8485. By Mr. QUAYLE: Petition of Mirakel Optical Co., of Mount Vernon, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Norbeck game refuge bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8486. Also, petition of Dykes Lumber Co., of New York City, favoring the passage of the Norbeck game refuge bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8487. Also, petition of Conservation Department, State of New York, Albany, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Norbeck-Andresen game refuge bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8488. Also, petition of the American Indian Defense Association (Inc.), Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of House bill 7204, a bill to authorize the creation of Indian trust estates; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

8489. Also, petition of Brooklyn Chapter, Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, favoring an appropriation sufficient to train 26,000 reserve officers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

8490. By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of about 1,759 employees and business men affected by the depression in the gypsum industries in Genesee, Monroe, and Erie Counties, in western New York State, to impose a duty on raw, partly manufactured, and manufactured gypsum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8491. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of North Dakota Holstein Breeders' Association, indorsing the Haugen bill (H. R. 10958) to amend the definition of oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8492. By Mr. WINTER: Resolution from O. G. Rhode, president the Sheridan County Farm Bureau, Ranchester, Wyo., urging adequate protection for domestic sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8493. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Constance Hall Totten, Garfield Park, Chicago, Ill., urging support of bill increasing pensions of Union veterans, Civil War (S. 4559); to the Committee on Pensions.

8494. Also, petition of Clem Sikorg, Chicago, Ill., urging support of House bill 15526 and Senate bill 3281; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8495. Also, petition of G. W. Mingus, urging support of anti-alien representation amendment bill (H. J. Res. 102); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8496. Also, petition of W. F. Judd of National Association of Letter Carriers, Bloomington, Ill., urging support of the Dale-Lehlbach retirement bill (S. 1727) and the La Follette-Mead short Saturday workday bill (S. 3281); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8497. Also, petition of Thomas O. Morris, president Tennessee Association of Drainage Districts, Obion, Tenn., urging support of Senate bill 4689; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

8498. Also, petition of Harry L. Gandy, executive secretary National Coal Association, Washington, D. C., urging support of House bill 16301; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8499. Also, petition of L. D. Garrett, 50 East Forty-second Street, New York City, urging support of the Black bill (S. 3089) and the McSwain bill (H. R. 13509); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8500. Also, petition of J. S. Abbott, secretary Institute of Margarine Manufacturers, urging support of Haugen bill (H. R. 10958); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8501. Also, petition for strengthening of the immigration laws, by Stacy Neal, Sorento, Ill., and 90 other citizens of Sorento, Ill.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8502. Also, petition of O. E. Campbell, carrier No. 2, Winchester, Ill., urging support of Senate bill 3027; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8503. Also, petition of W. A. Wallace, committeeman, Virden, Ill., urging support of the Capper-Kelly bill (H. R. 11); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8504. Also, petition of U. G. Lee, vice commander of William McKinley Camp, Chicago, Ill., urging passage of pension bill (H. R. 14676); to the Committee on Pensions.

8505. Also, petition of the Chicago Association of Credit Men, by J. F. O'Keefe, secretary, urging that the Committee on Agriculture give consideration to the views of the Illinois-Missouri joint conference of credit men; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8506. Also, petition of E. O. Excell Co., Chicago, Ill., urging passage of Senate bill 4689 and Smith bill (H. R. 14116); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

8507. Also, petition of Charles J. Rhoads, president Indian Rights Association, Philadelphia, Pa., urging support of House Joint Resolution 374; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

8508. Also, petition of citizens of Illinois, urging passage of the Dale-Lehlbach civil service retirement bill (S. 1727); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

8509. Also, petition urging passage of Jones-Stalker bill (H. R. 1069); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8510. Also, petition of George B. Lake, M. D., managing editor Clinical Medicine and Surgery, Chicago, Ill., urging defeat of House bill 14070; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8511. Also, petition of National Association of Letter Carriers, urging support of 30-year retirement bill and 44-hour week bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8512. Also, petition of Wilkinson, Huxley, Byron & Knight, Chicago, Ill., urging defeat of Senate bill 2366 and House bill 7951; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8513. Also, petition of Federal Motion Picture Council in America (Inc.), urging support of House bills 10761 and 13686; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8514. Also, petition urging support of Black bill (S. 3089) and Wainwright-McSwain bill (H. R. 12306); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8515. Also, petition of the Symington Co., Chicago, Ill., urging opposition to Senate bill 668; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8516. Also, petition of H. A. Meyer, attorney, Greenville, Ill., urging support of Pullman surcharge bill (S. 668); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8517. Also, petition of Cora S. Reid, Daughters of American Revolution, Springfield, Ill., urging passage of the 15-cruiser bill (H. R. 11526) and Kellogg pact; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

8518. Also, petition of White County rural letter carriers, of Illinois, urging passage of Reece good road bill (H. R. 5659) and Dale retirement bill (S. 1725); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8519. Also, petition of Daughters of American Revolution, urging passage of Joint Resolution 11; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8520. Also, petition of Church, Traxler & Kennedy, lawyers, Chicago, Ill., urging support of cruiser bill (H. R. 11526); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

8521. Also, petition of official board of the First Methodist Church, Springfield, Ill., urging support of cruiser bill and Kellogg Paris peace pact; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

8522. Also, petition of the United National Association of Post Office Clerks, of Peoria, Ill., urging support of longevity bills (S. 3282; H. R. 15083); the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8523. Also, petition of ———, urging support of dog exemption bill (H. R. 11998); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8524. Also, petition of board of directors of the Woman's Club of Springfield, Ill., indorsing the pending cruiser bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, *February 1, 1929*

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 31, 1929)

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate resumes the consideration of the unfinished business.

CONSTRUCTION OF CRUISERS

The Senate, as in the Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11526) to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARRISON obtained the floor.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Curtis	Hale	Mayfield
Barkley	Dale	Harris	Moses
Bayard	Dill	Harrison	Neely
Bingham	Edge	Hastings	Norbeck
Black	Fess	Hawes	Norris
Blaine	Fletcher	Hayden	Nye
Blease	Frazier	Heflin	Oddie
Borah	George	Johnson	Overman
Bratton	Gerry	Jones	Pine
Brookhart	Gillett	Kendrick	Ransdell
Bruce	Glass	Keyes	Reed, Mo.
Burton	Glenn	King	Reed, Pa.
Capper	Goff	McKellar	Robinson, Ark.
Caraway	Gould	McMaster	Robinson, Ind.
Couzens	Greene	McNary	Sackett

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Schall	Steck	Trammell	Walsh, Mont.
Sheppard	Steiwer	Tydings	Warren
Shipstead	Stephens	Tyson	Waterman
Shortridge	Swanson	Vandenberg	Watson
Simmons	Thomas, Idaho	Wagner	Wheeler
Smoot	Thomas, Okla.	Walsh, Mass.	

Mr. GLENN. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

Mr. NORRIS. I desire to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] is still ill, and for that reason is detained from the Senate. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. BLAINE. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is unavoidably absent from the Senate. I ask that the announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] are detained from the Senate by illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, I send to the desk several letters which I have received in relation to the pending cruiser bill, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILMINGTON, DEL., *January 29, 1929.*

Hon. DANIEL O. HASTINGS,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Allow me to enter a protest against the passage of the so-called cruiser bill.

We have now a navy bigger than that of any other nation except England, with which nation we are about on a parity, and with which nation there is not the slightest possibility that we could have a war.

Besides this, after having indorsed the Kellogg peace pact, the passing of the cruiser bill will imply that we are not honest in our desire for peace and make us look ridiculous to the other nations of the world.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS W. BROSIUS.

Senator HASTINGS.

DEAR RESPECTED FRIEND: Will thee kindly use thy influence and vote against the passing of the cruiser bill to build more ships, when we are so hopeful that the Kellogg peace treaty will end all war. It surely is not a sensible thing to build ships for war and send forth the message of peace—that has been such a comfort to the whole world at large—to settle the differences of nations by peaceful methods.

Hoping this will add to the many letters sent thee to do thy duty to God and man.

Very cordially,

ELIZABETH F. NEWLIN.

JANUARY 30, 1929.

THE MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION OF WILMINGTON
AND THE WILMINGTON EMPLOYEES' ASSOCIATION,
Wilmington, Del., January 30, 1929.

Hon. DANIEL O. HASTINGS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Manufacturers' Association of Wilmington, representing 75 per cent of the manufacturers in the State of Delaware, wishes to strongly urge your support of the cruiser bill, H. R. 11526, now before the Senate.

Our Navy, according to the highest authorities, is below parity with all first-class powers and is incapable of adequately performing its functions as our first line of defense and the guardian of our expanding commerce.

President Coolidge, in his last Armistice Day speech, estimated that our unpreparedness for the Great War cost taxpayers $1,000,000,000 for every six days. We, therefore, feel that this is an investment our Government should make, that the time limit specified in the bill should be strictly adhered to and that the wave of pacifism threatening to strip us of all adequate defense should be strongly resisted.

Very truly yours,

HARRY I. BELL, *Secretary.*

WILMINGTON, DEL., *January 31, 1929.*

Hon. DANIEL O. HASTINGS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HASTINGS: I sincerely hope you will use your efforts to have the bill authorizing the construction of additional cruisers brought up for a vote in such form that it will not include the time limit requiring all of the construction to be started or completed within the relatively short period talked of.

As a basis to trade with France and England in future negotiations, it may be policy to pass the bill. I feel rather some strong doubts as to whether there is, otherwise, justification for a program of construction of this size at this time, but in any event it would seem a great mistake to require that the entire program be entered upon within the next few years on account of the possibility of future treaties providing for reduction in expensive naval construction.

Yours very respectfully,

J. EDGAR RHOADS.

WILMINGTON, DEL., *January 31, 1929.*

Hon. DANIEL O. HASTINGS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DAN: You may think it rather peculiar that I, as a Quaker, should be writing to you to ask you to support the cruiser bill now before the Senate, but I feel very deeply on this question and can not agree with those who are making such a great "howl" against it, stating that an adequate navy is an invitation to attack.

To my mind, while these people are thoroughly sincere in their ideas, they are lacking in a knowledge of human nature. When we were boys we had no hesitancy in climbing a fence and going after apples—if we knew that the farmer was on the other side of the farm, and had no dog—whereas, if we knew that he had a good bulldog we walked carefully down the road and did not attempt to climb the fence.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

JOSEPH BANCROFT.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15848) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and prior fiscal year, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOOD, Mr. CRAMTON, and Mr. BYRNS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. TYSON presented memorials of members of the faculty and student body of Lincoln Memorial University, of Harrogate, Tenn., remonstrating against the passage of the bill (H. R. 11526) to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BURTON presented a memorial of members of the Friends Boarding School, of Barnesville, Ohio, remonstrating against the passage at the present time of the bill (H. R. 11526) to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Logan, Hocking County, Ohio, praying that the national-origins provision of the immigration law may be put into effect, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. BINGHAM, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions, to which was referred the bill (S. 5621) to repeal paragraphs 127 and 128 of the act entitled "An act to discontinue certain reports now required by law to be made to Congress," approved May 29, 1928, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1584) thereon.

Mr. STEPHENS, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 3949) for the relief of Frank F. Moore (Rept. No. 1586);

A bill (H. R. 4267) for the relief of Ernest J. Hiscock (Rept. No. 1587); and

A bill (H. R. 10624) for the relief of William J. Casey (Rept. No. 1588).

Mr. WATERMAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 4817) for the relief of the Federal Construction Co. (Inc.), reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1589) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4266) for the relief of certain officers and former officers of the Army of the United States, and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1590) thereon.

Mr. ODDIE, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, submitted a report (No. 1591) to accompany the bill (H. R. 496) authorizing an appropriation for development of potash jointly

by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce by improved methods of recovering potash from deposits in the United States, heretofore reported by him from that committee without amendment.

Mr. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1109) for the relief of Little Rock College, Little Rock, Ark., reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1593) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1939) for the relief of James M. Thomas, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1594) thereon.

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 4841) establishing a fund for the propagation of salmon in the Columbia River district, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1595) thereon.

Mr. BLACK, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11510) for the relief of Montana State College, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1596) thereon.

MEMORIAL TO MAJ. GEN. HENRY A. GREENE

Mr. BINGHAM. From the Committee on Military Affairs I report back without amendment, and unanimously, the bill (H. R. 12404) authorizing erection of a memorial to Maj. Gen. Henry A. Greene at Fort Lewis, Wash., and I submit a report (No. 1585) thereon.

Mr. JONES. The bill entails no expense on the Government, but simply permits the erection of this memorial on the Army post grounds at Fort Lewis, where General Greene was commander for a long time. I ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Henry A. Greene Memorial Association, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Washington, be, and is hereby, authorized to erect and maintain a suitable building, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, in and upon the United States military reservation at Fort Lewis, Wash., the plans of such building to be first approved and the building to be constructed in such location as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That the use of such portion of the ground floor of said building as may be necessary shall be given to the Post Office Department of the United States, free of charge, for the post-office service of the reservation, so long as said building remains on said grounds.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mr. GREENE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that to-day, February 1, 1929, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 4979) to authorize the city of Niobrara, Nebr., to transfer Niobrara Island to the State of Nebraska.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 5648) to amend section 8 of the act entiled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 5649) for the relief of John J. Holmes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FESS:

A bill (S. 5650) granting a pension to Ella P. Neeld; and

A bill (S. 5651) granting an increase of pension to Maria L. Evans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWES:

A bill (S. 5652) granting a pension to Barbara E. James (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5653) granting a pension to Susan E. Weaver (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL:

A bill (S. 5654) authorizing the Secretary of War to execute a satisfaction of a certain mortgage given by the Twin City Forge & Foundry Co. to the United States of America; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

A bill (S. 5655) granting a pension to Sarah Whoberry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 5656) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to grant a right of way for a levee through the Carville Marine Hospital Reservation, La.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana:

A bill (S. 5657) granting a pension to Winfred Tucker; to the Committee on Pensions.

PREFERENCE FOR DISABLED WAR VETERANS IN CENSUS BUREAU

Mr. ASHURST. I submit a concurrent resolution which I ask may be read.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that in the selection of such persons as are to be employed without reference to civil service, in the preparation of the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses direct preference shall be given to the disabled veterans of wars in which the United States has been engaged.

Mr. ASHURST. It seems that there is now no committee on the census; hence I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be referred to the Commerce Committee.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNARY in the chair) laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15848) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, that it accede to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. KEYES, Mr. OVERMAN, and Mr. GLASS conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on yesterday the House refused to agree to the Senate amendments to the deficiency appropriation bill, in which my amendment relative to prohibition enforcement was included. I shall not criticize anyone's vote or their motives and I shall make no partisan statement. I have consulted both Republican and Democratic Senators supporting this legislation and I have tried to keep partisanship out of the discussion entirely. Nothing I have said could be construed that way. It certainly will not be my fault if this effort to secure appropriation sufficient to enforce the prohibition law is made a partisan question.

But I want to analyze the vote of the House yesterday without reflecting on or criticizing any Member of that body. It shows that the leaders of the majority of the House joined the Tammany Hall Congressmen from New York City, the Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Chicago Congressmen, and the Representatives from the other great wet cities in the country in the other House, who do not believe in the prohibition law or its enforcement.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire will state the point of order.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator from Georgia is discussing what took place in another part of the Capitol, and under the rule he is not permitted to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, several Members of the House in discussing this bill referred to me as its author, and one Member went so far as to criticize my motives in offering the $24,000,000 amendment to enforce prohibition.

Mr. President, I ask permission to have read at the desk an amendment which will be submitted to the conferees by Congressman BYRNS, one of the conferees on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon the deficiency bill. This amendment is entirely satisfactory to me and those of us in this Chamber who supported my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

For the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment, the national prohibition act and supplemental acts, the tariff acts, and all laws pertaining to the traffic in intoxicating liquors and narcotics, the sum of $24,000,000, or such portion thereof as the President may deem useful,

to be expended in the discretion of the President through the Department of Justice, Coast Guard, Customs Bureau, Prohibition Bureau; and he may allot a sufficient sum or amount to the Civil Service Commission for the examination and investigation of eligibles for employment in the enforcement of such laws in the various agencies above mentioned in accordance with existing law, and to remain available until June 30, 1930.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. BYRNS, one of the conferees on the part of the House, will, I have been informed, offer that amendment when the conferees meet. It will meet very largely the objections of the Secretary of the Treasury. Of course, if he is opposed to any enforcement of the prohibition law, then, no matter what we agree to would be acceptable to him. This amendment does not force the spending of $1 extravagantly—only such part as is necessary—and I have faith in President-elect Hoover, who would have charge of this fund under my amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not see how it is possible for the conferees to put such an amendment in the deficiency bill. It is entirely different from anything contained in the language of the provision of the House or in the language of the amendment adopted by the Senate. Such a procedure would be not only against the rules of the House but against the rules of the Senate.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I suggest that other conferees be appointed if the Senate now thinks those already designated are not capable of determining these questions for themselves.

CONSTRUCTION OF CRUISERS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11526) to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, yesterday we were told, in a very eloquent speech delivered by a distinguished Senator, that those who oppose the time-limit provision in the cruiser bill are advocating a new dispensation on earth; that they think the hearts of men have changed and that no more is there any selfishness in the world. I submit, Mr. President, that some of us, at least, who believe in striking out the time-limit provision as it is now written still believe that there yet remains some selfishness in the world, but at the same time there has been a change in the thoughts and hearts of men affecting the peace of mankind.

There have been times, of course, when wars had to be fought and the people had to be taxed in order to prosecute them; but through the process of time civilization has developed, and I believe that the people of the world to-day are more interested in adopting plans that will preserve the peace of the world than they are in proposals imposing larger expenditures for the preparation of wars; so I expect to show, if I can, that the opposition of some of us to the time-limit provision is based upon reason and practice.

The speech of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] on day before yesterday was most eloquent. He has been most consistent in advocating preparation for war and the maintenance of a very large navy. I recall with pleasure the magnificent fight he waged against the adoption of the Washington conference agreement, and recall the many defects which he pointed out in the understanding then consummated. I recall, too, Mr. President, the long fight made on this side of the aisle in the cause for peace. I would not now detract one iota from the efforts of Democratic leadership in trying to evolve some plan for all the peoples of the world that future wars might be prevented and peace preserved.

It was pointed out in the debates at the time the League of Nations covenant was being discussed here that if we did not become a party to it we would have to go on a war rampage of naval competition. So it does not frighten me at this particular time to see bobbing up once in a while distinguished leaders, not only here but in the newspapers of the country, who opposed a plan of peace at that time and who now criticize as pacifists and poltroons those of us who believe in the elimination of the time limit in this bill. Many of them have been as consistent in opposing proposals of peace as they have been consistent in asking for large expenditures for preparation for war. If this country had exerted as much time and effort in cooperating with other nations to mold some plan, or working with them in some plan, to preserve peace and minimize the likelihood of future wars as it has in trying to find some way to destroy or effect these plans, we would not now be discussing this cruiser proposal. I did not think—and, in my opinion, but a small percentage of the American people thought at the close of the great World War—that we should hear in this body at this early date speeches so militant in character, so eloquent in presentation, that we could almost feel ourselves in the vortex of another war. Following the great World War some of us at least believed that the damage wrought, the suffering inflicted, the economic disarrangement imposed would naturally influence a modification, if not cessation, in another gigantic preparation for another war.

I read with interest the speech of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] as he, in that inimitable style of his, pictured the unpreparedness of this country when we entered the World War and how we had a scarcity of airplanes, machine guns, and other implements of war. One reading that speech might think that it was a detraction, in a way, from the great part that we played in that war. I shall not attempt to answer that. The glory of this country is written in the part played not only by the soldiers at the front and the men who manned our guns upon the seas, but by the great civilian population of this country, as well as by the statesmanship which guided the ship of state through those troublesome times.

The part played in that titanic struggle by our men and women in every walk of life will ever remain a great achievement and will reflect a lasting glory upon the country.

We are told that islands are fortified close to us; that Great Britain has a larger number of cruisers than we and has been expending great sums of money in the building of more. Mr. President, I know of no time when our country had a navy that was equal to the navy of Great Britain; nor do I now remember just when those fortifications, which we are told are pointing their guns toward us, were constructed; but, if I recall correctly, they have been there for decades; and yet not for almost 120 years have we engaged in war with Great Britain. And one must stretch his imagination now to believe that there is any likelihood of a war with that great Empire. They have been our allies in times of great moment and for a long time. I hope it will ever continue.

Mr. President, we are also told that the time limit should be placed in this proposed legislation; that it is necessary that it be placed there in order that the cruisers shall be built. I expect to show, before I conclude, that in no other instance where we have authorized the construction of battleships, cruisers, torpedo boats, or what not, has such a provision been inserted in any legislative proposal. Such action would be unprecedented, and the Senators who are leading this fight know that it would be unprecedented; yet, because some of us would eliminate it, we are characterized before the country as pacifists; cartoons are published in the newspapers ridiculing those of us who raise our voices here in the interest of peace, in the interest of economy, and in the interest fo adhering to the long-established customs and precedents governing such legislation as this in the past.

It is said that the Washington disarmament conference was a failure. In many respects it was a failure, but I have not any doubt that the men who represented this Government at that conference did their utmost to accomplish more than they did accomplish. I have not any doubt that they would have been delighted, as I know from reading the record, to have succeeded in the effort they made to have secured a limitation of cruisers and submarines and armament other than battleships; but they failed; they were unable to do it; and just so long as inventions are made and developments are brought about in naval construction and in military armaments or implements of warfare we are going to have naval and military competition. One country will say, "We want so many submarines to perfect our commerce"; another country will say, "We want so many cruisers in order to break blockades, so that we may develop our trade and commerce." One country is willing to make a desired concession to the other country if the other is willing to concede its particular contention; and so the mad race goes on and nothing is accomplished.

I submit, therefore, that we have in the end to get to some plan such as is proposed by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]—which I am delighted to see those who direct the destinies of the pending measure accept—that will ultimately bring about a conference that will establish the rules and regulations governing the rights of belligerents and the rights of neutrals. When we shall have done that, we can fix a basis for the limitation of armaments.

I am not frightened by the fact that we have failed in one instance. It is not the first time that a laudable mission which has been embarked upon has failed and then afterwards something has been accomplished. The whole world is full of instances where men have failed the first time to accomplish some achievement upon which they have set out, but on the secord or third or perhaps the seventh attempt have succeeded. Merely because the Washington disarmament conference failed is no reason to suppose that another conference might also fail.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I dislike to hear the Senator say that the Washington disarmament conference failed.

