

STATEMENT OF STANLEY LATSHAW, REPRESENTING THE NATIONAL PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. LATSHAW. What I had intended to say, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, has been largely said by some of the preceding speakers, and as time is getting late I will try to make only a very few comments.

I am representing in a way the periodical publishers.

Senator KING. By that do you mean the metropolitan press as well?

Mr. LATSHAW. No; these are the periodical publishers—farm papers, religious papers, scientific, and so forth.

Senator CONNALLY. Magazines?

Mr. LATSHAW. Magazines.

However, I am not here as the result of the collection of data and the collection of opinions of these publications representing, as I say, something more than 4,000 of all sorts of political and economic points of view unless we conducted a referendum, it would be impossible for anyone to speak definitely with respect to the views upon such a large and varied organization. So that anything that I might say is said with the backing of the officials of the organization and is in advance of the collection of data which we now have in progress.

We represent a business of \$300,000,000, probably, with an employment roll of some 100,000 or more and about 11,000—we have to take it from the census figures, as the combination, because it has not been broken down between metropolitan newspapers and periodicals—a total of some 11,524 of whom 11,000 roughly employ 50 persons or less. The nature of our business is such that our wages are high and our employment is stabilized to a degree I think that is unequalled in the other large industries.

We therefore have in the matter of employment, the minimum peaks and valleys of employment and unemployment, and I think that according to the figures of the National Industrial Conference Board, the rate of wages paid in our industry over the period of the last 10 years has been the highest paid by any large industry, with a few exceptions.

Senator CONNALLY. Is that because you are making more money than the other industries?

Mr. LATSHAW. Unfortunately that is not true. I happen to be the chairman of our code authority, and in our code authority hearings based on questionnaires sent to the publishers and the figures coordinated, we showed that 70 percent of the periodicals published in 1932 were in the red, and that in the opinion of our board of directors, 90 percent of them were in the red in 1933, so that we have not made a great deal of money.

Senator CONNALLY. That is because of the falling off in advertising by reason of the business slump?

Mr. LATSHAW. Very largely, and because our business unfortunately is one that cannot shut down. If the next issue promises to be unprofitable, we must issue it nevertheless; there can be no partial suspension. It must go on, either according to the custom in the trade, and also because of the post-office regulations.

Senator CONNALLY. Is the Saturday Evening Post a member of your organization?

Mr. LATSHAW. All of the periodicals, large and small. I find myself speaking for the periodicals with the reservations that I have made, because as I say, we include so wide a sector that we include all possible points of view, and the points I wish to make before the committee is the inability that we have to be of service in this hearing. This is a very large and complex subject. Our record shows, I think, and you may agree with me, that we have been leaders or a large part of our membership have been leaders in what might be called social betterment. I think that our record shows that we have been not the recalcitrant die-hards; our own handling of our employees and the payments that we make to them show that we practice what we have preached. And we should perhaps be prepared to come before you gentlemen with some plan.

Unfortunately, the point that I wish to make is that this legislation, perhaps because of our stupidity, has caught us without preparation. It involves and will involve for industry---

Senator CONNALLY (interposing). As I understand you, you do not even know whether your industry as a whole favors it or is opposed to it?

Mr. LATSHAW. Quite true. What I am trying to make as my point, gentlemen, is this, that our industry, in common with all industries, is that there is proposed a series of regulatory measures, new legislation which involve millions and ultimately billions of dollars: Our share of that will be not only our contribution but the contributions which we would have to absorb as other industries would have to absorb, by the additional cost of supplies and so forth, and the expense and ramifications of this do not frighten us, but they bewilder us with the speed with which we are asked—we are not asked, because we came here voluntarily, but we should like to be—and I think perhaps there are other industries in the same position; we should like to be better informed.

I suggest therefore that it is the opinion of our industry, and this I think I can speak with a reasonable degree of assurance that I would have the concurrence of that majority? that in the wisdom of this committee, that a commission be appointed to make a study of the situation in Europe, to make that study which has been made in Europe by commissions there and has taken a period of time and that the findings of that commission be made available for study, not only by Congress, but by industry and others interested in general.

