercised the office with becoming dignity and honor.

"PROUD OF OUR COMMITTEE

"This committee is also proud of its membership. Three, Franklin H. Pierce, James Buchanan, and William McKinley, have been President. Three other members have been candidates for that high office, John Bell, Stephen A. Douglas, and John W. Davis. James S. Sherman became Vice President, while three others were candidates for that office, George H. Pendleton, Allen G. Thurman, and John Sergeant. Seven were Speakers of the House, Philip P. Barbour, John Bell, John W. Jones, Michael C. Kerr, Thomas B. Reed, David B. Henderson, and Frederick C. Gillette. Three were candidates for that office, Timothy Pitkin, Samuel S. Marshall, and Joseph W. Bailey. Armistead Burt served as Speaker during the absence of Speaker Winthrop. Three served as President pro tempore of the Senate, Allen G. Thurman, Isham G. Harris, and William P. Frye. Fifteen have been Cabinet members, Daniel Webster, James Buchanan, Edward Livingston, Charles Toucy, John C. Spencer, John Bell, William Wilkins, George W. McCrary, George S. Boutwell, Thomas Corwin, Hilary A. Herbert, Edwin Denby, Charles A. Wickliffe, Nathan K. Hall, William L. Wilson. Two served as Solicitor General of the United States, John W. Davis and James M. Beck. Twenty-two served in the diplomatic service, one as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Philip P. Barbour. Three were circuit court judges, 12 as district court judges, 4 as judges of Territorial courts. One became Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and one chief justice of the United States Court of Claims. One became Judge Advocate General of the Union Army, John A. Bingham, who also served as special judge advocate in the trial of the conspirators against the life of President Lincoln. Several were Assistant Attorneys General of the United States. Thirty-four were United States attorneys, 49 United States Senators, 37 State governors, while Romulus Saunders was de-

feated by one vote for the office of Governor of North Carolina. Twenty-five have served as State attorneys general. Ten have served as chief justice of their State supreme courts. Twenty-two became justices of their State supreme courts. Four became presidents of colleges or universities, and many were professors of note. More than 300 of the total number of 588 filled, with honor and distinction, various minor offices.

"Judge Sumners gave expression to our self-satisfaction. It was in the lengthy hearings some years ago on his resolution giving the residents of the District of Columbia the vote and a measure of self-government. We had been holding these hearings for 3 weeks, frequently running into the night. The leading proponents including practically every president of dozens of local civic clubs, predominantly feminine, had read to us their testimony. Almost without exception, each statement had begun, like Paul before King Agrippa, eulogizing us and stressing the fortunate lot of the witnesses in having the privilege of appearing before such an able and distinguished group of legislators. Finally the representative of the CIO appeared, late at night, and with the 'Harvard accent' usually characterizing such chosen spokesmen, began, 'Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of this great committee, during the weary sessions of these long hearings, I have been thoroughly sympathetic with you gentlemen, as witness after witness piled eulogy on eulogy and read page after page of unctuous flattery. But I know that you gentlemen are far too astute and discerning to be swayed in the slightest degree from your high sense of duty by any compliments paid you.' At this point, Chairman Sumners broke in, 'Buddy, if you have any papers to sell, you'd better sell 'em, for we take judicial knowledge of the fact that we are pretty damn smart.' This effectively cleared the atmosphere and sped the hearings after a gale of laughter had swept this crowded chamber, relieving the tension.

"This portrait will be cherished here as it hangs in this historic room, for we love the judge and you! It will always serve us as an inspiration; challenging us to remember the Sumners leadership, acclaimed through the years by his colleagues in the Congress, by Chief Justice Taft, who referred to him as 'the best lawyer in Congress'; and, 'the only man who ever overruled the Supreme Court'; by Senator William E. Borah, who wrote: 'You had a delicate and difficult task to perform, and you did it with fine judgment, good taste, and inspiring patriotism.' And again, 'Your State will be proud of you for what you did and your country will always be indebted to you. Congratulations, from your friend.' By Secretary of State Cordell Hull: 'Let me take this occasion to express my deepest appreciation to you for your intelligent interest in and exceedingly helpful attitude toward many of the most important phases of our foreign affairs. This cooperation on your part has been of the greatest help and service to the State Department and to me personally.' By Attorney General Francis Biddle, in an article in Collier's in 1942: 'As a result of a suggestion from Congressman Hatton W. Sumners, of Texas, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, who was very much concerned with our experiences in the last war (he became a Member of Congress in 1913), I set up a War Frauds Unit in the Department of Justice in February 1942.' And in a personal letter, later: 'The signing by the President of the antitrust legislation to speed the war effort leads me to take this opportunity of telling you how much we appreciate your assistance on this legislation. Your expert and wise handling of such war measures as the First and Second War Powers Act and the Foreign Agents Registration Act will, I am sure, in the perspective of history, be found to be a marked contribution to our prosecution of this war.'

"By Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, who, when Under Secretary, wrote: 'I wish to express to you the warm appreciation of the War Department for the constructive work you have done recently in carrying the small-business bill to a successful conclusion in Congress. Your assistance in this matter, as in many others has been of great value to the war effort. I am also mindful of the good work you have done over the past 2 years, in Congress and out of Congress, to arouse the Nation to an awareness of the perils forced upon us by the ambitions of the dictators who control the Axis Powers'; by the award of the American Bar Association medal for distinguished service to American jurisprudence—an unprecedented award; by Washington correspondents, who called him 'the ablest and most potent advocate in Congress'; 'wisest as well as smartest.'

"Not only was he held in such high esteem by these eminent gentlemen, but also he won national approbation gained by few.

"On the occasion of the formal celebration in the House of the completion of a quarter century of service in Congress of Hon. Hatton W. Sumners—Congressional Record of April 7, 1933, pages 6528-6532—several of his colleagues

made heartfelt remarks concerning his career. There may be found fuller treatment than propriety permits today.

“Judge Sumners, when it had to be done, could criticize. And he could be stern. But he always tempered his criticism with humor—that oil that keeps machinery running. The philosophy, both of his private and public life, was that of the ‘God-fan,’ as he loves to call himself. He knows beyond cavil or question that God is the ‘Big Boss’ and that neither life nor law can be good unless in consonance with His will and plan. As a pound of example is worth a ton of talk, his life and leadership will always be revered above all other emphasis because he lived and lives in philosophy.”

Sources: Annals of Congress; Congressional Debates; Congressional Globes; Congressional Records; Congressional Directories; Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774–1927; Hind’s Precedents of the House of Representatives (1907), vol. III; Cannon’s Precedents of the House of Representatives (1933), volumes III, VI; House Journals; House Rules and Manual; Congressional Committees; McConachie; Creation of the Federal Judiciary, G. J. Schulz; Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service; Cases of Impeachment, extracts from the Journal of the United States Senate; Supreme Court in United States History, Warren; American Doctrine of Judicial Supremacy, Haines; Debates in the Federal Convention of 1787, reported by James Madison, edited by Gaillard Hunt and James B. Scott; Constitution of the United States, John Randolph Tucker; Proceedings of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in the Trial of Impeachment of Robert W. Archbald; The Business of the Supreme Court, Frankfurter and Landis; Proceedings of the United States Senate in the Trial of Impeachment of Halsted L. Ritter, Senate Document No. 200, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session; act of March 3, 1931 (ch. 436, et Stat. 1508, U. S. C. 170); Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