Mr. HARRISON. I did not catch the Senator's remark.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator said that the Washington disarmament conference failed. Yet it is admitted that it did reach an agreement as to battleships; and it is likewise admitted that every nation at that conference has abided by the agreement as to battleships. So it seems to me that something was accomplished.

Mr. HARRISON. Something was accomplished.

Mr. NORRIS. If it had not been for the conference, we would probably be in a controversy now about building battleships.

Mr. HARRISON. I repeat, something was accomplished.

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. CARAWAY. The very Senators who now here in the Senate are proclaiming that the Washington conference was a failure, a year or two ago were pointing to it as one of the greatest achievements of the Republican administration.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; that is true. However, in some particulars it did not obtain everything that those who represented our Government desired. Of course, as the result of that conference we did scrap some battleships. It is variously estimated that the loss to us as a result was about $150,000,000; and I believe the estimate has gone as high as $400,000,000. I do not know the exact figures, for I have never been able to ascertain that there is any real agreement among naval experts as to any particular proposition. As I have read the debates in the House, and as I have read the records and documents available to the Senate, I have found that there is some difference of opinion as to the amount of tonnage and as to the number of ships in the British Navy as compared to ours, and particularly with reference to what are called cruisers. Some tell us that the great number of vessels shown on paper to be possessed by Great Britain are in many instances small cruisers; that they are not as fast moving as ours; that they are not as good as some of the great submarines we have constructed. However, I pass that by. I assume that Great Britain has a larger navy than ours. I wish that we could be placed upon a parity with her some time. I would prefer that it be accomplished, if possible, by the British scrapping hers rather than ours being increased; but if the parity in time can not be achieved in such manner, then we will have to build toward her. But why hasten at this time? What necessity for it? Why the orderly way in which we have proceeded in the past to authorize construction be changed? It does seem to me, in this day of high civilization and broad statesmanship, that the nations could get together and adopt proper rules and regulations touching belligerent and neutral rights upon the seas, that a proper limitation upon armaments could be concluded. And if those high missions can be accomplished, there may be no need for these cruisers being constructed.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that only the other day, I think, it was figured out quite definitely that the cost of the ships which we scrapped, together with the cancellation of the contracts, involved about $175,000,000.

Mr. HARRISON. It is immaterial, so far as the purpose I now have in mind is concerned, whether the cost was $175,000,000 or $400,000,000.

Mr. HALE. It can be ascertained from an examination of the figures. The work which had been done on these ships which were scrapped cost about $150,000,000, and it cost $25,000,000 additional to settle the contracts which had been entered into.

Mr. HARRISON. Exactly; and the Senator from Maine and those who stand with him now want to see this great Government of ours begin within five months the construction of five cruisers, when they know that a disarmament conference is going to take place in 1931 that might result in scrapping some of the ships which will then be in course of construction, at the same time being forgetful that in this country we are still paying taxes for the burden of war and are suffering from the aftermath of the war.

Mr. HALE. We know, and the Senator himself knows perfectly well, that if the ships provided for by this bill shall be constructed we will not have to scrap them. It is not conceivable that Great Britain will scrap the ships that she has already built.

Mr. HARRISON. That may be; I will accept the advice of the naval expert upon that proposition; but I do know that when the Washington disarmament conference ended we had some battleships being constructed, and they were scrapped, and that act cost the American people a great deal of money. I know, furthermore, that when the war was ended by the treaty of Versailles the German Navy was destroyed. We did not ask to take over the German ships; England did not insist on taking over the German ships; nothing was said as to that, except that the ships should be scrapped. Yet here we are preparing to tax the American people again to build more ships, when we know that a disarmament conference is to meet in 1931, and perhaps another one this or next year.

Mr. HALE. The Senator also knows that the only reason we were able to bring about any agreement at the Washington disarmament conference was on account of the ships that we had building.

Mr. HARRISON. I can not believe that the statesmen of Great Britain were so weak that the reason they accepted a ratio of 5-5-3 with reference to battleships was because we had then some battleships in course of construction. That is the reason now advanced for this particular cruiser bill; that we must have in the yards being constructed some more cruisers in order to bludgeon Great Britain and Japan into limiting the construction of battle cruisers, perhaps.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, Great Britain, as she has a predominant navy, is perfectly satisfied with the status quo. If we are going to get her to cut down, we have got to show that we are going to keep up our Navy, or we will get nowhere in any conference; and if we provide merely for paper ships our "bluff" will be "called."

Mr. HARRISON. Here we are wanting to begin within five months, not willing to wait a year on five of them, not willing to wait two years nor three years, but wanting to begin five of them in four months by the 30th of June of this year, when we read in the papers that already Germany has invented a cruiser with 11-inch guns that can shoot many miles farther than the guns on these cruisers that we are going to construct.

Mr. HALE. What good would that do Germany?

Mr. HARRISON. No good, except that here is one nation in a mad race, in competition with another country, to build a bigger cruiser, a faster cruiser. It may be Great Britain or Japan will invent one more powerful and faster than the German type; then we will have to scrap these and adopt a new type.

Mr. HALE. Under the treaty of Washington such a ship could not be constructed.

Mr. HARRISON. Then those nations not members of the Washington conference have the advantage of us.

Mr. President, I shall not occupy the time of the Senate long, but I feel deeply and in earnest with reference to the time limit in this proposal. I said that it is unprecedented. The other day the Senator from Maine cited me to the law of 1924. We fixed a limit then. I want to read that law.

It will be remembered that in 1916, when war clouds were gathering in every part of the world, when every day we were approaching closer to the vortex of war, when these delicate questions were constantly presenting themselves to the administration, and the President of the United States and the naval board and the military authorities knew we must begin to prepare, and President Wilson went from one end of the country to the other arousing the people to the necessity of it; we needed those things, he said, pretty quickly; and so we passed the naval bill of 1916.

Was a provision written into the law at that time imposing a time limit? Did the law then say that we were to begin in five months the construction of five of the cruisers or five of the battleships? No, Mr. President. In that law we provided for a good deal. We provided for 10 first-class battleships. We provided for 6 battle cruisers. We provided for 10 scout cruisers. We provided for 50 destroyers, for 9 fleet submarines, for 58 coast submarines, for 1 submarine of another type, and for other instruments of war.

It is said that we have done nothing toward preparedness. It is said that we are a weak nation; that other nations have been constructing cruisers and other implements of war while we have sat quiescent and done nothing. That is not true. That was in 1916. In 1924 we came along, under the leadership of the Senator from Maine, and constructed more of these implements of war. At that time we provided for eight of these cruisers. We provided for other implements of war. We have done very well. The big fight on this bill is not against the 15 cruisers, not against giving the President the right to build them, but it is against the provision in regard to beginning

upon 5 of them within five months, by the 30th of June of this year, 5 more of them in one year and five months, and 5 more in two years and five months.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the Senator will recall that under the 1916 program, which put no time limit on the construction of the vessels authorized, certain vessels were authorized that have not yet been constructed. That is something that the Senate does not want to see happen in regard to these cruisers.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from Maine does not recall the facts about that bill. The bill of 1916 provided that the construction of those vessels was to be begun by the President by 1919. He was given three years in which to begin their construction. If the Senator will investigate the law, he will find that that is what it says. The President was given until 1919 to construct them. We hoped that perhaps he would not have to construct them. We gave him the power and the discretion to begin at any time within three years; and in 1918 we wrote a provision in the law also, because at that time some of them had not been constructed, saying that he was to begin as soon as practicable before the expiration of the time fixed in the law of 1916.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Mississippi to the fact that because of the improvement now over the conditions that existed a few years ago, the very delay that has taken place, and a repetition of which the Senator from Maine says he wants to avoid, will result, when the ships are constructed, in much better and more efficient and more useful ships than though they had been started and completed within a year or so. I call the Senator's attention also to the fact that that delay has not injured us or anybody else one particle.

Mr. HARRISON. Now I want to read, if the Senator will permit me, getting back to this proposition, what happened in 1924. Here is the report of the Senator from Maine in 1924. That law did not provide for beginning construction in a year or two years, nor did it say that five cruisers should be built within five months. The law of 1924 provided that their construction must be started before 1927.

Mr. HALE. That is correct.

Mr. HARRISON. The President was given three years from 1924.

Mr. HALE. The time limit was set within which they should be constructed.

Mr. HARRISON. Time within which they were to begin construction, and that three years off.

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator agree now to write a 3-year provision in this bill?

Mr. HALE. No, Mr. President; I will not——

Mr. HARRISON. Of course the Senator will not.

Mr. HALE. Because I think it is a much more orderly procedure to provide for building five each year.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator is inaugurating a new system here. All of those who have gone before, in providing for the building of battleships and cruisers, thought it was all right to give the President three years in which to begin construction; but the Senator wants to force his new President to begin on five of them inside of five months.

Here is what the Senator said at that time, in 1924, in his report:

> In view of the above facts, it is the opinion of your committee that the proposed program of eight light cruisers is a very modest one, and that it should be proceeded with as rapidly as practicable. In order to provide for this there has been incorporated in the bill a proviso that all eight vessels be laid down not later than July 1, 1927.

The Senator from Maine had confidence in President Coolidge. He was perfectly willing to give him the discretion of three years in which to build those cruisers. He said their construction must be proceeded with as rapidly as practicable; but to his new President, whom he stood for in Maine, whom he went to the Republican convention and advocated, he is not willing to give the discretion of building these cruisers for the next three years.

Mr. WHEELER. And that notwithstanding the fact that the President elect has said that he wants this time limit eliminated.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. Here is a bill that was introduced, carrying out the views of the Naval Board, in 1927. That is this program. Senators will recall that at that time it amounted to a billion dollars. It was so stupendous—it was, I might say, so ridiculous—that it did not even receive the approval of the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate. It did not receive the approval of anybody in the House of Representatives, so far as I know; not even the approval of the Secretary of the Navy—or, if he did approve it, he has kept quiet about it lately—and so they reduced the amount to $740,000,000. I presume, if they had carried through their plan, and if we now had before us the plan of expending $750,000,000, those of us who would say "strike out the time limit" and advocate not starting on the construction of so many of the vessels within five months would be classed as poltroons; we would be held up to the country as pacifists.

What has happened to change those who first suggested the plan of providing for $750,000,000 to the amount now of two hundred and eighty-odd million dollars? Have we been told?

Here is the bill that was introduced by the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee in the House at that time—Mr. Butler. Here is the way it reads. How different it is from this bill which some of us would have amended and are held up as pacifists by those who have never read the bill, by those who know nothing of the bill. Here is the difference in the two propositions.

Mr. Butler, carrying out the Naval Board's recommendation, introduced this bill:

> That for the purpose of further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States the President of the United States is hereby authorized to undertake the construction of the following vessels: 25 light cruisers, 9 destroyer leaders, 32 submarines, and 5 aircraft carriers.

Nothing is said about a time limit on the proposition. It just authorizes the construction of them, carrying out the administration's idea with reference to them; and that was for the building of 25 cruisers at that time.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, that bill was not reported to the House as introduced.

Mr. HARRISON. No.

Mr. HALE. The Senator does not know whether a time limit would have been put in or not had the bill been reported in that form.

Mr. HARRISON. No; it was not reported at the time, and so, after a while, they introduced the other bill cutting it down to $285,000,000, I believe; and then it was that they put in the time limit.

Mr. HALE. The original program, Mr. President, covered a period of five years. It would have covered, really, nine years after the laying down of the ships before they would have been finished. At that time a large part of the existing Navy would have become obsolete; and that was a general, comprehensive program to take care of what would be necessary in the future. At the expiration of that time, with the new ships, the Navy would not be as large, as far as numbers of ships are concerned, as it is at the present time.

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

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator from Maine has not quite accurately represented the situation. The fact is that Mr. Wilbur, speaking for the administration, and stating that he spoke with the authority of the President at that time, came before the committee and supported a bill which called for from 71 to 74 ships, none of which were battleships—25 cruisers, a number of destroyers, auxiliary crafts, and so on.

Mr. HALE. Thirty-two submarines.

Mr. KING. I know what I am speaking about—71 to 74 in all, at a cost, he said, of approximately $740,000,000. As a matter of fact, the cost would have been considerably more than $1,000,000,000; and it was stated in his testimony that this was only a starter. Mr. BRITTEN, speaking for the chairman of the committee, asked if this was only a starter, and Mr. Wilbur said yes; it was only a starter.

The fact is that the Senator from Maine and several others have yielded to the navalistic spirit which is flagellating the country, and they wanted to spend more than a billion dollars, and that was to have been merely a starter. Then would have come the construction of additional battleships, and, as Mr. Wilbur said, the cost would have been more than two and one-half billion dollars. That is the policy to which the Senator from Maine is committed.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I do not think the Senate understands the situation with regard to our Navy.

A navy is not self-perpetuating. The extreme limit of the life of vessels of the Navy is 20 years; and that limit is applied to battleships and aircraft carriers and cruisers. For destroyers the extreme limit, as determined at Geneva, was 16 years, and for submarine 30 years. Taking an average of 20 years

for the life of vessels of the Navy, that means that every year it is necessary to renew one-twentieth of the fleet that we now have if it is to be kept up to its present strength.

Our Navy at the present time is not composed altogether of new vessels. In fact, we have very few new vessels. It was not composed of new vessels at the time of the Washington conference. We have done almost no replacing since the time of the Washington conference. Therefore, what would ordinarily be laid aside to spend every year on replacement of the Navy increases for the years to come; and this proposed legislation was an attempt to forward the program of the Navy Department in an orderly way, to provide for the future replacement of vessels, and to bring us up to the necessary strength that we should have.

That will have to be done in the future if we are to take care of our Navy. We can not afford, every time we are to replace ships of the Navy, to have the outcry all over the country that we are trying to arm so as to fight foreign nations. It is a perfectly orderly procedure to provide each year ahead for the construction of the vessels of the Navy, and that I want to see done, and that this particular bill before us does in providing these 15 cruisers which we are now asking.

Mr. NORRIS rose.

Mr. HARRISON. Did the Senator from Nebraska want to say something?

Mr. NORRIS. I wanted to suggest that the Senator from Maine says we are not arming to fight other nations. I was curious to know why we were arming, then.

Mr. HALE. We are arming so that we shall not have to fight other nations.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, yes.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the same argument has been made every time we have had a naval bill before us, and I had hoped that the Senator would explain why in 1916, when we passed a naval bill, we gave the President three years in which to start the work under it, and in 1924 gave him three years to start work under it, but now it is proposed that he have only five months in which to start work.

Mr. CARAWAY. We had a Democratic President then, and they had confidence in him.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from Maine had more confidence, I take it, in President Wilson than he has in the President elect.

Mr. President, I can see no reason why we should not strike out this time limitation. As I have cited, in these other instances we gave the President three years. If we have confidence in the President elect—I have confidence in him, and it looks as if some of us have more confidence in him than the Senator from Maine has—if we are right in the proposition that we might limit armament construction as a result of the conference to be held in 1931, if we are right that we ought to agree upon the rules and regulations for the conduct of nations upon the seas as to the rights of belligerents, and the rights of neutrals, then let us give the President a free hand. Let him have an opportunity for real accomplishments when we go into these conferences. Let him have the power to build the cruisers, and in working out the plan for these conferences he may, if he pleases, use this legislation as a weapon of diplomacy, in order to force the hands of the other participants. Let us not go ahead and start the building of some ships within four or five months which might be scrapped. I do not know whether they will be or not; nobody else knows. The naval experts say that of course they will not be scrapped. They told us that the battleships would not be scrapped; but they were scrapped. I know that the American people to-day are not able to bear the heavy load of taxation which some people would force down upon them. They are still suffering from war responsibilities, and if I vote to put in this time limitation, and the disarmament conference should come on and should stop the further construction of those particular cruisers, I would have to explain to my constituents why it was that I voted against striking out the time limitation.

What harm can come from striking it out? What injury can come to the country from writing into the law, if you please, a 3-year provision, or a 2-year provision, or making it applicable following the adjournment of the next disarmament conference, in the meanwhile giving the President the power and the authority to build these cruisers? No one can say it would do an injustice to the country. We are not about to get into war with any country in the world.

Mr. HALE. How does the Senator know whether we are or not? The Senator can not say whether we will get into a war with any other country or not. Nobody thought we would get into a war a year before the World War.

Mr. CARAWAY. Everybody knew we would be in the war.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator has something in his breast, something he has not revealed to us, about some controversy with some foreign country with which we are about to get into a war. He ought to tell us about it.

Mr. HALE. I have not, nor had Senators in the Senate at that time.

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. The fact that President Coolidge recommended the cutting out of the time limit would indicate that the President does not think there is any immediate prospect of war.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, he wants it cut out. The State Department no doubt wants to put it off. The President elect of the United States wants to put it off.

Mr. KING. Perhaps the Senator thinks we are going to have war with Nicaragua and wants us to be prepared by having more battleships,

Mr. HALE. I think the President of the United States has already notified the country, through his talk with newspaper men, that he is ready to go ahead and authorize the construction of a certain number of ships. What we want to do is to provide by this bill when those ships shall be built, as we have a right to do as a body, under the terms of the provision of the Constitution by which we are required to provide and maintain a Navy.

Mr. HARRISON. If we notice there are many of the cruisers which are now being constructed that will not be finished until 1931. Who is calling for the immediate construction of the cruisers provided for in this bill? We have not been told that the naval board has done so. The proponents of this bill disclaim that the Secretary of the Navy has recommended it. The President of the United States is not insisting upon it. On the other hand, the President is appealing to his followers here to stand by him, and give to him and his successor the discretion to build them within the next three years, or to wait until at least after the next disarmament conference.

Mr. WHEELER. The Daughters of the American Revolution and the Navy League are back of it.

Mr. HARRISON. I think some people have been misled as to what is in this bill. I think that many of the societies which are advocating the immediate building of these cruisers under a time limit that is unprecedented do not know the real facts about the matter. Their purposes are high-minded but they are deceived. They do not recall that in all prior instances we have given the President three years in which to construct the vessels. They are misled by the speeches of such distinguished gentlemen as the Senator from Maine.

Who is it that is bringing influence to bear? Of course, it would help the Bethlehem Steel Co. It would probably help other steel interests in this country. The Government would need more armor plate, they will need to utilize more steel. It would give more employment to the men of those concerns, perhaps. It would add to their profits; yes. Of course, the chambers of commerce at Newport News, and perhaps at Norfolk, and perhaps at San Francisco, and other places in the country where there are great navy yards, have passed their resolutions, as have other organizations in those places. Perhaps the influential political leaders in the centers where these ships would be constructed have written to their Senators and their Representatives appealing to them to support this measure. But, Mr. President, that should not influence us in this particular instance.

Mr. HALE. The Senator knows that that consideration would not influence a Senator in this body.

Mr. HARRISON. I know it would not influence the Senator from Maine. That idea would be ridiculous.

Mr. HALE. Nor the Senator from Mississippi, or any other Senator.

Mr. HARRISON. I have no navy yards in my State, so I am immune.

Mr. HALE. It is unworthy of the Senator to make that suggestion.

Mr. HARRISON. Well, I will withdraw it. I must say to my friend, though, that I am glad I have no navy yard in my State, because I fear then I would be getting a lot of letters about it.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, at the time of the discussion on this pending bill on the floor of the House one of the members of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House at that time made the statement that unless this bill were passed the shipyards would have to go out of business.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I want to see a navy adequate for the defense of this country, as everyone else here does. I have so voted throughout my 18 years of public service. I am willing to give to the President the authority to build these 15 cruisers, with the time limit left out.

Mr. HALE. But the Senator is hoping that he will not build them.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I hope it will not be necessary to build them. I sincerely hope, as an advocate of peace in this country, that Mr. Hoover will show those high qualities of statesmanship which will lead him to call a conference, and that the conference will be successful, so that we can limit armaments, not only battleship construction, but the construction of submarines, airplanes, battle cruisers, and everything else of the kind. I hope we can agree upon rules and regulations as to rights of belligerents and neutrals upon the seas, and that it will not be necessary to build any more battleships or any more cruisers. The Senator objects to that.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I would like to read what the President elect, Mr. Hoover, said in his acceptance speech on August 11 last.

Mr. HARRISON. We have read that.

Mr. HALE. He said——

Mr. HARRISON. I read that three or four times. It did not sound very good to me at the time.

Mr. HALE. I want to read it, if the Senator does not object. Mr. Hoover said:

> We believe that the foundations of peace can be strengthened by the creation of methods and agencies by which a multitude of incidents may be transferred from the realm of prejudice and force to arbitration and the determination of right and wrong based upon international law.
>
> We have been and we are particularly desirous of furthering the limitation of armaments. But in the meantime we know that in an armed world there is only one certain guaranty of freedom—and that is preparedness for defense. It is solely to defend ourselves, for the protection of our citizens that we maintain armament. No clearer evidence of this can exist than the unique fact that we have fewer men in Army uniform to-day than we have in police uniforms, and that we maintain a standing invitation to the world that we are always ready to limit our naval armament in proportion as the other naval nations will do likewise. We earnestly wish that the burdens and dangers of armament upon every home in the world might be lessened. But we must and shall maintain our naval defense and our merchant marine in the strength and efficiency which will yield to us at all times the primary assurance of liberty; that is, of national safety.

And, Mr. President, our Navy is not in that condition now.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I am not finding fault with those sentiments of Mr. Hoover which have been read, nor am I finding fault with the communication the Senator from Maine read to the Senate the other day. The Senator does not doubt that the President elect is against the time limit in this cruiser measure?

Mr. HALE. I have no knowledge of the matter other than the information contained in the telegram.

Mr. HARRISON. The only two gentlemen in this body who entertain any doubt as to the position of the President elect are the present Presiding Officer [Mr. ODDIE in the chair] and the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. Everyone else knows that the President is opposed to the time limitation. He has appealed to Senators to strike it out. He wants to have a free hand in the conferences which are to be held. He is hopeful that we can arrive at some common understanding with the nations of the world. He is hopeful that he can carry on his policy of economy and make a saving for the taxpayer by wiping out the necessity of carrying on this great naval construction. I doubt not that he has appealed to the Senator from Maine himself to strike out the time limitation. But the Senator is a hardened sinner when it comes to that. So is the present Presiding Officer in regard to that matter. So it was that President Coolidge himself, knowing the sympathies of the Senator for him, of their close and intimate friendship, sent the communication of the President elect to him, and the Senator himself read it to this body, and this is what Mr. Hoover said, and this was only January 28.