It is proposed to put our hands to a plow that has a furrow that leads clear over the horizon. It is not temporary legislation, it is not emergency legislation. The dictation of the interest in the matter may arise from an emergency, it may be inspired by an emergency, it may be quickened by an emergency, but it is as I take it, not an emergency measure, and the publishers that I am representing ask that a commission be appointed to make a study. Perhaps it may take a year to make such a study, the study to reveal the experience and the mistakes. I understand that in Europe there is no system that has not been tinkered with repeatedly.

Senator CONNALLY. We do that with all of our laws. We would not be here if we were not tinkering with our laws all the time.

Mr. LATSHAW. I think, Senator, the best we can hope for is that legislation might emerge that would require the minimum of tinkering.

Senator CONNALLY. Is it not well known what these European countries have done? Did not the Cabinet Committee that prepared this bill make a study of all of these questions? Would your suggestion not merely mean the delay of a year?

Mr. LATSHAW. We are not cognizant of the result of any such study and plan as is set forth here that would give us time to digest or to understand or to make an application of it to our own industry and to make the calculations as best we could as to the ramifications and the computations and permutations.

Senator CONNALLY. We cannot make anybody study these things unless they want to. Here is your organization representing the press of the Nation, and ordinarily to whom we are supposed to look for instruction and guidance, and here you are coming along and wanting us to wait another year so that your members can learn all about this thing.

Mr. LATSHAW. Perhaps we are unduly modest in coming along with recommendations.

The CHAIRMAN. You will recall that this Committee, appointed by the President, was appointed many months ago and that they did give study to it over a long period of time.

Mr. LATSHAW. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They studied the European systems and State systems, and so forth, and at the close of the last session of Congress or before the close of the last session of Congress, it was thought then that at least one feature of this bill would be taken up, and that was unemployment insurance. Bills had been introduced on old-age pension. Committees of Congress had had hearings on all of these matters which were available, and the administration thinks that they have been proceeding along deliberately with a view of getting up a plan such as this and it makes these suggestions. So that all of this matter was available to your organization.

Senator KING. If I may say so, I do not believe that this request which you have made, and I say it with all due respect to you and your organization, will get anywhere. I do not think that this Congress is going to delay passing some bill dealing with social insurance, and unless you can make some contribution by way of practical suggestions or the form of the legislation, you will have no part in the measure that will emerge from Congress when we get through. There will be some bill passed, and I think your organization might just as well recognize that fact.

Mr. LATSHAW. We have never been here as obstructionists. I think that will be granted. I think on the contrary, that we were more like plumed knights that are trying to lead, whether properly or otherwise.

Senator KING. We wish you would, as plumed knights, suggest some improvements if you deem that the bill before us is defective.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that the committee gets the viewpoint of your organization, and your viewpoint, that you want us to proceed stealthily and slowly, that you have not been able to get together the opinions of your organization into various propositions, and you are not in a position to make any suggestions.

Mr. LATSHAW. There is only one thing, one trifling suggestion in passing, and that was given quite some discussion this morning at the hearing. I said at the start that we have a very fine record as to

wages paid and the stabilization of employment. It seems to me unfair to adopt a system by which the efficient, without reward, would carry on the work of the inefficient, or the "unlucky" as it has been termed. It seems to me that in this matter as in other things, that charity commences at home, and that those industries that have had a record of taking care of their own should be given recognition in legislation, definite recognition, because otherwise the premium will be on "letting George do it", and we have not had that point of view and we do not think that will be fair and equitable, and we do not think it would encourage the very sort of employer and employee relationship which is presumed to be desired in social legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very glad to get your suggestion. If there are any other suggestions you want to make or elaborating your remarks, do so, and we will put this in the record.

Mr. LATSHAW. Thank you.

Senator BLACK. Is there any industry in the Nation that is more dependent upon wages and the incomes of individuals that buy its output than the publishers?

Mr. LATSHAW. Not that I know of.