Mr. CARAWAY. But the Senator knows we must "construe that broadly." The present Presiding Officer so stated.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; the present Presiding Officer said, "You must construe this broadly." I am construing it broadly.

Mr. CARAWAY. What does "construe it broadly" mean?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Hoover said:

> As you know, I warmly support your own views, and you may so inform others if you wish to do so.

He did not say that he warmly supported the views of the Senator from Maine, or of the Naval Affairs Committee. He did not say that he warmly supported the views of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE], a member of that committee. He said "I warmly support your own views," with reference to that matter, and the President's views were that the time limit should be stricken out of the bill.

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. Is the Senator now trying to make up for the fact that his State was one of the few that did not vote for Mr. Hoover, and therefore to get on the right side of the President elect?

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, no; I am always with those of the opposite party when they are right. The trouble with some of you gentlemen is that you are wrong so often you do not know the right when you see it.

Mr. KING. If he did, he would do what the Senator from Connecticut never has done—be on the right side.

Mr. HARRISON. I am glad to find out one thing, because I knew that it would creep out sooner or later—that some Senators on the other side have no confidence in the next President of the United States.

I wish him success in his international dealings with nations in the conference that is coming on. I want to give to him the power to build the cruisers if it is necessary, but the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Connecticut, warm friends that they are of the President elect, do not agree with me in that regard.

Mr. HALE. We are upholding the hands of the President when we do this.

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, yes; you are—but I have said all I want to say. I am going to vote to strike out the time limit. I shall do it in the interests of peace, and I shall do it in the hope that the President elect will be able to conclude some kind of an understanding with reference to marine law and a limitation of all kinds of naval armament.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the Senator referred to the time limit in the 1916 program. That limitation was stricken out in the 1919 appropriation bill, where the words appear:

> But not later than June 30, 1919, is hereby repealed.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from Maine knows that in 1916 that wording was inserted in the bill.

Mr. HALE. That was in the original bill and stricken out in 1919.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course it was; and in 1918 it was written in again, giving the same length of time in which to construct.

Mr. HALE. The words appear here:

> Not later than June 30, 1919, is hereby repealed.

This was done in 1919.

Mr. HARRISON. That shows the correctness of our position.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Maine a question in connection with the time-limit provision. If we leave the time-limit provision in the bill, what is there that will compel the President to actually build the ships within the time mentioned in the bill?

Mr. HALE. The provisions of the bill do not direct the President to construct the cruisers. The bill merely authorizes him to do so. I think it is safe to say that very few Presidents, in view of the expressed wish of Congress that the vessels shall be started by such and such a time, would decline to act in accordance with that expressed wish.

Mr. DILL. If the time limit is taken out, is it not possible for the President to build just as many of them as fast as he wants to build them?

Mr. HALE. Of course, all that the President can do is to make recommendations to Congress for the appropriations.

Mr. DILL. We can build them all in the next two years if we have no limitation in the bill, can we not?

Mr. HALE. Yes; but if we have no limitation, they could be built at any time in the future, or not at all.

Mr. DILL. And if we have the limitation the President still is not compelled to build them, is he?

Mr. HALE. He is not absolutely compelled to do so; but if Congress has expressed itself on the matter, I think no President would turn that down, especially after what happened in the case of the last three cruisers authorized in 1924. Congress at that time expressed itself as standing for what it had already authorized and insisted on its rights in the matter.

Mr. DILL. The fact is that when we authorize the cruisers the President then is at liberty to make recommendations to Congress, and Congress is at liberty to accept those recommendations in the form of appropriations to build the cruisers just as fast as we want to build them. The mere fact that we have a provision directing them to be built within a certain number of years is not compulsory, and if the President sees fit to turn down that recommendation he may do so.

Mr. HALE. He could; and should he do so, I am very certain that Congress would take the matter into its own hands

and make the necessary appropriations and direct the construction of the necessary cruisers.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Maine a question. Section 4 of the cruiser bill reads as follows:

SEC. 4. In the event of an international agreement, which the President is requested to encourage, for the further limitation of naval armament, to which the United States is signatory, the President is hereby authorized and empowered to suspend in whole or in part any of the naval construction authorized under this act.

Has section 4 been changed or amended in any way?

Mr. HALE. No; I have not seen any amendment suggested.

Mr. HEFLIN. It stands as it is now?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. HEFLIN. If that is the case, then the President can suspend the building and none of the cruisers can be constructed unless he wishes?

Mr. HALE. That is very true, after an agreement has been reached on limitation of armaments. That is quite true.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, in any part which I might take in this debate upon the cruiser bill I want at the outset to have it clearly understood that my attitude, though in opposition to this cruiser program upon the general cause for armaments, is not in keeping with that of those who believe the hour has arrived when the United States can afford to or should utterly abandon armaments or submit its defenseless self to the possible thrusts of other nations.

Instead I quite approve such acts as will afford complete and adequate means of defensive warfare, and I desire to see every reasonable precaution taken against any possible attack upon us.

But this program calling for the construction of 15 new cruisers and 1 plane carrier at a cost of a quarter of a billion dollars or more is to my mind both morally and economically unsound. It is a program, I often fear, too much of bluff and bluster, calling for a gigantic expenditure for instruments of war which would not be worth as much as the powder to blow them up in another war, bringing as it will, if more war must come, modern means of warfare which would leave cruisers helpless to defend themselves. It is a program which is wholly uncalled for at this time, engineered in the main by our Admiral Plunketts, aided by the private shipbuilders. It is a program calling for appropriations which are going to be a severe drain upon the Treasury which must soon produce that material wherewithal essential to the stabilization of our agricultural industry and thus perfect or improve our first line of defense. It is a program calling for just the opposite reaction to that which is desired at this time, namely, the desire for better understanding among the nations of the world and consequent decreasing of armaments. It is a program that might very easily find us within a few years moving more of our ships out into the Atlantic for scrapping, just as was done only a few years ago; a program, however, to which shipbuilders have no objection. It is a program based upon false premises in that it aims at parity with Great Britain whereas that parity is already enjoyed, if we will accept the word of President Coolidge; and in that it is based upon the presumption that there is danger of war with Great Britain, whereas there is no such danger in view unless we are going to assume that the interests of our international money barons is going to invite the antagonism of Great Britain and call for a display of arms in their defense and in defense of their interests. Far better, to my mind, that we spend our money if need be in curtailing the selfish ones than providing for their defense after their selfishness has led them into trouble.

In his message to Congress two years ago President Coolidge told us that our Navy was equal to the British Navy, slightly behind with cruisers, but ahead with submarines and destroyers. "Only one navy in the world approaches ours and none surpass it," said the President then. Since that time it is my understanding that the United States has laid the keels for 7 or 8 new cruisers, while Britain has laid for 6. According to reliable statistics compiled from figures authorized by responsible advocates of this bill, the United States has 40 cruisers now, as compared with 64 for Great Britain. But while we are short on cruisers, the United States has 295 destroyers against 187 for Great Britain and 124 submarines against 74 for Great Britain. The tonnage of the cruisers, destroyers, and submarines owned by the United States is approximately 768,000, while the tonnage of British cruisers, destroyers, and submarines is something like 65,000 less, or 703,000 tons. This would certainly not indicate that we were out of step with Great Britain in any manner, and instead satisfies my mind that we have won more than a parity with Great Britain in the matter of naval strength.

While these figures are not altogether material to the argument I am making at this time, I think it well that they be presented the Senate for the purpose of inviting such criticism as will bring out the true facts.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. NYE. I have caused to be hung upon the wall of the Chamber a chart showing the number of ships and the tonnage in unlimited classes built, building, and appropriated for in the navies of the United States and Great Britain. Above the horizontal line the chart indicates the number of cruisers, the number of destroyers, and the number of submarines which are the property of the United States, and the last three columns above the horizontal line indicate the cruisers, destroyers, and submarines which are the property of the British Empire. Beneath the horizontal line is shown the comparative naval strength by tonnage of the two countries in destroyers, cruisers, and submarines. I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] a moment ago gave the number of cruisers Great Britain has, as well as the number which belongs to the United States. With the Senator's permission I would like to state that of the 67 cruisers credited by him to Great Britain, 9 are obsolete and of this number some have been disposesd of. I should also like to state that one of them, the *Comus*, was laid down in 1913, and 38 were laid down between 1914 and 1918. Most of this number were completed during the war, and all of them with the exception of the *Comus*, were projected during the World War and for use in that great conflict. Six of the 39 were specially designed to combat German naval craft operating in the North Sea; 2 of them have a tonnage of 7,500 tons; 3 have a tonnage of 9,750 tons each, and one 9,770; the remaining 33 cruisers are small craft ranging between 3,750 and 4,700 tons. The armament carried by these cruisers consists of four 6-inch guns, and the cruisers were constructed largely for patrol duty in the North Sea.

They were not built for what might be called sea service, and possessed many of the weaknesses that are found in craft which were hastily built during the war to meet a situation of peril and danger. Most of these boats were subjected to enormous strain because of the arduous service to which they were put, and many of them are practically obsolescent and will, within a short time, be obsolete. They are not comparable in size and strength or fighting qualities to the ten 7,500-ton cruisers completed by the United States between 1923 and 1925.

Some of the proponents of this bill failed to state that the United States, in addition to the 10 cruisers last referred to, is constructing eight 10,000-ton cruisers which, perhaps, will be superior to any ships afloat falling within that category, nor do they mention the fact that the United States has 22 cruisers, some of which are 14,500 tons displacement. It is true these cruisers are old and most of them are obsolete.

Scant reference is made by the advocates of this bill to the character of the small cruisers built by Great Britain during the war and their lack of capacity and quality for naval service.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I did not hear the first part of the statement of the Senator from Utah. I did, however, hear him state that the British cruisers are not fitted for long ocean voyages. I think he is entirely mistaken about that. They are vessels running from 3,750 tons to 9,750 tons.

Mr. KING. I know the vessels and their tonnage from the *Comus*, which has a displacement of 3,750 tons, to the *Hawkins*, which has a displacement of 9,750 tons.

Mr. HALE. Those vessels are fitted for long ocean voyages, and they are all used for long ocean voyages.

Mr. KING. Of course, the Senator from Maine is an authority upon this subject, and he often challenges statements of Senators, even though he does not hear them, who speak upon the other side.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator restate what he said, for I only heard what he said as I came into the Chamber?

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I object to any further delay. I think the Senator from Utah has offered some very worthwhile comments at this particular point in addition to what I stated.

I should like also to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that 41 of these 64 cruisers are not of the 10,000-ton type or of the greater efficiency type, but are under 6,000 tons, and also that 33 of these 64 "modern" cruisers are not so modern but what they saw service in the late great World War.

Mr. President, the chart which I have caused to be hung up on the wall shows the comparative strength of the two nations in a naval way which I have just recited; but, of course, it is answered, and I expect will now be answered, that this does not account for the entire strength of the two navies; that we are

forgetting the battleships, that we are forgetting other monsters of the sea that enter into the channels of war in time of war. With that thought in mind, I have prepared a table as to capital ships which I wish could be presented as the strength in destroyers, cruisers, and submarines is presented by virtue of the wall chart. However, the table which I have prepared shows the capital ships, carriers, and other combatant ships of the first and second line possessed by these two great countries. This table accounts for the ships which are built, ships which are in the building, and ships which have been appropriated for.

Of capital ships—battleships and battle cruisers—built and building and appropriated for, the United States has 18, Great Britain has 20. The tonnage of those of the United States is 525,850, while the tonnage of the British ships is 556,350.

Of aircraft carriers, built and being converted, the United States has three, representing a tonnage of 78,700. Great Britain has six, representing a tonnage of 107,550.

Of first and second line cruisers, the United States has 40, with a tonnage of 334,425, while Great Britain has 64, with a tonnage of 397,140.

Of destroyers of the first and second line built, building, and appropriated, including the 25 which are now in the service of the Coast Guard, the United States has 295, representing a tonnage of 340,994, while Great Britain has 187, representing a tonnage of 230,470.

Of submarines built, building, and appropriated for, the United States has 124, representing a tonnage of 92,979, while Great Britain has 74, representing a tonnage of 75,425.

Of light mine layers the United States has 14, with a tonnage of 16,674, while Great Britain has none.

Of mine layers of the first line each country has two, those of the United States representing a tonnage of 7,600 and those of Great Britain a tonnage of 11,810.

Of mine layers of the second line the United States has two and Great Britain none. The tonnage represented by the two of the United States is 8,496.

Thus, Mr. President, we have a total of ships possessed by the United States of 498 compared with a total of 357 accruing to Great Britain. The tonnage represented by the vessels of the United States is 1,405,718, while the tonnage of the British Navy is 1,407,565. Of combatant ships the United States has 141 more than Great Britain. With relation to these ships, in tonnage, Great Britain has the edge over us with a margin of 1,847 tons.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in connection with the comparison of the navies I hope the Senator will go on and show a comparison of the armies. If he will bear with me for just a moment, I should like to point out to him that with our population of 118,000,000 people we have a standing Army of 137,000 men; while Great Britain has a standing army of 400,000 men; France, 727,000 men; Russia, 644,000 men; Italy, 380,000; Poland, 280,000 men; Yugoslavia, 240,000; Japan, 210,000 men. As national defense embraces not only the Navy but the Army, in order to find out how well prepared we are we should also consider the armies of other countries and not merely their navies.

Mr. NYE. Yes; and I hope that I have considered both sides; and yet I do not see that the facts which the Senator has presented at this time have any material bearing upon the immediate program which now lies before the Senate.

Of the 64 British cruisers to which I have called attention 41 are under 6,000 tons and 33 saw service in the World War. The British have completed 15 cruisers and the United States 10 cruisers since the Washington conference. Each country has 8 under construction at the present time.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I think the Senator will want to show that the 10 that we have completed are cruisers carrying 6-inch guns and the 15 that Great Britain has completed and is now building carry 8-inch guns.

Mr. NYE. I will say to the Senator that it was not my plan, in view of all the facts which have been offered for the RECORD with relation to this program, to go into that feature at this time, because I am not making it a material part of my argument but only presenting what I am sure are the facts.

The United States has eight 10,000-ton cruisers, while Great Britain has thirteen 10,000-ton cruisers.

Mr. HALE. No, Mr. President, Great Britain has seven 10,000-ton cruisers already built, 8 building, 2 more appropriated for and 3 more authorized; so that she will have 20 such vessels when they shall have been completed. It is fair to say, however, that six of these are not 10,000-ton vessels but cruisers of 8,300 tons, though they do carry 8-inch guns.

Mr. NYE. Two of the cruisers to which the Senator makes reference have been delivered to Australia, have they not?

Mr. HALE. That has nothing to do with it, Mr. President.

Mr. NYE. Why, then, is not the Senator including in his figures the naval strength of Canada and of the other dominions of Great Britain?

Mr. HALE. I have included the naval strength of the dominions of Great Britain.

Mr. NYE. But not of Australia.

Mr. HALE. Certainly, including Australia.

Mr. NYE. I did not so understand, and I am glad to have that correction by the Senator. However, Mr. President, as nearly as I can ascertain, an increase of five cruisers at this time would give us parity with Great Britain. Of 10,000-ton cruisers, three, I understand, are appropriated for by Great Britain, but their construction is being held in abeyance awaiting ostensibly to see what the United States is going to do.

Mr. HALE. No; I think not as to the two that have been appropriated for. I think that applies to the three that have been authorized.

Mr. NYE. I meant "authorized," Mr. President.

Mr. HALE. But there never has been a question of their giving them up. It is simply a question of postponing them, as they did once before.

Mr. NYE. With relation to cruisers, however, let it be noted that among those owned by the United States are the fastest cruisers afloat to-day. I recite these facts not because they are material to the argument I am about to make but merely that the record may be clear; and I thank the Senator for offering whatever corrections were entered at this juncture.

Mr. HALE. I think, Mr. President, the fact that our cruisers are faster cruisers than the cruisers of Great Britain is due to the fact that they have put on their cruisers a certain amount of armor which we do not have on ours; and this additional weight cuts down the speed of the cruisers to a very limited extent. They are still very fast cruisers.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, we now have this program before us to build almost overnight 15 new cruisers. By the time they are completed there is no doubt in my mind but that if cruisers are still to be constructed those that we are authorizing now will be so obsolete and out of date that men like the Senator from Maine are going to come back before the Senate and say, "We have been outstripped now, and these 15 cruisers mean absolutely nothing to our strength."

I have before me a page taken from a recent edition of the Washington Daily News—that of January 23, to be exact—bearing the heading:

German mystery ship may cause junking of existing navies. New craft said to be greatest fighting ship ever built.

The article is written by Mr. William Philip Simms; and I ask that it may be incorporated in and made a part of my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, January 23, 1929]

GERMAN MYSTERY SHIP MAY CAUSE JUNKING OF EXISTING NAVIES—NEW CRAFT SAID TO BE GREATEST FIGHTING SHIP EVER BUILT—HAS BEEN EVOLVED BY GERMAN SCIENTISTS SINCE NATION WAS LIMITED TO 10,000-TON CRAFT—BUILT OF SPECIAL STEEL—CAN MOUNT SIX 11-INCH GUNS WHEREAS 8-INCH ARE OUR BIGGEST—SPEED 30 MILES AN HOUR

By William Philip Simms

Is the United States Navy, our first line of defense and safeguard against invasion in time of war, about to be converted into so much junk by the invention of a brand-new and more efficient type of vessel?

Similarly, are all the other existing navies of the world—including that of Great Britain, with which we demand parity, ton for ton—on the eve of being relegated to the limbo of the obsolete or the not-so-good?

Is the treaty of Washington framed to limit the naval armaments of the United States, Britain, Japan, France, and Italy, to be turned into a scrap of paper by recent marine developments in the sixth country entirely outside the jurisdiction of that treaty?

SECRET GERMAN SHIP

These questions are being asked uneasily not alone in Washington but in London, Tokio, Paris, and Rome following revelations from Berlin concerning the secret ship which German scientists have evolved and which conservative naval experts pronounce the most remarkable fighting craft ever laid down.

Forbidden by the treaty of Versailles to have a regular navy through being limited to craft not exceeding 10,000 tons displacement, Germany has been quietly seeking for years to evolve a baby battleship which

would be a match for the big fellows. Necessity being the mother of invention, she now seems to have found what she was looking for.

It is called the *Ersatz Preussen*—Prussia's substitute for a dreadnought or the beginning of a "synthetic" German Navy. And while it may not answer to a technician's definition of proper navy, in practice it may be able to lick the stuffing out of the real thing, if and when the test comes—which is all that any German could require or any other nation fear.

MADE OF SPECIAL STEEL

The *Ersatz Preussen* displaces 10,000 tons. Her hull is in one piece, electrically welded from stem to stern. It is made of a special steel secretly developed by the Krupps and is similarly armored. She mounts six 11-inch guns with a 30,000-yard range and can fire a salvo every 20 seconds, making her more than a match for any three 10,000-ton cruisers in the British or American Navy. Eight-inch guns are the biggest our cruisers may mount.

Powered with internal-combustion Diesel engines of a new pattern, she can do approximately 30 miles an hour. Up to now engineers have figured motors of this kind would have to weigh upward of 60 pounds per horsepower, but the *Ersatz Preussen's* are said to develop one horsepower for every 17.5 pounds weight. And so economical are they in fuel consumption that at 20 knots an hour the mystery ship could do 10,000 miles without refueling or nearly 20,000 miles at a slower and more economical speed, making her the earth's most dangerous potential commerce raider.

BUILT REGARDLESS OF EXPENSE

Germany has built this ship regardless of expense. She represents the hitherto unthinkable in warships. She is to fighting craft what the German Big Bertha that fired 75 miles on Paris was to artillery. Experts said it could not be done yet it was done. What is to keep Germany—or England or Japan or any other country with the price—from building a navy composed of ships developed from these and obtaining complete mastery of the seas?

Obviously the world must reckon with this new naval weapon. Henceforth a naval conference which left Germany out, would get nowhere because she might undo anything the conferring powers might do. It is also obvious that ships built now, without taking the *Ersatz Preussen* into consideration, would likely be obsolete before they were laid down.

The future battleship, many experts believe, may surpass even Germany's latest. It may have the combined attributes of the dreadnought, the submarine, the cruiser, and the aircraft carrier, all in one. It may fight in the air, on the sea, and under the sea. Admiral William S. Sims, one of the clearest thinkers our Navy has produced, makes it plain that he is not blind to the possibilities. Thus the limitation of naval armament, when next the problem arises, of necessity must not only include more than five nations to be effective but must be vastly wider in scope as well.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I think that matter has already been brought up in the Senate. The Senator knows, of course, that that sort of a ship would not be allowed under the terms of the Washington conference, and I can not see that it has any special significance.

Mr. NYE. It has just this significance—that there is every reason in the world why, within the next few months, or two or three years at the outset, the nations of the earth are going to come to their senses long enough to sit down with their feet under one table again and determine that it is time to take real, definite, forward-looking action that is going to put a stop to this ever-crowding program, first on the part of Britain and then on the part of the United States—a program which finds the United States now stepping into this program calling for 15 new cruisers, with Great Britain sitting back to see what we are going to do about it; and if we proceed and go through with it, as I am afraid we are going to do, Great Britain then immediately will respond with a like building program, not to seek a parity with us, but to put themselves ahead of us. Then it will be up to us again to repeat our part in that program—an endless, never-ending program of building, building, building machines that to my mind in the next war are going to be of little or no utility.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, does not the Senator think that we will be stronger in a conference on the limitation of armament if our Navy is not in a negligible condition at the time?

Mr. NYE. I do not. I have heard and read much of that argument, but I can not grasp it. I can not make it a part of my mind at all.

Mr. HALE. Does not the Senator think that the partial success we obtained at the 1922 conference was largely due to the fact that we had a great program building that no other country could hope to equal?

Mr. NYE. Possibly, and yet I doubt it; and if we are to look upon it as having served that purpose prior to that conference and at the time of the conference, then we are going to have to admit that it is an exceedingly expensive program to bring about anything of that kind.

In connection with my argument there, the New York Times of this morning, in the first column on the first page, contains an article by Edwin L. James, a dispatch from London, under the heading Britain Will Build Navy Equaling Ours, Bridgeman Asserts. I read only two paragraphs from that article:

It is the position of the British Government that it has no right to appear to interfere in the Senate discussion of the cruiser bill, which is entirely the business of the United States; but after the United States has decided on its course of action it becomes the business of Britain to keep level with American cruiser construction, said W. C. Bridgeman, First Lord of the Admiralty, in discussing the naval situation before the Constitutional Club to-day, when he made the official British position clear. Denying that Britain would set the pace in construction of big cruisers, the official head of the British fleet said others had set the pace, and that while committed to a policy of naval equality with the United States, Britain nevertheless did not intend to be outstripped. She had done more than her part toward naval reduction, he said.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HALE. Does not the Senator think it is rather a joke for Great Britain to state that she will keep her navy up to our Navy when she is very far ahead of us at the present time?

Mr. NYE. I do not concede that she is far ahead of us.

Mr. HALE. I think most experts would concede that; would they not?

Mr. NYE. The Senator's own figures, from which I have quoted here this afternoon, indicate that in actual tonnage she excels us by a margin of only 2,000 tons or so.

Mr. HALE. The Senator is including in that actual tonnage a vast number of surplus destroyers that we have on hand.

Mr. NYE. And of surplus British ships to offset it.

Mr. HALE. No; I think they will not offset it.

Mr. NYE. Has the Senator offered anything in the RECORD to show how much or how little offset there might be on the part of the British Navy?

Mr. HALE. I have not built up the tables in exactly that way; but, of course, that could be done.

Mr. NYE. If these that are included in the Senator's figures are obsolete, why has he included them?

Mr. HALE. They are not obsolete. These figures are right up to date, and are furnished me by the Navy Department. The Senator has included in his tonnage a great many ships which are not ordinarily considered combatant ships. Ordinarily, when you take the combatant ships of a navy, you refer to battleships, battle cruisers, carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines.

Mr. NYE. Then what of the 20, 22, or 24 British ships which are stipulated only for virtually coast-guard purposes in the North Sea?

Mr. HALE. Oh, I simply gave a list of the combatant ships that were being carried on the navy lists.

Mr. NYE. Then the Senator will admit that there is an offset?

Mr. HALE. No; I do not. Of course, we shall have to be building a great many more combatant ships in the near future ourselves; but as far as these destroyers are concerned, I want to say that they were built by us in these large numbers largely at the instigation of Great Britain.

During the war we had a great number of capital ships on the stocks, and we were going ahead with the completion of these ships. On the request of the British that we help them to control the submarine menace we built destroyers, whereas the British built cruisers. That left us at a manifest disadvantage at the end of the war. We were willing to do so because we were all acting in a common cause at the time; but that accounts for our great surplusage of destroyers.

We have 266 destroyers at the present time. We keep up only 104 with the fleet, and it is inconceivable that we should use them all. We simply keep them laid up in the navy yards. Each year these vessels are going behind. They are not up to the modern type of destroyer that is now being constructed.

All of the other countries that are parties to the Washington agreement have gone ahead and built a new type of destroyer called the destroyer leader. We have not any of these ships at all. This is a much more powerful, much more seaworthy vessel than the present destroyer. We are falling back as far as destroyers are concerned. If we put in commission the destroyers that we do have it will cost us a great deal of money to do so. We probably would do it if we got into a war, because we have not cruisers enough for the work of cruisers. We

should have, to a certain extent, to use these destroyers for that purpose; but destroyers can not take the place of cruisers, and we would be nearly as well off if we did not have this great surplusage of destroyers.

Mr. NYE. Be all of that as it may, I venture the guess that if we get into another war one of the last things we will do, after all is said and done, is to equip more above-surface vessels for use in war time. I think it is not going to take long in the next war, if we must have another war, to convince us all that they are not a tool of any utility.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, that is entirely at variance with the experience of the other countries of the world, all of which are building up their surface-vessel equipment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. The Senator referred to the parity or equality of our fleet. May I add to what he said the statement of Mr. Hector Bywater, who is one of the ablest writers upon naval matters?

Mr. NYE. I am glad the Senator is making reference to that. He stated, in substance, that taking all factors into consideration, "the American fleet is adjudged to be superior to the British fleet," and that "even in gun power the advantage is held to lie with the American fleet."

It is a fact that seven of the capital ships that were built by the United States between 1919 and 1923 are superior in construction and equipment and in fighting strength and power to those of the British Navy, with perhaps the exception of the *Nelson* and the *Rodney*, the two most recent capital ships constructed by Great Britain.

Mr. President, from a somewhat careful investigation of the qualities and character of the British and American naval vessels, I believe that Mr. Bywater's statement is true; and I believe that the American fleet in a naval battle would be able to defeat Great Britain's fleet.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, that is entirely a matter of speculation.

Mr. KING. Undoubtedly. Mr. President, there are elements of uncertainty in every naval contest as there are factors of uncertainty in battles upon land. Many battles on land and sea are won or lost as the result of contingencies or accidents or fortuitous circumstances against which no human foresight could have provided.

The matter of visability may determine a naval contest; a torpedo fired from a submarine may prove the decisive factor in an important naval battle. An accidental hit may destroy a battleship or battle cruiser and thus give the balance of power to the fleet to which the submarine belongs.

It is my opinion that the American capital ships are superior to those of the British fleet. We are superior in submarines and in destroyers. And in aviation we are far ahead of Great Britain. Our aircraft carriers, although fewer in number, are superior to those of Great Britain. Our battleships carry airplanes but the British capital ships do not. Weighing all facts which go to determine the fighting qualities of a fleet, I think I am absolutely safe in saying that the American fleet is superior to the British fleet.

The President of the United States has stated that no fleet surpasses ours and that it is the equal of any. Since he made that statement we have pushed forward the construction of eight 10,000-ton cruisers, one of which was launched a day or two ago. The Senator from Maine has referred to the large number of destroyers belonging to our fleet, and has said that they were constructed at the suggestion of Admiral Sims. I do not know whether he intends, by that statement, to convey the impression that destroyers are not necessary auxiliary craft. The fact is that they are not only highly important but absolutely indispensable to a modern fleet.

The development of the submarine has given to the destroyers an increased importance. Senators will recall that early in the World War German submarines were taking heavy toll of the merchant ships, not only of belligerents but of neutral nations. When Admiral Sims, representing the United States, went to Great Britain the latter part of 1916, or early in 1917, he quickly discovered that the Allied cause was seriously endangered by the ravages of the submarine. My recollection is that he urged our Government to provide naval craft to aid in combating the submarine. After the United States entered the war it addressed itself with commendable vigor to the construction of those vessels deemed important, if not vital, in defeating the Central Powers. More than 260 destroyers were built. They measured up to the highest standard of efficiency and of technical development. They are efficient and up to date at the present time.

Mr. NYE. And would last as long in the event of another war as the 10,000-ton cruisers of the best type would.

Mr. KING. It is true that all of our destroyers are not in commission, but they are well cared for in suitable berths and within a few days would be ready for service upon the high seas.

The Senator from Maine referred to the leaders. I suppose he has in mind what some call flotilla leaders. They are large destroyers to head the destroyer squadrons. However, the number of flotilla leaders possessed by Great Britain is small and its destroyer fleet is very much below that of the United States. The United States, in my opinion, is superior to Great Britain in capital ships, in destroyers, in submarines, in air carriers, and in airplanes. In the air our country is supreme, and on the surface of the sea and under the sea I believe we are superior to any other nation in the elements of naval warfare. It is true that Great Britain has a larger number of cruisers than the United States. As I stated, we have constructed 10 modern cruisers each having a displacement of 7,500 tons. The eight 10,000-ton cruisers which will soon be completed will perhaps be superior to those of any other fleet. But as I have indicated, more than 30 of Great Britain's cruisers are very small, having been built for patrol duty in the North Sea during the World War and no great importance can be ascribed to them in the appraising of the value, strength, and power of a great navy such as that proposed by the United States or Great Britain. In my opinion our ten 7,500-ton cruisers possess greater importance and value than the small patrol cruisers which are so often referred to by proponents of this bill when they seek to convey the idea that Great Britain has an enormous number of cruisers. As all naval writers and experts state, the value of a navy does not depend upon the number of ships in the fleet, nor for that matter is the fighting quality of a fleet dependent upon the size of its guns. Von Scheer had no guns of greater caliber than 12 inches in the Battle of Jutland, but he was able to destroy mighty British cruisers, and, as I believe, he won that memorable contest. The Senator from Maine during the debate has repeatedly insisted that in the event of a conference to secure the limitation of armaments, the position of the Government would be much stronger if it had a larger battle fleet; in other words, if we were to sit down at an international table to secure or promote disarmament, our chance of success would be increased by the number of cards we hold in our hands. I do not quite understand this logic or psychology. I do not like the thought of sitting down with the nations as if we were about to play a game of cards and gamble with the lives and destinies of men and nations.

The statement has been made that the United States was victimized at the Washington conference, or at any rate our Government was the one which made the greatest sacrifice. Senators forget that Great Britain, immediately following the war, scrapped more than 1,300,000 tons of her naval craft; that Japan scrapped a large number of ships belonging to her navy. The United States, however, under the whip and spur of the navalists of the United States pushed forward the 1916 program which called for the construction of approximately 156 naval craft, at a cost of more than a billion dollars. Sixteen battleships and battle cruisers were included within this stupendous program. No nation had ever projected a program of such magnitude and such stupendous cost. France and Italy scrapped many of their naval vessels; but the United States seemed unable to resist the militaristic spirit and yielded to the demands of the naval board and spent tens of millions of dollars to bring about the speedy completion of the 1916 naval program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], in January, 1921, offered a resolution in the Senate directing the Naval Affairs Committee to report whether, in its opinion, it was practical and a sound policy to suspend the naval construction for a 6-month period, in order that an investigation might be had as to the requirements of our Government and the necessity of the ships. Other reasons were mentioned in the resolution and it was finally adopted.

The Committee on Naval Affairs, of which I was then a member, made a rather imperfect, in my opinion, investigation, pursuant to the resolution. The General Board of the Navy, of course, set its seal of disapproval upon the resolution and the committee followed the General Board. I was unable to agree with my colleagues and submitted a minority report in which attention was challenged to the naval situation throughout the world, the effects of the war, the wisdom of carrying forward the 1916 naval program, and the importance of bringing about a limitation of naval armaments. I am glad to say that the Congress did not follow the recommendations of the naval board and the Naval Committee. There was an insistent demand that

the 1916 program should be modified. The Republican Party in its convention of 1920 had declared in favor of reduced expenditures for naval construction, and later President Harding called the Washington conference to bring about a limitation in naval armaments.

As I have stated, Great Britain and Japan, following the armistice, scrapped many ships and showed no inclination to engage in competitive naval development. Indeed, Great Britain did not lay down a single naval vessel, except one submarine, as I recall, between the armistice and the Washington conference. But in the United States the navalists and the naval board and other elements were demanding that the United States build more battleships and carry to completion the 1916 program.

In 1919 belligerent speeches were made throughout the United States, and there was constant talk of war between the United States and Japan. Speeches were made in the Senate——

Mr. NYE. Like many of those now being made.

Mr. KING. Relative to the imperative necessity of our building the most powerful navy in the world. I recall that in the Senate and in many of the newspapers of our country Japan was referred to as the nation with which we would soon be at war. In 1919 our fleet was sent from the Atlantic to the Pacific through the Panama Canal. The effect of this naval maneuver, in view of the belligerent and jingoistic talk in the United States of war in the Pacific, compelled Japan to take notice of what was occurring in the United States. Senators will recall that the Japanese Government as well as the Japanese people were greatly disturbed; indeed, they were filled with apprehension as to the purpose of the United States.

Undoubtedly the situation in the United States and the talk to which I have referred produced reactions unfavorable to peace in Japan. The result was that the Japanese Government formulated her 8–8 naval program, which called for the construction of 16 capital ships, some of which, as I recall, would have been larger than those then being constructed by the United States. Some naval writers believe that the 8–8 program when completed would have given Japan a navy as great if not greater than that provided the United States under the 1916 program. Whether this is true or not, the fact is that Japan began the execution of her 8–8 program. A little later Great Britain talked of constructing four great naval vessels of the *Hood* type. The situation had become by this time so acute that, as I have stated, President Harding called the Washington conference.

It may be, as some Senators have indicated, that at the Washington conference we had more cards in our hands than other nations. It may be that because we had more naval vessels on the ways and under construction the United States exercised greater influence, as the 1916 program was not in process of completion. However, I do not accept that view. Neither Great Britain nor Japan desired to increase their military burdens. The allied nations were suffering from the effects of the war. They were more interested in industrial development, in economic rehabilitation, and in furnishing food and clothing to their suffering nationals. It is urged now by some that we should project an extensive naval program upon the theory that in so doing we will have greater influence and power in any conference called to bring about disarmament or limitation of armament.

Mr. President, in my opinion our Nation should take the lead to bring about disarmament and to promote world peace. Senators have frequently referred to its wealth and power. Because it does have wealth and power it should feel the responsibility resting upon it and the solemn duty which it owes to the world. Where much is given, much is required; a nation blessed of God and secure from every danger should carry forward the standard of moral and world leadership; it should set an example for peace and so lead other nations to follow in its footsteps. In listening to this debate I could not help but feel that there was a spirit of boastfulness, because of the financial resources and wealth of the United States. It seemed to me that our fortunate situation should bring a degree of humility not a spirit of arrogance; that it should lead us to desire that our Nation should wear the crown of moral leadership, and that this Nation should be known for its attributes of justice and righteousness, which exalt a nation rather than for its physical strength and material riches.

Mr. NYE. Which is right in keeping with the argument which I now wish to make.

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

Mr. NYE. I will not yield for any more elaboration of these statistics at this time.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Utah has made several statements that I would like to comment on.

Mr. NYE. Then let the Senator, if they are in conflict with anything he has previously offered for the RECORD, present his statements at this time.

Mr. HALE. I simply wanted to say, Mr. President, in answer to some of the things the Senator from Utah has said—and the Senator from Utah, I know, dislikes to project himself into a debate—that I can not answer all that he has said at this time, because I can not recall everything that he has said. But he did speak about Admiral Sims and the destroyers. The Senator is quite right in stating that Admiral Sims did suggest that we use these destroyers, and he did that, presumably, after conference with the British, and it was carrying out what they wanted and was the entirely reasonable thing to do.

Mr. KING. What we wanted.

Mr. HALE. What we wanted at the time; but it left us in a somewhat involved position for the future.

The Senator has also spoken about our gambling with the lives of our men. It seems to me that the man is gambling with the lives of our men who prevents us from providing the kind of cruisers we really need for our Navy. If we do not have those cruisers, we shall have to use the cruisers we now have. America, if we get into war, will send out every ship that she can to take part in the war, and American seamen will man those ships.

Mr. NYE. Where is this war we are going to have?

Mr. HALE. I do not know. I hope that there will be no war; but if we ever do get into a war the American seamen who are sent out on these miserable old cruisers which we now have—and which we would still have to use—will have a very small chance of surviving when they get into conflict with ships of a superior size and fighting quality.

Mr. NYE. My conclusion, Mr. President, is that those cruisers will have just about as much chance as the finest type of cruiser that could be laid down.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator if he will not yield for some comment in regard to some statistics he has given?

Mr. NYE. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. ODDIE. In connection with a comparison of the cruiser strength of this country and that of Great Britain we should not overlook the fact that Great Britain has many times more fast merchant ships than we have, which will, to a certain extent, take the place of cruisers in an emergency.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, let the Senator from Nevada offer an amendment to this bill substituting merchantmen for cruisers, and we will all join with him, and I will join with him in the argument which I am to present this afternoon.

Mr. ODDIE. I do not think that is apropos at all.

Mr. NYE. Oh, no!

Mr. ODDIE. I am citing these figures to show that Great Britain has an enormous preponderance of fast merchant ships, which could in an emergency be made into a certain class of cruisers, ships of long radius of action and great speed.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURTON in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I only wanted to say that the very able argument of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] yesterday was based upon the proposition that we did not care what Great Britain had.

Mr. ODDIE. I am not commenting on what the Senator from California said, but I do want it understood clearly that as we are comparing cruiser strength of the two countries, Great Britain has an enormous instrument of offense in these fast merchant ships which can be made to take the place of certain cruisers in an emergency.

Mr. GLASS and Mr. DILL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. GLASS. We are selling all the merchant ships we have.

Mr. DILL. I was going to say that if we adopted the suggestion of the Senator from Nevada, we would have to adopt some sort of provision against the selling of our merchant ships as long as they are running.

Mr. NYE. Quite right, Mr. President.

The criticism which has been offered against those who have ventured to oppose this cruiser construction bill has had but one purpose in mind, and that has been to convey the thought that such opponents as there are were moved by influences which were not patriotic and by influences which were blind to the possible needs for adequate preparation to defend ourselves and defend our honor. Constantly are sarcastic references made to the so-called pacifists. If one supports the position taken by

President Coolidge two years ago when he declared that our strength was ahead of that of Great Britain, then that one is a pacifist, and I presume that those who are in support of that endeavor now being made to deprive Army officers of provision for maintenance of more than one horse, thus depriving Army officers of their polo ponies, immediately become pacifists. I expect to hear the same argument a little later on.

It is a strange world; but, for my own part, I am ready to suffer such sneering criticism as is directed against those, among whom I number myself, who are unqualifiedly opposed to this program, which I have previously referred to as one of unsoundness from a moral and economic standpoint.

To my mind, the leading thought in connection with this controversy must be that one involving the occasion for and the need of a better spirit of good will than now seems to exist on the part of all the people of the world.

The nations of the world have brought about a peculiar kind of companionate marriage—armaments and peace—and this body is acting as parson to such a union in the attempt to make the cruiser bill partner legislation with the ratification of the multilateral peace treaty. It is like uniting fire and water. There are those who seem to assume that these two policies of government—the renouncing of war as a national policy and as an instrument of settling international differences, and the increasing of armaments—can exist side by side without any relation one to the other. Again, to use the physical analogy, one might as well expect fire and water not to spread, or if put into the same receptacle to keep respectfully apart.

Peace suggests compassion, trustfulness, good will, good faith, and at least reasonable forbearance. War and the instruments of hostility are supported by hate, greed, brutality, and the right of might. The Senate is trying to convince this and other nations that there is no anomaly in uniting the policies of war and peace, and, alas, many other countries have already adopted a plan of making treaties of peace while at the same time expanding their means of warfare. Since the World War this incongruity has spread until we have the spectacle of the most extensive international agreements looking toward peace and likewise the largest increase in armaments of any period in the world's history.

The entire situation reminds me of the conduct of a British divine who, after writing a pamphlet entitled "Come to Jesus," became displeased with a brother minister and wrote him a letter expressing his feelings in no uncertain terms. Before sending his epistle he showed it to a friend to get his opinion of it. The friend advised that he should put a caption on his strong, expressive letter, and when the first divine inquired what the caption should be, his friend said: "Put across the top of your letter these words, 'Go to the devil, by the author of Come to Jesus.'"

Later in this discussion I shall give the staggering figures of the burden of armaments in the different nations, including our own, countries still bowing under the cost of the recent world conflict, which amount for the United States alone, when the last sum is paid to worthy veterans, will equal, according to an estimate stated by President Coolidge, $100,000,000,000, or one-half the wealth of America when we entered this war. I shall also review the progressive moves made in recent years looking toward the assurance of permanent peace, and I shall ask the question: Are the forces promoting peace and the forces increasing armaments the same? If they are not the same, then I shall ask: Which of these groups are sponsoring the real desire of the peoples of the world? If throughout the nations the growth of armaments is not necessary to, aye, is even a great hindrance to, the progress toward lasting amity among the civilized countries, then how can this great legislative body vote for the building of 16 war vessels simply because a group interested in increasing the armaments of warfare asks that these vessels be built?

Mr. President, let us accept the possibility that the United States may need additional cruisers; are not naval heads the last group to be consulted about the extent of a naval building program? Did they not thoroughly discredit themselves as advisers in the last session of the Congress when they proposed to have the taxpayers of this peace-loving Nation dig down into their pockets to pay for the largest peace-time navy-building program ever presented to a national legislature?

They asked for 71 vessels, the initial expenditure to be $750,000,000 and the final cost around $4,000,000,000. The "bigger Navy" advocates have changed their tune, and now ask for 15 cruisers and 1 aircraft carrier. Why just this number; why not 20 vessels? They are asking not for what America may need, but for what they think they can get. I repeat that this group has discredited itself with respect to its ability or intention to present an unprejudiced analysis of the needs of our Navy. The people do not have faith in it as an unbiased advisor with regard to armaments. It is not a peace arm of the Government; it is a war arm. Navy leaders said we needed 71 vessels; now they say 16. Perhaps we should make the number 40. At least we should have a body appointed to determine the need, desire, and wisdom of adding to the United States Navy's strength without the handicap of a purely fighting tradition, a body that can take facts and weigh them in all their relationships.

To make clear that the point I am making is not personal bias as regards the attitude of the American naval leaders toward parleys for the reduction of sea armaments, let me briefly refer to their attitude with respect to such matters in recent years. When Congress in 1916 passed the Navy bill authorizing the construction of 10 first-class battleships, 6 battle cruisers, and numerous smaller ships, making a total of 113 vessels, the General Board of the Navy defined the American policy as the creation of a "navy equal to the most powerful" maintained by any nation. America was not actually in the war at this time, but the danger was imminent, and this slogan had the protection of the psychology of war that spread from the other side of the Atlantic. We entered the war the next year, and this particular program was pushed aside, while our facilities were utilized in building submarines and other types of vessels immediately required. When the war closed, the Navy had not forgotten its plan for this prodigious program earlier conceived, and the construction which would have placed the American Navy ahead of the British Navy by 1924 was resumed.

It was partly to forestall the completion of this prodigious program, the thought of which paralyzed the war-torn peoples of the world, that the Washington Limitation of Armament Conference was called in 1921. The success of this conference was not due to the naval experts of any navy; neither our own nor other naval leaders gained control of the conference. In the face of the inward wishes of the General Board of the American Navy and its purpose to make our Navy the greatest of any nation, we scrapped 30 ships, 19 of which were completed and 11 under construction. Civil officials, under the leadership of Secretary Hughes, negotiated this conference with others of their kind from other nations (Plain Talk, p. 133).