Senator BLACK. To that extent, then, anything that stabilizes employment throughout industry as a whole and which might improve the income of the purchaser is at least as much to your industry as to that of any industry that does business in the country.

Mr. LATSHAW. I should say so.

Senator BLACK. And in connection with your idea of waiting! you are familiar of course with the fact that for a number of years in all of these periodicals, many of us have been reading most excellent articles on the subject of unemployment insurance, old-age pensions in this country and in general. Your periodicals have been open to such publications, have they not?

Mr. LATSHAW. Many of them.

Senator BLACK. And they have been carried from year to year all through the years. Even the progressive Saturday Evening Post, as I recall it, has had a number of articles on that subject of unemployment insurance. So that your industry of all industries, if it reads its own publications, has certainly been better educated on it than any other industry in the Nation, has it not?

Mr. LATSHAW. Perhaps, but we still do not feel that we are sufficiently educated.

The CHAIRMAN. But they are not all together on the proposition.

Mr. LATSHAW. No; and we never will be.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true with reference to this committee and that is true with reference to Congress.

Senator CONNALLY. While you are not prepared to represent the views of all of your members, probably you would like to give us your own individual views. I do not insist, but if you do, I think the committee would be glad to have it as an individual.

Mr. LATSHAW. I do not believe, sir, that I should take the time of this committee to indulge in generalizations. We have had the question as to whether the Ohio plan was better than the Wisconsin plan, and whether this bill should be divided or whether it should be left in the present omnibus form, whether it should be administered by a commission or Cabinet member, and so forth and so on. There has been many suggestions about this thing. I have 4 pounds of data in

there [indicating] and I do not believe I can concrete any brilliant new thought that would solve the problem. I am trying to say that from the best guidance that I can get from the members that I represent, that this is a problem so far-reaching, so important, and so long in duration that it should not be passed as an emergency measure without the opportunity for review and consideration, so as to minimize the inevitable tinkering that will come.

Senator **CONNALLY**. Of course there is no law that we ever passed that we never changed. The world is moving and we are progressing, and we are going to have to change all of these laws from time to time. Did it ever occur to you that the old-age pension and the unemployment will probably help your business?

Mr. **LATSHAW**. Anything will.

Senator **CONNALLY**. The unemployed and the aged are the chief newspaper readers now. [Laughter.]

The **CHAIRMAN**. You have been one of the best witnesses before this committee. I congratulate you on your modesty, and I presume you can appreciate our troubles, perhaps more than any other witness who has appeared before the committee.

STATEMENT OF ELON H. HOOKER, PRESIDENT HOOKER ELECTRO-CHEMICAL CO., NEW YORK CITY, REPRESENTING THE MANUFACTURING CHEMISTS ASSOCIATION

Mr. **HOOKER**. Mr. Chairman, if you want to go to lunch, if the time is short—

The **CHAIRMAN**. No. We have had to arrange our calendar as we have gone along. We hope to close these hearings this week. If you have a statement that you want to put in the record, very well, and discuss the high points of your statement, all right. The committee is not going to sit this afternoon.

Mr. **HOOKER**. I would like to put in my statement and then if the committee is not too tired, I would like to make a few remarks afterward that are a little more direct and a little less carefully studied but perhaps a little more human.

The **CHAIRMAN**. You may put your statement in the record then. Did you want to read the statement?

Mr. **HOOKER**. I will bring out the main points in it; yes.

I am president of the Hooker Electrochemical Co. In that capacity I am an employer of labor and have a definite responsibility, which I feel deeply, for the welfare and best interests of those who are employed in my plants. I appear before you, therefore, today as a man faced with an operating responsibility who will, in his particular field, have to carry out the provisions of the bill which you are considering should it become law. I am here also in a broader capacity as a representative of the chemical industry, having been requested to serve by both the Manufacturing Chemists' Association and the Chemical Alliance.

According to the 1933 figures from the Bureau of the Census, the chemicals and allied products industry have 6,257 establishments, employing 265,709 workers, with wages totaling \$311,540,000. I cite these figures to you simply to show you that the provisions of the bill which we are considering today are of the greatest interest to the industry which I represent.