The naval experts contributed for this conference facts and figures, but stayed in their rightful places. What would have resulted at this conference had naval leaders been given full rein is indicated by what happened at Geneva two years ago at another limitation of naval armaments conference, when navy men of Great Britain and America brought a hopeless deadlock with respect to a reduction. And as if this unnecessary failure were a glory, the naval experts came forward last year with the proposal to build 71 vessels.

I reassert that this group with its ideal ever directed toward the largest American Navy possible is unfit to recommend a naval construction bill to the United States Congress. Who will deny that the bill now before us represents what the big-navy advocates were able to save from their initial program, not all they want? Their strategy and tactics mark it. In the House Naval Affairs Committee, where the extensive hearings on this measure were held, these hearings amounted to a love feast for the naval officers and their friends, and most of the time given to hearings was used by advocates of the measure, who were already here in the city and had their support well organized. The opposition, largely unorganized and not here on the ground to make known their attitude, was given little consideration until public opinion made itself felt throughout the body of Congress. Then it was that the present cruiser bill was salvaged from the wreckage.

Note the last-minute strategy applied. The original bill provided that under the event of the calling of an international conference the President might halt the construction program, but this was changed cleverly, so that under the terms of the bill which passed the House and is now before this body for action, the President may not halt the construction until after an international agreement to cut armaments has been absolutely effected. And a second addition inserted by the naval group provides that the 15 vessels be laid down 5 each year until by 1931 all would be under construction. The House has approved this, but the President disapproved it directly in that innocent-appearing phrase in his message to the present session of Congress when he said that he advocated that "the bill before the Senate with the elimination of the time clause be passed." This would take away from the standpoint of its sponsors about half of the half-loaf victory, which the measure promises to the "bigger navy" sponsors.

But whether the Navy have a fourth or a full victory with respect to the cruiser bill, I reject the proposal and ask that facts upon which to base a measure of this kind be looked at, first, by a commission of unbiased minds. Experience has

proven that it did not pay to let the naval experts of the countries control the Geneva naval-cut conference. When our Navy was hopeful of its 71-vessel construction proposal, as a method of arousing public support, its author, Admiral Hughes, declared before the House Naval Affairs Committee that it was aimed at the British Navy, and Admiral Plunkett pictured the imminency of war between the two leading Anglo-Saxon nations so vividly that it called for denial by President Coolidge and denunciation by Senator BORAH, who said:

A few days ago an admiral in the English Navy put out a similar statement. If anything could possibly bring on war between two great nations it is these enlarged naval programs in connection with declarations from the navies of the respective countries that war is inevitable. This was the insane policy which obtained between Germany and Great Britain from 1900 to 1914 and was one of the great contributing causes to the World War.

Thus my first objection to the cruiser bill before us is that the wrong group created it, and it will never be free from the taints of the prejudice involved, and therefore a fresh bill from an entirely different source is fundamental in giving the American people a square deal with respect to a possible increase in the size of the American Navy.

The President, under the influence of naval officials, has shown a change of front since in his address before the American Legion at Omaha, Nebr., in 1925, he said:

In spite of all the arguments in favor of great military forces no nation ever had an army large enough to guarantee it against attack in time of peace or to insure its victory in time of war. No nation ever will.

No doubt this country could, if it wished to spend more money, make a better military force, but that is only part of the problem which confronts our Government. The real question is whether spending more money to make a better military force would really make a better country.

I would be the last to disparage the military art. It is an honorable and patriotic calling of the highest rank. But I can see no merit in any unnecessary expenditure of money to hire men to build fleets and carry muskets when international relations and agreements permit the turning of such resources into the making of good roads, the building of better homes, the promotion of education, and all the other arts of peace which minister to the advancement of human welfare.

Happily the position of our country is such among the nations of the world that we have been and shall be warranted in proceeding in this direction.

Speaking in the same tone in his message to Congress two years ago, he said:

Only one navy in the world approaches ours, and none surpasses it.

In recent months his language has implied a different attitude. In his last Armistice Day address he said:

All human experience seems to demonstrate that a country which makes reasonable preparation for defense is less likely to be subject to hostile attack and less likely to suffer a violation of its rights which might lead to war.

This hardly explains the outcome of the British and German naval expansion just before the World War. There is little doubt but the concern of their respective navies was contributory in bringing on this conflict. If the President's assertion is true, then the world owes solicitous attention to Germany, for that country under the Versailles treaty was limited to a navy of 6 small battleships, 6 light cruisers, 12 destroyers, and 12 torpedo boats, and no submarines, even for commercial uses. If this offers sufficient defense for Germany in the eyes of other nations, it is inconsistent if they provide proportionately larger naval units for themselves. Of course, the United States is not a party to the Versailles treaty, but after taking the lead in reduction of battleships, it is hardly in keeping with the spirit of that move for the Chief Executive now to say:

The size of the Navy which America is to have will be solely for America to determine; no outside influence should enlarge it or diminish it, that since there is no definite agreement to bind the United States the attitude of any other country is not to be permitted to alter our policy.

However much we ignore the attitude of other nations toward us, these will not ignore our program of naval armaments. It was the resumption of our 1916 naval program at the close of the war which led to a naval expansion by Japan and threatened the world with such an enormous competition for sea power that Secretary Hughes called the Washington Limitation Conference with its resultant victory for world peace. Whatever may be said of our independence with respect to what other nations think of our plans to increase armaments, we know well that other countries are influenced by our program and attitude.

Experience tells us that if England and America start out for sea parity in a competitive spirit that war is as likely to be the result as it was in the case of Germany and England. Because such a war is unthinkable is the greater reason why, with all the sanity we can bring to the cause, this great country, freer from the dread of conflict than any other leading power, should, by word and deed, forward world peace.

Does anyone think for a moment that the citizens of this country would have refused to shoulder the $4,000,000,000 naval building program which was the original size of the cruiser bill if there had been convincing evidence of its need? But they found that it sprang from a greed born of a desire to outstrip the British Navy. They distrusted its source. Their stand was protected by Congress. Why should it not so be with respect to the present proposal, which is the miniature saved from the original and has the same source?

Public opinion awaits justice. In a democracy such as ours, if public opinion is not sacred, what is? With regard to peace, it has won victories in these recent years but in spite of armaments. Peace agreements have usually been born enslaved, or their wings immediately clipped, and all because the peoples of the world can not command the representation which will choke off the militarism, which clings persistently to this age, and give the ideals and means of peace a fair and open chance. Their victories are barely made when along come the gods of war and wrap them in the warrior's garments. It is what the Senate is now asked to do with respect to the treaty renouncing war.

But, in spite of this condition there has been progress. Public opinion was literally on the march when a few weeks ago conflict broke out between Paraguay and Bolivia and armies which have trampled across so many paper treaties find that when the cry to halt is from an unsmothered, firm-spoken public opinion, the warring governments take heed. And it is just this vital connection between the peace agreements and the people which mark the progress. And this achievement is practically a new phenomenon in the world. Although it is yet of small stature it is no longer invisible. Witness its strength when it set itself against the Anglo-French naval agreement which was secretly negotiated and aimed at deceiving the American Government. It is the support of the peoples themselves which give vitality to treaties and agreements which mark the most outstanding advance toward permanent amity between the nations of Europe since the World War.

We have had on the Western Hemisphere in the Pan American Union a peace agency sponsored by public opinion, and for more than two decades it has worked. Now comes the Kellogg pact, which represents similar forward steps on a world-wide scale. Note what characterizes the making of these agreements. Their negotiations are open. They are not hedged about with technicalities which destroy and make obscure their meaning. Their language is simple and direct. They are no longer disguised guarantees for war. These characteristics mark them as different from the old type of agreements among nations. It is possible for the peoples of the nations to understand and support such international treaties, and they do.

The cost of armaments to-day, Mr. President, is most staggering. To indicate how really staggering it is, I ask for the inclusion in the RECORD at this point of a full-page article taken from the New York Times of Sunday, August 12, 1928, bearing the headline The Cost of Arms is $3,500,000,000 a Year. I understand that the maps and charts which accompany the article can not be reproduced, but I do ask unanimous consent to have the article itself printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article may be inserted in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sunday, August 12, 1928]

THE COST OF ARMS IS $3,500,000,000 A YEAR—LEAGUE SURVEY SHOWS WORLD HAS 5,500,000 SOLDIERS, COSTING EVERY HUMAN BEING $2 YEARLY TO MAINTAIN—SEA POWER IS DECREASING, BUT NAVIES STILL HAVE 5,047,300 TONS OF WARSHIPS AFLOAT

By P. W. Wilson

In the progress toward disarmament the events of the next few weeks are bound to be important. In Paris the multilateral treaty renouncing war is to be signed by the principal powers of the world. At Geneva the preparatory commission appointed by the League of Nations to find a basis for limiting armaments is expected to resume its discussions, with the United States and Russia participating. Throughout the world there is a public opinion increasingly watchful of the progress of these long and complicated negotiations.

Of particular pertinence at this time, therefore, is the Armaments Year Book for 1927–28, just issued by the League of Nations—a complete, detailed, and authoritative survey of the armaments of the world and the cost of those armaments at the most recent available date.

The statistics of armies, navies, and aircraft, with expenditure thereon, and the particulars of munitions and of the natural resources (of importance for national defense) of the various countries are bewildering in their complexity. But there are certain facts, simple and challenging, that emerge. The cost of armaments, the number of men under arms, and the tonnage of navies can be stated with some approach to exactitude.

THE COST OF PREPARATIONS

After allowing for varying rates of exchange we may take it that the annual expenditure on preparations for war is as follows:

Armies	$2,400,000,000
Navies	1,100,000,000
Total	3,500,000,000

These approximations include aircraft, sometimes naval and sometimes military.

The total expenditure of $3,500,000,000 is equal to the entire expenditure of the United States for all purposes, including interest and repayment of debt. It is also equal to a charge of $2 a head, or $10 a family, for the entire human race, including those hundreds of millions of people in Asia and Africa to whom as yet money has scarcely a meaning.

On the other hand, it is easy to overstate the effect of disarmament on national budgets. We are often told that four-fifths or three-fourths of such budgets are due to "the cost of war."

That is true. But the heaviest cost of war in time of peace is debt, and a national debt is not directly affected by disarmament, which would deal only with current expenditure. An examination of the budgets of the world suggests that if suddenly there were to be a suspension of all expenditure throughout the world on armies and navies and aircraft and munitions the average relief to the taxpayer would amount to about one-sixth of his burden.

THE SIZE OF THE ARMIES

Let us turn next to the size of armies. Here we are warned that the statistics supplied by the various nations are the result of differing methods of computation. But a reasonable enumeration results in the broad conclusion that the number of soldiers at this moment serving their whole time with the colors is about 5,500,000.

It should be clearly understood that this figure represents only the standing armies. In addition there are the reserves, who have completed their training and what may be called civilian troops, like the National Guard in the United States and the territorials in Great Britain.

The British dominions, to give a case, maintain a permanent force of only nominal strength—3,500 for Canada—but around this nucleus there are large bodies of men who undergo what may be described as holiday training and who in an emergency would be an important factor, as the Great War demonstrated, in military operations.

The population of the world may be taken as 1,800,000,000. An aggregate standing army of 5,500,000, then, is only a little more than one soldier to every 300 civilians. This, then, is what we may call the military ratio for the human race.

In the United States the population is 118,000,000 and the standing Army is 145,000. The military ratio, to repeat our phrase, is thus little more than 1 soldier to 800 civilians. If, then, we take the United States as an example of a country which has demobilized its forces to a purely defensive standard, and if we apply this standard of 1 in 800 to the world as a whole, we find that the result would be a diminution of standing armies from 5,500,000 to 2,200,000. In other words, no fewer than 3,300,000 regular soldiers would be disbanded.

The returns to the League of Nations show that the navies of the world, taken as a whole, have been substantially reduced. In 1913 warships of all kinds were rated at 6,895,600 tons. The figure rose during the war to 7,350,400 tons. It has fallen to 5,047,300 tons—a figure which may be visualized as the equivalent of a fleet of 100 mammoth liners like the *Leviathan*, the *Majestic*, and the *Berengaria*.

While this reduction has been proceeding, the mercantile fleets of the world have grown from 47,000,000 tons in 1913 to 65,000,000 tons in 1927. This means that in 1913 there was 1 ton of navy to 7 tons of mercantile marine, whereas to-day there is only 1 ton of navy to 13 tons of mercantile marine.

Every day peaceful commerce is claiming a more and more absolute control of the ocean.

To sum up this general statement we may say, then, that the world is spending $3,500,000,000 for armies and navies, or about one-sixth of its aggregate of national incomes; that it is keeping approximately 5,500,000 men under arms, or 1 soldier to 300 civilians; and that it has 5,000,000 tons of naval shipping on the ocean, or 1 to 13 tons of mercantile marine. Let us now look a little more closely into these armies and navies.

The military ratio for the world is, as we have seen, 1 soldier to 300 civilians. It is a ratio that varies greatly in different countries and different continents.

First, take Latin America. Including Mexico, we have a population of 90,000,000. But an examination of 19 sovereignties shows that the armies in this area aggregate 250,000 men. To give two cases: Brazil has an army of 47,000 men and Mexico an army of 72,000. For Latin America the military ratio is 1 soldier to 360 men, or more than double that of the United States.

There is Canada with 9,000,000 citizens. She can manage with 3,500 permanent troops. But Bolivia, with 3,200,000 citizens, has 8,000 effectives, while Cuba, with 3,370,000 citizens, maintains 12,500 troops. A bright spot on the map is Panama, where national defense consists of "a general and two majors and the outlay on a military band."

Another area where the military ratio exceeds that of the United States, namely, 1 soldier to 800 citizens, is the Far East. The population of China is returned as 448,000,000. Her army is stated to be 1,600,000, which works out at 1 soldier to 280 citizens.

It is fair to add that, in many quarters, there is some measure of skepticism over this huge army or series of armies in China. But, according to the most conservative estimates, the number of troops is very large, say 1,000,000.

INDIA'S LOW RATIO

The most pertinent comparison here is with India. The population of India is 319,000,000. The standing army is 234,000, and the military ratio is thus 1 soldier to 1,363 civilians, or only one-fifth of the military ratio for China.

With a population of approximately 60,000,000 Japan has an army of nearly 200,000. Her military ratio is thus 1 soldier to 300 civilians, and, curiously, it is thus equal to the similar ratio for the world as a whole.

Indeed, there is an even more interesting comparison. Britain, on her islands, is the Japan of Europe; Japan, on her islands, is the Britain of Asia; and Japan and Britain have nearly the same military ratio. The population of Britain and Northern Ireland is 45,000,000; the standing army is 145,000; and this works out at 1 soldier to 310 civilians, or nearly three times the ratio of the United States.

The explanation of the Japanese Army is simple. China is disturbed and Russia is on the borders of China. Between the Japanese and the British Armies there are, however, two distinctions to be drawn. The Japanese soldier is a conscript, recruited for short service, and the entire manhood of the nation is thus trained for war. The British soldier is a professional, enlisted for a term of years, and he passes into a reserve, limited, therefore, in numbers.

Also, the British Army is the force reservoir for an empire of more than 400,000,000 inhabitants. As a whole, the military ratio for that empire is well within the peaceful standard maintained by the United States.

It is when we touch the Continent of Europe that we find ourselves in the area of highest military ratio.

The standing armies of Europe total nearly 3,000,000. This means that a continent with one-quarter the population of the world maintains more than one-half of the mobilized manpower.

In the armies of Europe there is manifest an immense change. Before the war the standing armies of the Central Powers were:

Germany	655,000
Austria-Hungary	400,000
Bulgaria	60,000
Total	1,115,000

Now consider the Allies. Before the war their standing armies were:

France	645,000
Russia	1,200,000
Italy	300,000
Belgium	46,000
Serbia	361,000
Rumania	98,000
Total	2,650,000

The Serbian figure, though official, must be accepted with caution. Also, the Russian Army was ill-equipped. But there was clearly a balance between two national groups.

Consider the position to-day. The armies of what used to be the Central Powers are as follows:

Germany	99,000
Austria	20,000
Hungary	34,500
Bulgaria	30,000
Total	183,500

In other words, the countries vanquished in the war have had their land forces put upon a peace footing. Conscription has been abolished and enlistment is voluntary.

IMMENSE EUROPEAN ARMIES

On the other hand, the Allies are maintaining immense armies:

France	625,000
Poland	263,000
Rumania	150,000
Yugoslavia	116,000
Czechoslovakia (approximately)	125,000
Belgium	65,000
	1,344,000
Italy	250,000
Russia (approximately)	560,000
Total	2,154,000

Over the Central Powers this represents a superiority of 8 to 1. If Britain be added, the superiority is 9 to 1.

A reason for this situation is the new political alignment. It is true that the Central Powers are disarmed. But there are two powers which stand outside what may be called the allied group. Italy has an army of 250,000 and Russia has an army which we may take to be 560,000.

In Europe, as in Latin America, the military ratio is increased by the division of the Continent into numerous sovereignties.

In 15 of the smaller independent countries of Europe there are 70,000,000 citizens. They maintain 400,000 men under arms. With 6,500,000 people, Greece—to give one instance—has an establishment of 67,000 troops; with 3,500,000 people, Finland has 28,500 soldiers. These 15 countries have no more than two-thirds of the population of the United States. Yet they have three times as many soldiers as the United States in their standing armies.

Of armies, we may then say broadly that throughout the entire English-speaking world and its dependencies, whether American or British, the military ratio is a minimum. In Latin America the ratio is higher than this minimum; in the Far East it is still higher, and in Europe the military ratio reaches its maximum. We need only add that over wide areas of the world—for instance, Africa, the Middle East, Siam, Burmah, the Malay Peninsula, and Australasia—armaments are negligible.

NAVIES OF THE WORLD

Let us now subject the navies to analysis. The League of Nations indicates precisely what has happened to sea power as the result of the war. Certain navies have been increased; others have been decreased.

Let us take the decreases first. They are, in tons:

	1913	1926	Decrease
Germany	1,030,000	151,000	879,000
Britain	2,208,000	1,184,000	1,024,000
France	683,000	529,000	154,000
Italy	337,000	295,000	42,000
Russia	339,000	125,000	214,000

The interpretation of these figures is simple. The German Navy has largely disappeared. The British have been able, therefore, to reduce their fleets by more than a million tons.

The increases are:

	1913	1926	Increase
Japan	536,000	695,000	159,000
United States	843,000	1,290,000	447,000

On paper, then, the United States has a larger—a considerably larger—Navy than Great Britain. With all navies, however, a real question, as experts know, is not aggregate tonnage, but a much more vital factor, namely, the date of the vessels in the navies. Hence, in both the United States Navy and the British there is an official allowance for what is described as depreciated tonnage; that is, one-twentieth per annum for a battleship, one-seventeenth per annum for light cruisers, and one-twelfth per annum for destroyers and submarines. For the United States Navy the depreciation is 488,000 tons. For the British Navy it is 495,000 tons. If these figures are to be accepted as conclusive, it would appear that, contrary to a very general impression, the United States Navy is, taken as a whole, as recent in construction as the British.

Here, however, it should be stated that the two British superdreadnoughts, *Rodney* and *Nelson*, with their nine 16-inch guns, twelve 6-inch guns, and 34 smaller guns, are entered as still "building," a remark which also applies to 12 cruisers of the *Kent* class, representing a displacement of 108,000 tons.

TONNAGE OF SHIPS FALLING

The character of navies is changing. The tonnage of battleships has been reduced from 3,897,000 in 1913 to 2,168,000 in 1926. It is a reduction not a little due to the terms and the influence of the Washington conference. The tonnage also of cruisers has fallen from 2,205,000 in 1913 to 1,191,000 in 1926.

On the other hand, the tonnage of destroyers has risen from 517,000 in 1913 to 903,000, while submarines also have developed from 95,000 tons in 1913 to 268,600 in 1926. The importance of any limitation of smaller warships is thus manifest.

The problem of armaments involves much more than the arithmetic of armies and navies. There is also what France calls "potential," namely, the animal, vegetable, and mineral resources of the various countries, the length of their coast line, the density of their population, the development of their railways, and other imponderable factors, including diplomatic commitments.

Hence, it has been maintained that the problem of limiting armaments by treaty is essentially insoluble; and the real question to-day is whether public opinion accepts such demurrers as final.

An essential factor is the growing importance of equipment. As industry is no longer manual as it used to be, but mechanical, so in a sense is fighting. A small army, well supplied with modern devices, is much more powerful than a larger army in which the equipment is merely traditional.

A measure of disarmament would be the abolition of compulsory recruiting in all its forms. This would compel all nations to enroll professional armies on terms of long service, and would limit the reserves accordingly.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, as to the United States we know the burden of war costs and national defense is on the increase. The President states that there has been an increase of $118,000,000 within the past four years. When we count the sums given to the Army and Navy we are likely to forget the additional amounts provided for in the deficiency appropriations. The last session of Congress voted in all $755,516,175 for the War and Navy Departments. Of this amount $48,000,000 was provided for the increase of the Navy. The naval craft under construction in 1929 will include two submarines and eight cruisers. Of the latter two will be completed during this year. In view of the stupendous sums paid out each year to the gods of war, our national-defense development is receiving about all the taxpayers of the country can bear or will stand. The direct cost of the War of 1812 was more than the total Federal expenditures up to that time. The direct cost of the Civil War was more than all the Federal expenditures of the Government up to the time. And since then its cost has increased 150 per cent through pensions. The cost of the World War to the United States when the last pensioner has received his last Government check will bring the total to almost triple its original cost, which has been estimated at around $35,000,000,000. Of this war burden upon the American people the Secretary of the Treasury in a recent annual report has this to say, after stating that above 80 per cent of the Federal expenditures are used to pay war bills:

When the average citizen grumbles over the size of his income-tax payment he often visualizes his hard-earned money being spent by the Government to compile reports on business or agricultural conditions or to erect public buildings, send diplomats abroad, carry on scientific investigations, or make and enforce laws.

As a matter of fact, a small part of the taxpayer's dollar goes into work of this sort, only about one-sixth being used for all multitudinous types of ordinary civil functions added together. One-half of each tax dollar is used for the service of the public debt, also a war bill. The remaining one-third of the taxpayer's dollar is spent in behalf of military veterans.

Between 1917 and 1923 our military expenditures totaled $18,000,000,000. A writer has shown how much this amount really is. It would pay the 679,000 public-school teachers in 271,000 schools a salary equal to twice the amount they received during this period and for the same years; it would in addition have paid the running expenses of 618 colleges and doubled the salaries of all their teaching staff; doubled the endowment of 145 colleges, which now have a $1,000,000 fund or over; and an amount would yet remain sufficient to purchase 1,000,000 homes at $4,000 each, buy the capital stock of 30,000 banks in the United States, all the stock of the telephone and telegraph companies in the United States, and leave in the bank an account of nearly a billion dollars.

No item of armaments are ever small and these expenditures sneak in unaware. Take the deficiency items. The Navy received from both deficiency appropriations for the current year $28,583,945, so that the Navy's appropriations exceeded the Budget estimates by about $2,000,000. The Navy items calling for increase in appropriations are under building construction as surface ships, aircraft, submarine bases, aircraft stations, ammunition depots, docks, and navy yards.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. HALE. The Senator does not mean that the naval appropriations exceeded the Budget estimate by the amount he has given. All of the items in the deficiency bill were estimated for by the Budget, if I recall correctly the circumstances.

Mr. NYE. Yes; but the naval appropriations exceeded the first estimates of the Budget Bureau.

Mr. HALE. Yes; the first estimates, but not the final estimates.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, armaments are everywhere. The American Air Service, which I wish well, is comparatively new. The leaders in aviation are desirous that this field of service contribute to world amity. Colonel Lindbergh, Commander Byrd, and others have made good-will flights. Our good-will air-

men circumnavigated the globe. Since 1924 the American Congress has appropriated for the promotion of aviation a grand total of more than a half billion dollars. More than $450,000,000 of this has gone to the War and Navy Departments. The estimates for 1930 give in round numbers $6,000,000 to the aviation division of the Department of Commerce, but an amount in direct and indirect appropriations to the War and Navy Departments totaling above $100,000,000. If it is commerce and transportation and mail service we desire to promote by air routes, why do most of the funds go to the national defense branches of the Government? It is because armaments have hogged the Government and in this and other nations have become monsters which mankind is bowed in attempting to feed. Not only that these monsters have forced their psychology and viewpoint upon his bent figure and his outlook is so obscured that he thinks he has not the right even to make peace agreements with neighboring peoples without wedding his child to an armament monster.

The military burden being carried by all the people of the world is one that must be reckoned with. The increasing cost can not go on and on without inviting disaster.

It is not surprising that from all lands come murmurings of complaint by the people, and expressions of the burning desire to get away from the crushing military load.

I read, Mr. President, from a very interesting editorial published under date of January 28 by the Detroit News and Journal with the caption Must We Travel the Same Old Route?:

MUST WE TRAVEL THE SAME OLD ROUTE?

The attitude of the people of America toward the cruiser bill now before the Senate shapes up as follows: Great enthusiasm for the bill on the part of a few Senators, a few people; great enmity to the bill on the part of a dozen Senators, a few people; and great apathy toward the bill on the part of the overwhelming majority.

That apathy is easy to understand. The people have been told—so often that they believe it—that the American Navy has fallen behind the British Navy in strength, and is not very far ahead of the Japanese. They have been told that the Washington conference adopted a 5–5–3 ratio for these navies (which is not true, as this ratio applied only to capital ships) and that we are not keeping up to this ratio. They have been told that in the case of war with an enemy (unnamed and unknown), our commerce will be at the mercy of that enemy. They have been informed that the covenant of the league, the Locarno treaties, the Pan American decision to avoid war, the Kellogg multilateral treaty, are but scraps of paper, and that the only insurance of our safety lies in having a navy at least as powerful as the British.

On the other hand, their common sense tells them that they have no intention of picking a quarrel with any nation, and that we are so safe from invasion and our resources for self-maintenance are so great that no nation is at all likely to declare war on us. It tells them that even if a people should go mad with war fever, responsible ministers would scarcely dare to commit it to a conflict in the face of so many solemn covenants between so many signatories. It tells them that this continental Nation, with its few outlying possessions, has no such need of a navy as has an island power with dominions and colonies all over the world, in every continent—an island power that could be starved into submission by an effective blockade.

Common sense would tell the great majority that there is no need of a large increase in cruiser construction were it not for the vague unrest created by the advocates of the cruiser bill. There is no war; there is no enemy in sight; but would it not be better to play safe, even at the expense of several hundred million dollars? Perhaps the treaties will not hold; perhaps the pledged word of governments is not to be trusted; perhaps a combination may be formed against us; perhaps this; perhaps that.

So we shall probably pass the bill and construct more cruisers—not against Great Britain or any nation in particular, but against a cloudy eventuality. And then Great Britain will have to increase her navy—not against us, but to protect her commerce. And then Japan will have to increase hers, for is she also not an island empire? And then Mussolini will have to strengthen his, and France hers, and Brazil hers, and so on down the line. Whereupon, our Navy being again inferior, we shall have to build still more vessels, and the game begins all over again.

We saw all these things happening prior to 1914. We saw protective alliances being formed, all sorts of insurance against war being taken out, and the armament race going madly on. The result was that the insurance failed, war was created out of an already created war psychology, and for four dizzy years the world stood on the brink of general ruin. A great navy a protection? Rather it is a liability! There is far more protection in such scraps of paper as the Kellogg treaties supported by a world-wide public opinion. And that opinion exists, and was never stronger for peace than it is to-day. But it may become bewildered by preparations for war, by the adoption of an attitude of general suspicion, by imagining that the world is full of enemies waiting to strike and armed to the teeth. Let us rather have faith in the peoples, in their pledged word, and in the lessons that the recent war drove home to them.

Under these circumstances what a wonderful opportunity is America's! After years, yea, after generations, of education the people of most lands—the people of all great lands—know what occasions war, and they see it all as a thing which no well-regulated community would tolerate for a moment. Yet they are finding set up in their midst that force which constantly cries out, "Prepare!" and they are caused eternally to dig and dig and dig that there may be the wherewithal to foot the bill of preparing—funds which put in the shadow such sums as are spent for education or other worthy, forward-looking, progressive purposes; and these people know, too, that the preparation being made can eventually mean but one thing, namely, a test of strength.

Our lot in the United States is no different than that of other nations. We know that other peoples are as adverse to all talk of war and preparation for war as are we; but our Congress, like the set-up in other countries, is prevailed upon to see that Americans keep digging that we may produce, nationally, $4 for war purposes for every dollar we pay for educational or other purposes removed from militarism.

With all people dreading, as do we, the thought of more war, the drums of war, the drums of death, the drums of suffering and of pain, there stands out at this hour the pressing need for one thing, and the United States is better fitted to supply that one thing than any other nation. What is needed is not the complete abandonment of preparation for war. I shall not be one to urge or aid disarmament to the point which would leave us open to attack and defenseless. Indeed, I have already said that I believe in ample and adequate defenses. But there is sore need for some great nation like our own to make it very, very clear by its actions that it never plans to molest another nation or do more than defend itself against attack. There is need that one neighbor in this great world neighborhood afford evidence that others need not fear attack from him; that while he is prepared to defend himself against the attack of others, he is not making ready to single out a neighbor or neighbors upon whom to practice his strength.

What a wonderful opportunity is America's right now!

We can abandon this economically and morally unsound cruiser program, leave ourselves amply prepared to meet any possible attack, and convince the people of the world of our sincerity of purpose; and, setting that sort of an example, I am confident that people of other lands will quickly shame their war lords away from that purpose upon which they are constantly bent—a purpose that they will follow so long as all the world continues giving them such food for argument as we give them now if we inaugurate this cruiser program—and in the end we will find nations preparing not for war but for peace. The world but needs a moral example to be set by one great people. The world only awaits some nation to take the lead, some one people to start the ball rolling. Why not America, where our make-up is of the people of all the world, where blood and sympathies are balanced through blood and sympathies from every corner of the universe?

Some one nation must start in such a direction lest we all break and witness the very crumbling of civilization under the weight of superarmaments and the burden of the cost of supplying and maintaining them. It ought to be America. Let it be America.

Do we take a long chance by such a step? Do we jeopardize our safety or our honor by trying such a program? Not if we maintain those standards of defense which are ours to-day, and not in the present state of world unpreparedness for war. We have everything to gain and naught to lose by taking the lead in this program of abandoning preparation for offensive warfare.

Abandon or modify this cruiser program and we will at the same moment abandon talk about possible war with Great Britain or any other country, and with that loss to the militaristic cause I am confident that public sentiment in all lands would call for and cause a like program in their own countries.

Is it a dangerous step? Is it not an effort worth the try? I answer that to my own satisfaction by asking another question: How much backing would accrue to those who now urge this cruiser program upon us if England did not by her acts—in the main, the acts of her admirals—which are acts just enough to invite exaggeration through fabrications, make available some small opportunity for the fuss now made over the British Navy and naval plans? In other words, what chance would there be for this cruiser program now before us if Great Britain showed no tendency to be preparing for war away from her own shores? Why, Mr. President, in that event this cruiser

program would have about as much chance of success in Congress as there is chance of the outbreak of another World War to-morrow.

Abandonment of this cruiser program, or at least postponement of it, is well worth the try. Lay it aside for a year, two years, with the express purpose of seeing what the world result might be, and if then it appears that our example is not being followed by the force of sentiment in other great nations, and first of all Great Britain, I will readily join in prevailing upon my constituency to participate in such a program as will convince the world that we mean to build to meet the most extreme sort of military emergency, and will do it knowing full well that I am aiding in a program bound eventually to rush nations again into war—a more terrible war than imagination can fathom; a war which no one will win; a war in which all participants will lose; a war bound to crush civilization; and a war which will find cruisers of about as great utility for war purposes as the toy sailboats with which the children amuse themselves in the bathtub.

Mr. President, if there is a labor problem to be met, if our shipbuilders are without work, let us appropriate means with which to build merchantmen in their yards, build things of utility which will contribute to progress and not to destruction. But let us, in any event, seize upon this opportunity which is given us as a nation to set the pace which is the only pace that can possibly win economic and moral victory of a lasting kind for all the world.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator who has just spoken if he does not think we have done what he suggests since the time of the Washington conference? We have gone ahead with practically no new construction in our Navy, hoping that we could get an agreement on limitation of armaments that would amount to something. We have practically stood still, and at the same time all of the other countries that were parties to the conference have gone ahead and greatly increased their armaments. How long does the Senator think we ought to keep that up? It seems to me we have a very good illustration of the fallacy of the argument.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, to my mind, the situation that exists at this time in Britain and here in the United States is a situation which, if we were to postpone or to abandon the program now before us, would quickly call for a like display of good will on the part of the British people—not on the part of the British Admiralty, by any manner of means, but on the part of the British people—and when that demand became ripe, when it was properly expressed, as it certainly would be expressed, in opposition and in antagonism to the program of the British Admiralty, there is no doubt in my mind but that we could seek that measure of understanding with Great Britain which would make not only unnecessary but foolish in the extreme such a program as we now have before us, voiced by some as being a program preparing for war—with whom? With Great Britain.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. While the Senator from North Dakota is considering what the Senator from Maine describes as a fallacy, I should like to have the Senator from North Dakota consider what I believe to be the fallacy of the argument of the Senator from Maine. He says that we are passing this bill, or going to pass it, not to fight anybody but to prevent war. I judge from that, if that be true, that we are liable to get into a war if we do not build more ships. Then, in the next breath, he says that since the peace conference of 10 years ago we have not built any naval vessels to speak of; and if both of those propositions be correct, the question arises in my mind, why is it that we are not in war now?

Mr. NYE. Let the Senator from Maine answer that.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, no one knows when a war may come about. I can not predict that; neither can the Senator from Nebraska. Certainly where we have held off on our building program for the last few years——

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator think that after holding off for 10 years we are now in danger of war?

Mr. HALE. I think we are in much more danger of war than we were before.

Mr. NORRIS. How much more? Will the Senator tell us with what country we are in danger of war?

Mr. HALE. I do not know of any particular country, but all of these other countries that have naval armaments have increased their armaments since that time.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; and we have increased ours to some extent.

Mr. HALE. Very little.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator himself says that we have not done very much at it, and that is probably true; but he wants now to build a lot of warships to keep us out of war.

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. If that is a true theory, then when we do not build warships it must follow that we get into war, and I am wondering why we have not gotten in.

Mr. HALE. Not of necessity that we must get in, but that we may get in.

Mr. NORRIS. And we may get in if we build more.

Mr. HALE. No; we are much more likely not to get in if we are strong.

Mr. NORRIS. That was the experience of Germany and Great Britain. They both built, and they both got into war.

Mr. HALE. Oh, yes.

Mr. NORRIS. It was the nations that had navies that got into war, whereas, if the Senator's theory is true, the nations that had navies would not have been in war, and the nations that did not have navies would have done the fighting.

Mr. HALE. And if Great Britain had not gone into the war what would have happened to the rest of the world?

Mr. NORRIS. Well, I am not a prophet, if the Senator wants to ask me.

Mr. HALE. There is very little question what the German fleet would have done if Great Britain had not gone to war.

Mr. NORRIS. The fact remains that neither Great Britain nor Germany would have been in the war had they not both been armed to the teeth.

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	George	McMaster	Simmons
Barkley	Gerry	McNary	Smoot
Bingham	Gillett	Mayfield	Steck
Black	Glass	Moses	Steiwer
Blaine	Glenn	Neely	Stephens
Blease	Goff	Norbeck	Swanson
Borah	Gould	Norris	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Greene	Nye	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Hale	Oddie	Trammell
Bruce	Harris	Overman	Tydings
Burton	Harrison	Pine	Tyson
Capper	Hastings	Ransdell	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hawes	Reed, Mo.	Wagner
Couzens	Hayden	Reed, Pa.	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Heflin	Robinson, Ark.	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.	Warren
Dill	Jones	Sackett	Waterman
Edge	Kendrick	Schall	Watson
Fess	Keyes	Sheppard	Wheeler
Fletcher	King	Shipstead	
Frazier	McKellar	Shortridge	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. REED of Missouri. With the consent of the Senator from Kentucky, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article by Rear Admiral Fiske in the February number of Plain Talk, which I think affords some very interesting information. I believe, in view of the great reputation and character of the author, the article is well worthy of the study of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri asks unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article by Rear Admiral Fiske printed in what is known as Plain Talk for February. Is there objection? Consent is given.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From Plain Talk, February, 1929]

HOW BRITISH GUILE SCUTTLED THE AMERICAN NAVY

By Rear Admiral Bradley A. Fiske, United States Navy, retired

[We all know that following the Great War, we actually had, counting ships under construction, the greatest Navy in the world, and that we abandoned the construction of many capital ships through agreement with other powers, chiefly England. We know that England, keeping the limitations treaty to capital ships, is now asking superiority in cruisers. This article shows how we were duped. Admiral Fiske, foreseeing depredations on our merchant marine by England and Germany alike, fought for a larger Navy until his retirement. After we got into the Great War we started the preparations that he had unsuccessfully urged, but at the cost of a year's delay and a consequent cost in lives and dollars that is incalculable. It is something to think about]

The pictures of Uncle Sam have always shown him as a typical Yankee, tall and lank, with a humorous but exceedingly shrewd expression about the eyes. Doubtless, he was shrewd in settling the domestic

questions that concerned him most in his younger days; but he has not always been shrewd in international affairs and when the World War broke out on August 1, 1914, he was given a perfect opportunity for exercising shrewdness and failed to seize it.

On that day the General Board of the Navy sent in a long letter to the Secretary of the Navy, pointing out the various dangers to our peace that a war between the world's two greatest sea powers made inevitable—especially those dangers inseparable from questions of neutrality—and urging that immediate and adequate steps be taken to prepare the Navy to defend our neutral rights, etc. In many conferences which I had with the Secretary of the Navy after this, I (as his virtual chief of staff) urged him to follow our advice. I pointed out that a state of adequate preparedness on our part would not tend to involve us in the war, but would act in the contrary way, because then the belligerent nations on each side would be sedulous to enlist us on their side, if possible, and extremely careful to refrain from any actions that might provoke us and cause us to take part on the other side.

Had the Navy's advice been followed, Germany would have made every effort to gain and hold the sympathy and support of a Nation that was able to throw a deciding force into the scale on either side and certainly would not have been so unwise as to sink the *Lusitania*, with many prominent Americans on board, or to torpedo our merchant vessels. And we should not have been given any compelling cause for entering the war. The European nations would have settled their quarrel much sooner than they did, though not, of course, until they were exhausted, both militarily and economically. As a further result, only one nation on the earth would have remained great and prosperous—the United States.

But Uncle Sam rejected the Navy's expert advice. He flatly refused to prepare at all and yet tried to carry on sea commerce as a neutral with both sides. As the General Board had predicted, dangerous questions as to breaches of neutrality very soon came up. These, at first, were with Great Britain, because of her seizing our merchant ship in and near the English Channel, under charges of breaches of neutrality and violations of blockade, sending them into British ports for examination and holding them there for what seemed to us long periods of time.

However, when we entered the war it was on her side. The reason, of course, was that Germany, overestimating our degree of unpreparedness and the extent of the pacifistic nonresistance into which President Wilson had beguiled our people, adopted a policy of unrestricted submarine warfare and sank some American merchant ships without previous warning or subsequent assistance. Subjected thus to continual and grave injuries and insults (because we were deemed too weak to resent them), America finally plunged headlong into a war 3,000 miles away, which we had had no hand in causing, for which we were dangerously unprepared, and in which we had had, at first, no real or material interest.

It has been said by many people not conversant with naval strategy that we did have an acute material interest in the outcome of the war because, if Germany had conquered Britain and the rest, she would then have come across the Atlantic and conquered us. But the United States Naval War College would tell you the reverse. Germany could not possibly have done this; that is, if our Navy had been prepared.

Of course, it would have been a "selfish" policy to let the European nations commit suicide together while we sat by, shrewdly observant and peacefully secure in our neutral rights, behind the shelter of our guns. But intelligent selfishness sometimes results more advantageously for everybody than unintelligent altruism. Surely it must be clear to anybody now that it would have been far better, at least for the United States, if it had acted as any other nation in the world would have acted and had let the nations who were having a perfectly natural quarrel about business matters settle their quarrel in their own way.

When America finally entered the war it entered with all the ardor of a youthful though untrained fighter. Our service was so effective that it rescued the side that would otherwise have been overwhelmed.

Of course, our unprepared condition made us late in entering the war. One might suppose that the side which we rescued would forgive us for this. It did not. Probably it would have done so if it had not conceived the notion that it was Uncle Sam's duty to assist and that only blame should attach to us for our slowness. We of the United States may think such a frame of mind unreasonable and that the Allies should be thankful to us that we rescued them at all.

But such a feeling on our part would seem unreasonable to anyone who understands even a little of the elements of human nature, for the simple reason that it is unreasonable to expect either nations or individuals to hold an unbiased view of any question in which their own interests are involved.

But whether the view of the Allies after the war was unreasonable or not, it seems to be a fact that they did take that view. Furthermore, the superskillful statesmen of Great Britain made a very large fraction of the people of the United States take it. Many of our papers and many of our statesmen were eloquent in broadcasting the idea. Closely connected with this idea, also eloquently broadcast, was the idea that wars were 100 per cent bad and that the best way to preserve peace was for all the nations to limit their armament. After a few years of the spreading of this idea, the United States invited the great maritime nations to a conference on limitation of armament.

At that time our Nation was the most powerful in the world not only economically but navally, for we possessed the actual and potential factors that constituted a navy far more powerful than any other. It was not unreasonable that this should be the case; not only because our country was then the richest in the world but also because we had wisely conserved its riches and built up its Navy at great cost. And there was a further reason, which was the fact that the progress of the world had isolated this Nation and had made it the perfectly natural target for the perfectly natural envy and jealously of all the other nations. To imagine that such a position would not have made it such a target is to imagine human beings as being very different from what they really are.

That our Government conceived the idea of the limitation of armament conference in its own mind and proposed it of its own initiative is the prevalent impression. The fact is that it closely followed the receipt of information by our Government that the British cabinet was ready to abandon the old 2-power stand and to welcome the American Navy to "equality" with the British!

But even if that nation did make the suggestion and even if she did, in cooperation with her ally Japan, bring about the decision that was ultimately made, such an action should not cause bad feeling on our part toward them. We should merely smile and realize that it was the duty of the statesmen of Great Britain and Japan to do whatever they could for the prosperity of their nations. Their loyalty and honor were due to their mother countries and not to us.

The three major nations in the conference were the United States, Great Britain, and Japan. Of these three, Great Britain and Japan were at the time actual allies and had been actual allies for 20 years. The conference, therefore, was really between two parties. One party was the United States, the other party was the two allies—Great Britain and Japan. The natural result was that the decision was to the disadvantage of the United States and to the advantage of Great Britain and Japan.

The major parts of the decision were two in number.

One part was the voluntary abnegation by the United States of her naval superiority over Great Britain and Japan, a substitution of parity with Great Britain and a 5 to 3 ratio with Japan.

The other major part of the decision was an agreement by the United States not to make any further improvements in the defenses of the Philippine Islands or to increase their capacity as a naval base.

Referring to the parity between Britain and the United States, the decision involved parity in only battleships and airplane carriers. The discussions preceding the decision indicated a willingness on the part of Britain to include parity in other classes of ships, but for reasons that need not be mentioned now the only parity to which the three countries agreed in writing was parity in battleships and airplane carriers. There has been considerable said since then in American newspapers as to the "principle" underlying the agreement, but in fairness we ought to admit that any such talk is very vague and is subject to numerous misunderstandings and that the only things to which the three nations committed themselves were those to which they signed their names. Clearly the loose talk which some Americans have indulged in concerning the "principles" of the agreement and the oral remarks which Mr. Balfour and others made have nothing to do with the case any more than have any of the oral discussions which have preceded any business agreement in ordinary business life.

The 5 to 3 ratio regarding Japan, most people not conversant with naval strategy have accepted as being fair and reasonable, on the theory that such a ratio represented the approximate ratio between the resources of the United States and Japan. But this reasonableness is only apparent. It is not real, for the simple reason that in any war between this country and Japan our fleet would have to go out to Japan, 7,000 miles away from our bases in the United States and very close to the bases of Japan, and accept a strategic disadvantage so great that the 5 to 3 ratio is not anywhere near great enough to permit our fleet to fight with any reasonable prospect of success.

As to the second major part of the decision—this has impressed our people very much less than has the numerical reduction of our fleet; and yet it is immeasurably more important. Our agreement not to defend the Philippines serves the double purpose of making it very easy for Japan to capture them and almost superhumanly difficult for us to recapture them. That the value of these considerations is thoroughly apreciated by the British and Japanese will be easily realized.

It is necessary to bear in mind that the British and Japanese were actual allies when the conference was held and had been allies for virtually 20 years and that the Japanese had at least two powerful naval bases in Japan, while the British had decided to build a powerful naval base at Singapore. By looking at any map, it can be seen that the "communications" of these two allies in the East lay between Singapore and Japan and that our naval base at Manila flanked those communications.

By two military countries, such as the British and the Japanese preeminently are, such a situation could not be regarded with indifference, because in case of war with us it would constitute a military danger, while in time of peace it constitutes a permanent vantage point in commercial dealings.

For both peace and war, therefore, it was highly desirable for Britain and Japan to get rid of our naval base at Manila. At that time the naval base there was extremely weak, holding as it did only one small floating dry dock. But the far-sighted statesmen of Britain and Japan, visualizing the certain increase in the value of China for their sea commerce, realized that if the United States should make Manila a real naval base, it might prove extremely troublesome to the line of communications between Japan and Singapore.

In order to induce us to emasculate it the Japanese first effected the ruse of preparing their navy for war and then insisted that they would not sign any agreement at all unless we agreed not to increase the defense of the Philippines or their capacity as a naval base. Their pretense was that any increase of defense there would menace the security of Japan. Yet Japan was more than a thousand miles away and flanked all lines of communication between the United States and the coast of Asia.

After the decision of the conference had been published in 1922, the people of the United States acclaimed it, because they had been led to believe that it was a great triumph of statesmanship.

It would have been a great triumph of statesmanship if the following statement of Secretary Hughes had been correct:

"This treaty ends—absolutely ends—the race in competition in naval armament. At the same time it leaves the relative security of the great naval powers unimpaired."

But that statement was wholly incorrect. As to the first sentence in it, anyone who reads the newspapers knows that the decision did not end "the race in competition in naval armament." He knows that all it ended was (by the terms of the decision itself) the competition as to battleships and airplane carriers. He knows that the race in all the other factors of naval armament is proceeding as keenly as before. Anybody with even a moderate knowledge of naval strategy would have known in 1922 just what the General Board told Mr. Hughes that this would inevitably happen.

As to the second sentence in the statement of Secretary Hughes, it is equally incorrect. Before the decision the United States was fairly secure in the Philippines and she had started to make herself wholly secure by the simple and inexpensive process of equipping the Philippines with enough airplanes, submarines, etc., to prevent an enemy from disembarking from his ships in open boats, proceeding to the shore in those open boats, and landing from those boats on the shores of the island. But the decision rendered the islands helpless before any determined foe. Was our "relative security unimpaired?" If you had valuables in a safe-deposit vault, guarded by armed watchmen, and equipped with locks, would you feel that the security of those valuables was "unimpaired" if the watchman and time locks were removed?

Mr. Hughes's statement being wholly incorrect, the decision of the conference, instead of being a great triumph of statesmanship, was a great blunder of statesmanship.

It should be clearly understood that no member of the American delegation was a Navy officer. One would naturally suppose that in a conference in which the whole subject of discussion was one that hinged on the relative values of naval units there would have been at least one member who understood those relative values. It had been suggested that at least one Navy officer should be a member. But this suggestion was rejected, and not only did the delegation contain no Navy officer, but the civilian delegates, during all their discussions, paid little heed to the advice of Navy officers, and in their final decision went flatly counter to it. The General Board did all in its power to prevent the American delegates from making the decision which they did, a decision which every intelligent man in the world, who is unbiased and knows the facts, now realizes was worse than a crime; it was a blunder.

Yet press and pulpit vied with each other in praising it. One of the editors of a prominent American magazine declared it to be the most beneficent incident in the progress of the human race since the coming of Jesus Christ. Much, if not most, of the reason for this was the superskillful propaganda coming from England and the associated fact that the publicity relative to the British activities which was given out in Washington to the newspapers was given to them at the British Embassy by an Englishman, Lord Riddell. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 22, 1922, states:

"Mr. Wickham Stead, editor of the London Times, in a recent speech quoted in the Montreal Statesman, stated the following:

"'The American delegates refused to give out any news during the conference. They left the whole matter with the British publicity agent, Lord Riddell.'"

When one looks back now and realizes the state of feeling in the United States at that time one can see that our people, including the Secretary of State and his colleagues of the delegation, had been propagandized into a condition so emotional as almost to constitute psychosis.

Not long after a bill was presented to Congress for carrying into execution the details of the limitation. It was presented by Mr. Butler, the chairman of the House Naval Committee. It was passed almost unanimously. In the Senate only one man voted against it—Senator France.

The situation since has been made immeasurably worse by the fact that, while we have bound ourselves not to make any improvements whatever in our feeble little base at Manila, Britain has proceeded with characteristic British determination and thoroughness to complete her naval base at Singapore at a cost of at least $35,000,000. There is no pretense whatever that this base is anything but a naval base. The British do not pretend that it is a commercial base or a base for the propagation of the Gospel, or for any other purpose whatever, except the use of force whenever ability to take advantage of the use of force may seem to them desirable.

It must be plain to any intelligent person now that the present situation was brought about as the result of proper foresight and persuasive ability on the part of the British and Japanese at the conference in Washington, combined with an amazing lack of foresight and a fatuous credulity on the part of our American delegates. Nowhere in history can there be found an equal lack of common sense on the part of any men of equal national standing, intrusted with their country's safety. The foresight shown by the British and Japanese was really not extraordinary, for many similar examples can be found in history. Their foresight and persuasiveness appear extraordinary merely because we see them against the background of the extraordinary ineptitude of the Americans.

In order to visualize the situation correctly, it is essential to clear away the "bunk" that beclouds it and realize that the great nations of the earth are essentially business firms. They are the most powerful business firms in the world. The directors of these great business firms are called governments.

In carrying on their relations with each other all governments have two main official agencies, diplomacy and war. Diplomacy is conducted by the State Department and war by the Army and Navy. Like all other business organizations, governments have many mutual and common interests and many reasons for refraining from strife. To effect their peaceful purposes they employ diplomacy, an agency of great antiquity. With the progress of civilization this agency has been continuously and increasingly developed, until now in every civilized country it constitutes a veritable machine.

So long as this machine operates successfully between any two countries, their mutual relations proceed satisfactorily and they remain at peace. But every man-made machine is subject to derangement, and the diplomatic machine is no exception to this rule. When the diplomatic machine finally breaks down, the two nations involved, being separate and independent sovereigns and having no common superior to direct them or any code of enforceable law to appeal to, have no means of settling their dispute except war.

The ends that could be achieved by war, however, have often been achieved by diplomacy. This being adequately realized by all the great nations except the United States, those nations have created diplomatic organizations just as carefully selected, as finely trained and as reliable in every way as the Army and Navy. It was by reason of the excellence of her diplomatic machine that Britain secured, at the conference in 1921–22, an advantage so great that it has been aptly termed "Britain's greatest naval victory." It wiped out the United States as the principal rival of Britain on the sea and perpetuated Britain's mastery on the sea to a degree that Americans do not realize. Mr. Balfour was promptly created an earl and a Knight of the Garter. The reward was wholly inadequate to his deserts. There was no reward possible on this earth that would have been even approximately adequate for a triumph of diplomacy so magnificent and complete, so clearly implicit in the assurance of the perpetuation of Britain's empire on the sea.

Although we had voluntarily sacrificed our safe position on the sea, yet Congress failed, in the years that followed, to keep the Navy up even to the low strength decided on. Britain and Japan, on the contrary, went strenuously ahead and built their navies up increasingly, with the result that, relatively, we kept falling more and more behind. This condition naturally alarmed our Navy officers; but the mental condition of the country was such that our people could not be made to see the future dangers which the situation was developing. Finally, however, Navy officers were able to make the authorities realize that, in one particular at least, the danger was very clear. This danger was the fact that Britain, Japan, and the other nations were building a large number of cruisers of great speed and steaming radius, which, in case of war, could exercise the double function of preying on our commerce and acting as scouts for their own fleets; while we were doing nothing whatever in the matter.

The result of all the agitation was that a further conference was called at Geneva, which, after a preparatory conference, met in June, 1927. Our idea in bringing about this conference was to have the same

kind of limitation apply to cruisers and other kinds of vessels that had been applied by the Washington conference to battleships and airplane carriers.

Before the conference met, I naturally had talks with many Navy officers about it. Not one officer to whom I talked had the slightest notion that we could accomplish anything. Of course, we did not. How could any sane person who understood the situation believe that Great Britain would yield to our suggestion? Obviously, if she had yielded, she would have sacrificed part of the advantage that she had gained over us. It was represented by us that the "spirit of the conference" in Washington in 1922 had been that the ratio decided on should apply to all classes of warships.

But what did that have to do with the case in 1927? The British delegation attended the conference in 1927, charged with the responsibility to their government of furthering the interests of their country. Why should they neglect that responsibility and play into the hands of a rival country? The only possible reason that could be advanced was that the United States had done what she had in 1922. But would any business man in New York, engaged in any "deal" with a rival business man, agree to make a fool of himself simply because his rival had made a fool of himself five years before?

The main single contention at Geneva in 1927 was concerned with large and small cruisers. The British delegates, in the discharge of their responsibilities to their country, endeavored to induce the American delegates to consent to limiting the size of cruisers and their guns to dimensions too small for the purposes of the American Navy, which virtually has no bases and no merchant ships that could be readily converted into warships. Such dimensions, of course, were perfectly suitable for the British Navy, because it has many bases and a multiplicity of great merchant ships easily convertible into warships.

After the Geneva conference broke up without coming to an agreement, an instructive thing happened in the United States. If ever our Government showed conclusively its utter lack of shrewdness in international affairs, it was when it exhibited a tremendous disappointment over the lack of agreement. As to the people themselves, they displayed actual resentment against the American delegates, because they had failed to agree to the British proposals! Many of the greatest newspapers in this country concentrated their wrath on the Navy officers on the delegation, and declared that the next time such a conference was to be held, we should be very careful that no admiral should take part in it. Can anyone imagine a state of mind more stupid?

The principal outstanding fact of international importance since the so-called "failure" of the Geneva conference was the speech in our House of Representatives made by Mr. Butler, in which he deplored the fact that he, himself, had introduced the bill cutting down our Navy and declared frankly that he and all the rest of Congress had been "fooled." This statement was exactly true; and the fact that we all had been fooled is now admitted by a large section of our people. There are, nevertheless, very many people and very many great newspapers that hold virtually that our delegates to the conference of 1921–22, instead of being fooled, acted in the noblest and wisest manner possible.

It is obvious that we are dropping still farther behind, even in the ratio in power decided on in 1921 and 1922. That Congress should have permitted this is not at all surprising. It is the kind of thing that Congress usually has done, a trait that English diplomats perfectly realized.

It has finally come about that the United States is in a situation at once ridiculous and dangerous. With the purest intentions in the world, we have allowed ourselves to be cajoled into giving up not only our naval supremacy on the sea but also the only considerable base we had in all the world, the Philippine Islands. For let us realize frankly that our agreeing not to increase the wholly inadequate defenses of the Philippine Islands has made it not only possible but easy for Japan to capture them whenever she wishes.

Let us look at the map again, and realize that that long stretch of China coast offers the most tempting opportunities in all the world for the sale of manufactured goods; that Britain and Japan have realized this for many years and have acted in accordance with that realization; that Britain and Japan came to an agreement at the start of the century which resulted in a formal alliance; that, although that formal alliance was canceled in 1922 as part of the agreement of the Limitation of Armament Conference; yet, nevertheless, the same conditions of mutual interests which brought about the alliance persist and, so long as those mutual interests persist, no formal alliance is essential. Let us also realize that Japan has powerful bases at one end of the line that runs along the east coast of China and that Britain will shortly have a tremendous naval base at the other end.

Let us realize that we are committed to the policy of the open door in China, and that this policy is contrary to the interests of Great Britain and Japan. This being the situation, is it not plain, in case of those conflicts of interest which continually occur in foreign trade, that we should be tremendously handicapped if we tried to insist on our rights as against those of the allies? How can we profitably insist on anything when we have no means with which to back up our insistence? Let us not forget, in case of a conflict of vital interests regarding matters in eastern Asia between us on the one hand and the allies on the other, that there will be no court competent to decide the matter and no policemen to enforce the decree of the court, even if there were such a court. Each state holds itself sovereign.

It may be objected that Japan's interests lie with Russia rather than with England; that Germany, Russia, and Japan will constitute a coalition which will dominate the world in the proximate future. Perhaps they will, but certainly they do not now; and until they do, if ever, it must be clear that Japan will fear Russia more than she will fear any other country, for the same reasons that she feared her in 1904, and the last thing she will want to lose will be the support of the British fleet.

It may be objected that this article is materialistic and takes no account of the teachings of Christianity. Possibly. But I should like to have some one point out an instance where any nation, in its relation with other nations, has not acted according to the materialistic methods which Americans themselves follow in their private business dealings with each other—with the single exception of the United States in the case under discussion. No people can surpass the Americans in shrewd business dealings with each other; and yet no other nation has ever approximated the childish faith in human nature which Americans as a nation show in European nations. We, as the richest nation in the world, the nation becoming richer still and with amazing speed, are so absorbed in making money that we fail to realize that other nations may not look at many matters as we do. The very fact of our absorption in money making shuts our eyes to what other nations may be doing. But it makes other nations open their eyes to what we are doing, and it tempts them to ask themselves if they can not, by guile or force (or by guile and force), get some of the money that they think we are making.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I had not intended to consume any of the time of the Senate in a discussion of this measure, because it seems to me that some effort ought to be made to dispose of the measure in order to give proper consideration to other important bills that await our attention. However, as this debate has progressed I have felt that a candid expression of the viewpoint of each Senator here might be beneficial in clearing away some evident misapprehensions which seem to surround the consideration of this whole matter of naval construction and equipment.

In the first place, I desire to make my own position clear. Unfortunately, in this as in other controversial questions there are extremes on both sides. There are those who would plunge our country into an extravagant and unnecessary prodigality of expenditure for naval and military equipment without regard to either necessity or propriety. On the other hand, there are some who would abolish, even under present conditions, all semblance of preparation for resistance to encroachments upon our territory or our rights by any nation whatsoever. I do not belong to either of these groups. I believe in peace. I have supported to the best of my ability every movement that held out any hope of future permanent peace among the nations of the earth, and I am prepared to follow that course in the future.

I am not unmindful of the fact that we must consider the conditions of society as they are and not as we might wish them to be. I feel that in the consideration of our duty in a matter of the nature and scope of national defense we must keep in mind both our longing for peace and our obligations to the people of our own country in their pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness.

We have often said, and it can not be too often repeated, that we want nothing that belongs to any other nation or people except their good will and friendship. We do not want their territory. We do not wish to deprive them of any right to which they are entitled as members of the family of nations. We desire and court the same sentiments toward us from all the other nations of the world. This feeling, not only on our own part but, as I believe, on the part of practically all other nations, was recently manifested by the negotiation of the Kellogg-Briand multilateral treaty renouncing war as an instrument of national policy and pledging one another not to resort to any but pacific means to settle international controversies.

As between the peace pact and the cruiser bill, I voted to give the peace pact first consideration, because I believe the time has arrived in the affairs of the world—in fact, it arrived long ago—when peace should be given the first chance to work out the problems which trouble the nations of the earth.

When the Washington disarmament conference had concluded its deliberations and a treaty was signed fixing the 5–5–3 standard for the navies of Great Britain, the United States, and Japan, respectively, it was the general belief among the people of America, if not of the other nations, that competition in naval construction among the three great naval powers of the world was at an end. It was hailed as the dawn of a new day of real disarmament, and it was believed that this great controversy was well on its way to permanent settlement. It would not be fair to intimate or leave the impression that this great confer-

ence failed to accomplish a long and valuable step in that direction. In the matter of what are known as capital ships among the respective navies I think it can be truthfully said that a great step was taken in the direction of permanent disarmament, though it probably ought also to be said that the capital ship in the intervening years since then has become relatively less important as a part of any navy than it had been prior to that conference.

However, there were certain important fields in naval construction and equipment with which the Washington conference did not deal, or at least which were not included in the limitations fixed by the treaty then negotiated. One of these has to do with the construction and maintenance of cruisers, which is the important subject covered by the bill now under consideration. Every nation signatory to that treaty can build any number of cruisers which it wishes or can afford to build without violating the terms of that treaty.

There seems to have been an unnecessary amount of confusion created and misinformation disseminated concerning the relative cruiser strength of the three great naval powers of the world—Great Britain, the United States, and Japan. And likewise there has been an undue amount of dispute and confusion as to the relative needs of these nations not only for cruisers but for all characters of naval vessels and equipment.

I do not understand why in a debate of this sort it has been so difficult to arrive at the real facts about the strength not only of the navies involved in capital ships under the Washington treaty but in their respective strength with reference to the cruiser situation with which we are trying to deal in this legislation.

I wish to call attention to what I deem authentic information upon this subject obtained from an impartial source and not colored by any fantastic fears or ambitions on the part of any group or interest.

The following table gives the number of modern cruisers already built by the three nations, United States, Great Britain, and Japan:

Modern cruisers built

UNITED STATES

Completed	Name	Obsolete	Standard tonnage	Speed (knots)	Main guns
1923	Omaha	1943	6,600	34	12 6-inch.
1923	Milwaukee	1943	6,600	34	Do.
1923	Richmond	1943	6,600	34	Do.
1923	Detroit	1943	6,600	34	Do.
1923	Concord	1943	6,600	34	Do.
1923	Cincinnati	1943	6,600	34	Do.
1924	Raleigh	1944	6,600	34	Do.
1924	Trenton	1944	6,600	34	Do.
1924	Marblehead	1944	6,600	34	Do.
1925	Memphis	1945	6,600	34	Do.

Total modern cruisers built, 10; aggregate tonnage, 66,000. Between 1908 and 1923 the United States completed no cruisers.

BRITISH EMPIRE

Completed	Name	Obsolete	Standard tonnage	Speed (knots)	Main guns
1911	Weymouth [1]	1931	4,860	25	8 6-inch.
1911	Dartmouth [1]	1931	4,860	25	Do.
1912	Yarmouth [1]	1932	4,860	25	Do.
1913	Melbourne (A)[1]	1933	5,120	25	Do.
1913	Sydney (A)[1]	1933	5,120	25	Do.
1914	Birmingham [1]	1934	5,120	25	9 6-inch.
1914	Lowestoft [1]	1934	5,120	25	Do.
1915	Calliope [1]	1935	3,920	29	4 6-inch.
1915	Castor [1]	1935	3,920	29	Do.
1915	Champion [1]	1935	3,920	29	Do.
1915	Carysfort [1]	1935	3,895	29	Do.
1915	Cleopatria [1]	1935	3,895	29	Do.
1915	Comus [1]	1935	3,895	29	Do.
1915	Conquest [1]	1935	3,895	29	3 6-inch.
1916	Brisbane (A)[1]	1936	5,120	25	8 6-inch.
1916	Gambrian [1]	1936	3,920	29	4 6-inch.
1916	Canterbury [1]	1936	3,920	29	Do.
1916	Constance [1]	1936	3,920	29	Do.
1916	Centaur [1]	1936	4,120	29	Do.
1916	Concord [1]	1936	4,120	29	5 6-inch.
1917	Caledon	1937	4,180	29	Do.
1917	Calypso	1937	4,180	29	Do.
1917	Caradoc	1937	4,180	29	Do.
1917	Cardiff	1937	4,290	29	Do.
1917	Ceres	1937	4,290	29	Do.
1917	Curlew	1937	4,290	29	Do.
1918	Coventry	1938	4,290	29	Do.
1918	Curacao	1938	4,290	29	Do.
1918	Carlisle	1938	4,200	29	Do.
1918	Dauntless	1938	4,850	29	6 6-inch.
1918	Danae	1938	4,850	29	Do.
1918	Dragon	1938	4,850	29	Do.
1918	Vindictive	1938	9,996	30	6 7-inch.

[1] All will become obsolete before 1937.

Modern cruisers built—Continued

BRITISH EMPIRE—continued

Completed	Name	Obsolete	Standard tonnage	Speed (knots)	Main guns
1919	Cairo	1939	4,200	29	5 6-inch.
1919	Calcutta	1939	4,200	29	Do.
1919	Colombo	1939	4,200	29	Do.
1919	Dunedin	1939	4,850	29	6 6-inch.
1919	Delhi	1939	4,850	29	Do.
1919	Hawkins	1939	9,800	30	7 7.5-inch.
1921	Durban	1941	4,850	29	6 6-inch.
1922	Capetown	1942	4,200	29	5 6-inch.
1922	Despatch	1942	4,850	29	6 6-inch.
1922	Diomede	1942	4,850	29	Do.
1922	Adelaide	1942	5,100	25	9 6-inch.
1924	Frobisher	1944	9,860	30.5	7 7.5-inch.
1925	Effingham	1945	9,770	30.5	Do.
1926	Emerald	1946	7,100	33	7 6-inch.
1926	Enterprise	1946	7,100	33	Do.
1927	Adventure	1947	6,740	28	6 4.7-inch.
1927	Cornwall	1947	10,000	31.5	8 8-inch.
1927	Cumberland	1947	10,000	31.5	Do.
1927	Berwick	1947	10,000	31.5	Do.
1928	Kent	1948	10,000	31.5	Do.
1928	Suffolk	1948	10,000	31.5	Do.
1928	Australia	1948	10,000	31.5	Do.
1928	Canberra	1948	10,000	31.5	Do.

Total modern cruisers built, 56; aggregate tonnage, 316,776.

JAPAN

Completed	Name	Obsolete	Standard tonnage	Speed (knots)	Main guns
1910	Tone	1920	3,760	23	2 6-inch.
1912	Chikuma	1932	4,000	26	8 6-inch.
1912	Hirato	1932	4,400	26	Do.
1912	Yahagi	1932	4,400	26	Do.
1919	Tatsuta	1939	3,230	31	4 5.5-inch.
1919	Tenryu	1939	3,230	31	Do.
1920	Kuma	1940	5,100	33	6 5.5-inch.
1921	Tama	1941	5,100	33	7 5.5-inch.
1921	Kitakami	1941	5,100	33	Do.
1921	Kiso	1941	5,100	33	Do.
1921	O-i	1941	5,100	33	Do.
1922	Nagara	1942	5,170	33	Do.
1922	Natori	1942	5,170	33	Do.
1922	Kinu	1942	5,170	33	Do.
1923	Yura	1943	5,170	33	Do.
1923	Yubari	1943	2,890	33	6 5.5-inch.
1923	Isudzu	1943	5,170	33	7 5.5-inch.
1924	Sendai	1944	5,195	33	Do.
1925	Abukuma	1945	5,170	33	Do.
1925	Jintsu	1945	5,195	33	Do.
1925	Naka	1945	5,195	33	Do.
1926	Furutaka	1946	7,100	33	6 8-inch.
1926	Kako	1946	7,100	33	Do.
1927	Aoba	1947	7,100	33	Do.
1927	Kinugasa	1947	7,100	33	Do.
1928	Nachi	1948	10,000	33.5	8 8-inch.

Total modern cruisers built, 26; aggregate tonnage, 136,415.

The following table shows the number of cruisers under construction or authorized and appropriated for:

Cruisers under construction or authorized and appropriated for

UNITED STATES

Laid down	Name	Standard tonnage	Speed (knots)	Main guns
1926	Pensacola	10,000	32.5	10 8-inch.
1927	Salt Lake City	10,000	32.5	Do.
1928	Augusta	10,000	32.7	9 8-inch.
1928	Houston	10,000	32.7	Do.
1928	Chicago	10,000	32.7	Do.
1928	Chester	10,000	32.7	Do.
1928	No. 26	10,000	32.7	Do.
1928	No. 28	10,000	32.7	Do.

Total cruisers building, 8; aggregate tonnage, 80,000.

BRITISH EMPIRE

Laid down	Name	Standard tonnage	Speed (knots)	Main guns
1926	Devonshire	10,000	33	8 8 inch.
1926	London	10,000	33	Do.
1927	Shropshire	10,000	33	Do.
1927	York	8,300	33	6 8-inch.
1927	Sussex	10,000	33	8 8-inch.
1927	Dorsetshire	10,000	33	Do.
1927	Norfolk	10,000	33	Do.
1928	Exeter	8,300	.....	6 8 inch

Total cruisers building, 8; aggregate tonnage, 76,600. Authorized and appropriated for 1928 program, two 8,300-ton cruisers.

Cruisers under construction or authorized and appropriated for—Con.

JAPAN

Laid down	Name	Standard tonnage	Speed (knots)	Main guns
1924	Myoko	10,000	33.5	8 8-inch.
1925	Ashigara	10,000	33.5	Do.
1925	Haguro	10,000	33.5	Do.
1927	Tagao	10,000	33.5	Do.
1927	Atago	10,000	33.5	Do.
1918	Chokai	10,000	33.5	Do.
	NOT YET LAID			
	Maya	10,000	33.5	Do.

Total cruisers building, 6; aggregate tonnage, 60,000. Authorized and appropriated for 1928 program, one 10,000-ton cruiser.

Attention to the fact that the ratio in tonnage of modern cruisers built, building, and about to be built is not the Washington conference ratio of 5–5–3, but 1.8 for the United States, 5 for the British Empire and 2.5 for the Japanese Empire.

The following table makes a comparison of the modern cruiser strength of the three respective nations referred to:

Modern cruiser strength compared

	United States		Great Britain		Japan	
	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage
Modern cruisers completed with guns less than 8-inch caliber	10	66,000	49	246,776	21	98,015
Modern cruisers completed with 8-inch guns			7	70,000	5	38,400
Modern 8-inch gun cruisers building	8	80,000	8	76,600	6	60,000
Modern 8-inch cruisers about to be laid down			2	16,600	1	10,000
Total modern 8-inch cruisers	8	80,000	17	163,200	12	108,400
Total modern cruisers of all calibers built and building	18	146,000	60	409,976	33	206,415

It will be seen that the United States now has only 10 modern cruisers in service in the Navy, with an aggregate tonnage of 66,000; while Great Britain has 56 modern cruisers in service in her navy, with a total aggregate tonnage of 316,776; and that Japan has 26 modern cruisers in her navy with an aggregate tonnage of 136,415. These modern cruisers of the United States have a total of 120 guns, those of Japan have a total of 169 guns, and those of Great Britain have a total of 339 guns.

The number of modern cruisers now being built by the United States is 8, aggregating 80,000 tonnage; the number being built by Great Britain is 8, with a total tonnage of 76,600, with 2 about to be laid down, aggregating a tonnage of 16,600; and the number being built by Japan is 6 with an aggregate tonnage of 60,000.

Therefore, the United States has built and building, 18 modern cruisers aggregating a tonnage of 146,000; Great Britain has built and building, 60 modern cruisers with a total tonnage of 409,976; and Japan has built and building, 33 modern cruisers with a total tonnage of 206,415.

In other words, at present Great Britain has more than five times as many modern cruisers in use as the United States, with five times the total tonnage; while Japan has now in use more than twice as many cruisers as the United States and more than twice the tonnage.

It has been claimed that instead of having only 10 cruisers now in use the United States has 32 in the service. But in order to arrive at this figure it is necessary to include 22 old cruisers, all of which are obsolete, the newest of which is more than 21 years old and the oldest is 36 years old. These old vessels are of practically no value in warfare, and are not entitled to be counted in comparison with modern cruisers either in our own or in other navies.

It is an interesting fact, not generally known, and I have no doubt will be surprising to learn, that from 1908 to 1923 the United States did not build a single cruiser to be added to our Navy.

It is not necessary to draw any invidious comparisons in order to arrive at the conclusion that because we are undertaking in this bill to authorize the construction of 15 additional cruisers, in view of the fact that now we only have 10 with a total aggregate tonnage of 66,000, Great Britain having a total of 56 with over 316,000 tons, that we are necessarily building in competition with Great Britain or that a war, either imminent or remote, with that great country is in prospect.

We have in the course of construction 8 additional cruisers, so that we have already building and under construction a total of 18, aggregating a total tonnage of 146,000. Therefore after we complete the 8 cruisers now under construction, making a total of 18 modern cruisers, we will only have a total of 146,000 tons compared with 316,000 tons now possessed by Great Britain of cruisers which are already in use.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. These programs of construction on the part of the nations to which the Senator has just referred proceeded while the United States was standing absolutely still and doing no construction in respect to cruisers.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is practically correct.

So that not only now are we less equipped with cruisers than Japan, but after we finish the 8 now under construction, and after Great Britain finishes the 8 she is building, and Japan finishes the 6 she is building, we will still be very far below Japan in cruiser strength. So that by comparison of the three navies from the standpoint of cruiser strength in total tonnage and in total guns we are third in rank among the three great maritime nations of the world.

We know the average age for efficient use of a cruiser of this type is 20 years. We also know it requires an average of about five years to build one of such cruisers.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. I want to emphasize the fact the Senator has just brought out. As I understand it, if a passenger-carrying ship were 25 to 30 years old, it would be considered very questionable whether it would be safe to continue it in use, and yet they want 22 cruisers, the average age of which is 25 years, to be manned with sailors and seamen when it is hardly permitted to carry passengers on a vessel that old. The average age of these cruisers is 25 years, and if one of them should be sent out and anything happened to it, the people who now criticize the pending cruiser bill would be denouncing the Navy for its dereliction in using such ships.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I only desire to say that I am surprised at the Senator's moderation.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator is surprised at anybody's moderation these days. There is none of it here at home.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am curious to know who "they" are. Who are demanding that these 25-year-old ships be manned?

Mr. SWANSON. Some of the pacifists in the country. I did not hear the Senator's speech. If he advocates it, he is making a mistake.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If he is!

Mr. SWANSON. I hope he is not.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Up to the present time he is not. I was merely curious to know who it was the Senator referred to as wanting such ships used.

Mr. SWANSON. Some Senators have used those ships in trying to show the strength of the American Navy. I think the Government would be derelict in its duty—indeed, it would be almost criminal—if it were to take ships with an average age of 25 years and send them into the line of battle.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think most of us would agree with the Senator, but I was curious to know who those people are who urge doing any such thing.

Mr. SWANSON. We have heard estimates made in the Senate including those ships as a part of the American Navy, and comparing the American Navy, including those ships, with the British Navy and the Japanese Navy.

I hope the Senator from Montana will be frank enough to say those ships ought to be excluded. I hope the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] will also be frank enough to say those ships ought to be excluded from any estimate of the relative strength of the American Navy, the British Navy, and the Japanese Navy.

Mr. BORAH. I do not think the Senator heard that statement in the Senate. He has it confused with outside voices.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will read some of the speeches made in the Senate where an effort was made to compare the relative strength of our Navy with the navy of Great

Britain, he will see that I am correct. Some Senators have said that we have as many cruisers as Great Britain. The only way that result can be arrived at is to include the 22 old cruisers to which I have referred. The Senator said they ought to be excluded.

Mr. BORAH. Who said that?

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from Idaho said they ought to be excluded. He would not send anybody out in a 25-year-old ship to fight in the American Navy for our country.

Mr. BORAH. I thought the Senator a while ago had me including them.

Mr. SWANSON. I say they ought to be excluded.

Mr. BORAH. Now, the Senator is right.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope all this extraneous debate is not going to be excluded.

Mr. SWANSON. I hope the next time a Senator undertakes to make a comparison between the American Navy, the Japanese Navy, and the British Navy, he will not include those 22 cruisers having an average age of 25 years. If any Senator does that I hope the Senator from Montana or the Senator from Idaho will rise in his place and say they ought to be excluded.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am still curious to know what Senator did include them.

Mr. SWANSON. All the estimates I have seen have shown that they were included.

Mr. BARKLEY. One of the reasons why I injected the old cruisers into the discussion was because a few days ago, during the address of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE], when he took the position that the 15 cruisers now proposed were for replacement purposes, he was asked to name the cruisers they were to replace. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] had inserted in the RECORD the names and ages of the 22 cruisers to which I have referred. Then, the Senator from Montana stated that they had been replaced so many times that he wondered when we were going to cease replacing those identical cruisers; when as a matter of fact we only have 10 cruisers now in operation and only 8 cruisers in the yards under construction, and if the 8 were finished we would have only 18, so it could not be contended that the 22 old ones replaced any that are now in use.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Did the Senator refer to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I referred to the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER].

An effort has also been made to create the impression that we are and have been for some time engaged in a race or competition with Great Britain, not only in battleship construction, but in cruiser construction. I think when we consider the fact that for 15 years, from 1908 to 1923, we did not turn out a single cruiser of any kind, we can not be truthfully accused of having, at least for a great many years, been engaged in any competition with Great Britain or any other country in the building of this type of warships.

In 1915, when the famous triangular controversy with Great Britain and Germany over the rights of neutrals on the high seas was approaching a climax, President Wilson submitted to Congress a program of preparedness calling for the construction of 156 naval vessels, costing $686,000,000, and soon thereafter he departed on his tour of the country to arouse the people on the subject.

This building program was stopped when the United States entered the war in 1917 and the shipbuilding activities of the United States were turned to the construction of a different type of ships.

After the war the 1916 program was resumed, and the General Board advocated such construction as might be necessary to give the United States a "navy equal to the most powerful maintained by any nation in the world." At the same time Mr. Winston Churchill was saying to the British people: "Nothing must lead you to abandon that naval supremacy upon which the life of our country depends."

At the Washington Conference on Limitation of Armaments in 1921 the United States proposed, and Great Britain accepted, the principle of "equality" or "parity" between the sea forces of these two great naval powers. However, it was not possible to apply that principle to any except "capital" ships and aircraft carriers. It had been the original intention of the United States to apply it to all classes of naval vessels, but difficulties that could not be surmounted arose when it was sought to apply this principle to cruisers and submarines. Great Britain was ready to outlaw submarine warfare altogether, and in this had the sympathy and support of the United States. But France and Italy refused to accede to this application, and, therefore, the only limitation that was placed on cruisers was a stipulation that they should not exceed 10,000 gross tons and should be armed with guns not to exceed eight inches in caliber; but no agreement was reached as to the number of cruisers any nation should have, or the total cruiser tonnage of each nation.

In 1927 President Coolidge sought a further conference among the five nations signing the Washington treaty, upon the subject of a limitation of cruisers. To this conference France and Italy refused to be a party, and it was therefore limited to Great Britain, Japan, and the United States.

When the British and American delegates began to consider this phase of naval limitations, it was inevitable that each should look at the problem from the standpoint of their experiences in the war. Great Britain's preponderance in cruiser strength had enabled her to destroy the commerce of the enemy, control that of neutrals, and protect her own sea lanes for the transportation of food and munitions. As a result of our own cruiser inferiority, the United States was compelled to suffer interference with her trade which in all probability would not have been suffered if we had been sufficiently equipped with cruisers to protect our legitimate interests on the high seas.

After we entered the war on the side of the Allies these controversies were merged in the common interest, and I believe the two Governments have entered into some kind of an agreement for the settlement of the claims arising out of the interruptions suffered by our people on the high seas as a result of the war.

When the 3-power conference on further naval limitations met at Geneva in 1927 it was natural for the delegates of Great Britain and the United States to arrive at a stumbling-block over the question of the uses of cruisers in the protecting of neutral trade in times of war, for neither nation seemed willing to recede from its position taken before our entry into the war. The delegates were not authorized at that conference to discuss the uses of cruisers in time of war. They were only authorized to discuss types and tonnage, and a deadlock was soon encountered which made it impossible to reach any agreement whatever.

The Kellogg-Briand multilateral treaty offers an opportunity in the future not only to bring about a further limitation of armaments but also to settle the age-old question of the rights of belligerents and neutrals upon the high seas in time of war. But until that question is settled, especially the rights of neutrals upon the high seas in time of war, it is difficult to settle the matter of relative strength which any maritime nation should possess in the protection of its legitimate commerce among the nations and among belligerents while war is in progress.

I am very greatly interested in the position taken by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] on the subject of the rights of belligerents and neutrals. I think it would be a happy occasion if we might look forward to the solution of that problem by some sort of peaceful arrangement and understanding that might be arrived at between the maritime nations of the world. But in these days when war comes, in view of the fact that armies alone do not make war against opposing armies but the population of a nation likewise makes war against the population of the opposing nation, industry, labor, transportation, finance, all of the accumulated forces of the people of the respective nations being mobilized as instruments of warfare against their antagonists, it is not entirely easy to see how the nations can even arrive at an understanding or an agreement as to what is the freedom of the seas or what is contraband of war any more than it was possible to arrive at a definition of self-defense in the consideration of the treaty which was recently ratified by the Senate of the United States and entered into by nearly all of the nations of the earth.

In that connection, Mr. President, I desire to insert in the RECORD at the end of my remarks a very able and intelligent article which appeared in the New York Times of last Sunday, January 27, by Prof. James T. Shotwell, discussing the question of the Kellogg-Briand treaty and its relationship to the settlement of the question of freedom of the seas and contraband of war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GLENN in the chair). Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky.

(See Exhibit A.)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in discussing the relative strength of the nations in vessels capable of protecting legitimate commerce we must also keep in mind that Great Britain has some 40 or more merchant vessels which are capable of being converted into cruisers when needed for naval purposes in time of war. So when we add these 40 vessels which are capable of conversion into war-time cruisers to the 56 now already in the British Navy Great Britain has 96 potential cruisers against our 10 at present and our 18 when we shall have finished the 8 now under construction.

As already stated, when the Washington conference met in November, 1921, it was the purpose of the United States to insist upon naval equality with Great Britain. Great Britain agreed to that principle, and it was applied to capital ships but was not applied to cruisers. Why, may I ask, should cruisers have been eliminated from the agreement? If the interests of the United States and Great Britain are so nearly equal in extent and importance as to justify equality in naval strength, why should this equality be limited to the type of ships which many intelligent observers believe has lost a large part of its value and effectiveness in naval warfare? Why should there be a limitation as to battleships but no limitation as to cruisers? It is difficult for any fair-minded man to understand the reason for limitation in one type and unlimited right and power in the other type.

In the discussion of this question it is fortunate that we may view it in the calmest and most friendly spirit. There is no asperity or ill feeling injected into this matter because of the necessity of mentioning the name of Great Britain. We admire the people of Great Britain. Many of us have descended from them. The ties of kinship, of common language, and common ideals all militate against military conflict between these two great English-speaking nations. It would be a tragedy beyond repair if these two great nations, which have contributed so much to the welfare of the human family throughout the world, should find themselves in armed conflict. Such a conflict, Mr. President, is almost unthinkable, and I do not entertain the fear that such a conflict is either imminent or remote.

But it is entirely conceivable that conflicts to which we ourselves may not be a party may involve sacred rights and obligations upon the high seas, the transgression of which we would be compelled in honor to protest.

In recent years the United States has increased its list and quantity of manufactured products by leaps and bounds. These products find their way into all the markets of the world, and it must be so if labor in America is to be continuously and profitably employed. American imports and exports have become almost equal to those of Great Britain. American coastwise trade in 1926 amounted to more than 227,000,000 tons, valued at more than $15,000,000,000. Like Great Britain for centuries the United States has just come to realize to what extent American daily life depends upon imports from other countries.

Any interruption of our overseas trade would not only seriously affect our lives and comfort but would throw millions of men and women out of employment, depriving them of the means to live and depriving them of their power to purchase the products of other men's labor.

While the world looks to-day with hopeful eye to the day when no such danger may exist, to the day when all controversies may be settled without resort to arms, the question which confronts the people of America and confronts us here in our representative capacity, is whether it is wise to leave ourselves unprotected while we are praying for the realization of this ideal, or whether we should within reasonable limits prepare for such contingencies as may arise in the event our peaceful hopes are not realized?

If the 15 cruisers provided for in this measure were now completed and in the service of the United States Navy, we would still be far below Great Britain in cruiser strength, and but little stronger than Japan. We would have then something like 300,000 tonnage to more than 400,000 for Great Britain and over 200,000 for Japan.

That would not mean parity or equality in the sense in which I think the average man in this country and in Great Britain and in Japan looks upon that term as applied to these great countries. It would mean additional strength so definite as to serve as a check upon the ambitions of other nations to persist in the effort to maintain an overpowering supremacy on the high seas. It would constitute a strength which would compel attention and respect in any future efforts further to limit naval armaments among the maritime nations of the world.

I have faith, Mr. President, that the United States and Great Britain will yet be able to arrive at a just understanding about this delicate problem which will confront them when they shall meet again in conference.

On last Saturday night, in the city of Birmingham, England, Sir Austen Chamberlain, British Secretary for Foreign Affairs, gave expression to the conviction that the problem of naval armaments, which he described as the "only difference" between his country and the United States, could be settled amicably. "Do not be discouraged if we have not solved the problem at once," he said.

During the course of his remarks at a dinner in Birmingham, which was attended and addressed by the American ambassador, Mr. Houghton, Mr. Chamberlain said further:

> As we seek to be loyal to other friends, so shall we seek to be loyal to that other nation which is nearest and most akin to us in racial and moral outlook of all the nations of the world.
>
> The existing difference is as to how we shall apply a limitation of naval armaments fairly and justly to our different circumstances and conditions. We admit freely and willingly the parity between the United States forces and our own. It is an admission which we have never made to any other nation and which we would have made to no other nation.

That admission itself is significant, when the British Secretary for Foreign Affairs in a public address freely and openly admits the right of parity between the United States and Great Britain, and in that connection states that no such admission would be or ever has been made as to any other nation compared with Great Britain.

> Such differences as have occurred have not therefore been differences of principle, but merely differences arising out of the difficulties of applying that principle to the very different circumstances and needs of the two countries.

The Foreign Secretary said he believed the "passing difficulty" loomed larger than similar differences with any other country because of the common thought and outlook of the two peoples.

> I venture to say—

Said he—

> that it is inconceivable that, with patience and the proper and opportune moment, friends should not be able to resolve technical difficulties which have hitherto prevented them from reaching an agreement.
>
> The problem is to find some conclusion whereby we can measure naval strength so that the parity which both nations desire may be reached, and reached at a level which will not mean an increase in the armaments of the world, but a reduction.
>
> Do not be discouraged if we have not solved the problem at once. Nearly 50 nations represented at Geneva have been trying to find a common measure for the limitation of armaments. I doubt if any two nations saw exactly alike on any one of the different arms which are comprised within that phrase, limitation of armaments.

Last night, in the city of London, Mr. W. C. Bridgeman, who is now the First Lord of the Admiralty, speaking on disarmament, expressed confidence in the United States as a peace-loving nation, and said that the bill for new cruisers now before the American Senate was of no concern to Great Britain. If our proposal to add 15 new cruisers to the 10 we already have and the 8 we are now building gives no concern to Great Britain, why should it give concern to anybody in the United States who may fear that the interests of Great Britain are to suffer because we undertake to approach that parity which was in the minds of all the statesmen who assembled in 1921 and 1922 in an effort to bring about actual parity in naval strength between these two great nations?

He said, further:

> I don't wish to criticize the number or size of anything America thinks necessary in the matter of cruisers, because I believe that the future peace of the world will be much safer in the hands of countries who have a generous confidence in each other than in the hands of scaremongers who try perpetually to make us believe there is grave risk of war.

I join in the belief expressed in the language I have quoted from Sir Austen Chamberlain and from Mr. Bridgeman. I earnestly believe that in the course of human events these two great nations, whose power and influence throughout the world should make for permanent peace, can arrive at a sensible and friendly solution of this great question. Until that time has arrived, no nation can complain or look upon us with fear or suspicion if we seek to approach that parity or equality to which we are admittedly entitled, and upon which not only our own security but the peace of the world may largely depend; and if the emergency is so great in order for us to begin to approach that parity which is our right, and which is admitted as our right by the foremost statesmen of Great Britain, I see no reason for delaying beginning that program until some other conference may have met and probably failed to arrive at a conclusion for the very reason that we have not done the thing which we are seeking to do in this bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I not only intend to support this measure but I intend to vote to retain the time limit which the measure carries in its present form.

EXHIBIT A

[From the New York Times, January 27, 1929]

(Will the Kellogg-Briand treaty serve as a stepping-stone for the development of a common policy of freedom of the seas, in accordance with the traditional American attitude toward this doctrine? This question is discussed in the following article by the professor of history at Columbia University, who points out the intricacy of a problem that has long remained unsolved.)

By James T. Shotwell

What is the effect of the pact of Paris—the Briand-Kellogg multilateral peace treaty—upon the problem of naval armament? This is the most important single question in the foreign policy of the United States at the present time. I do not refer to the discussion over the 15-cruiser bill, for that is only a relatively small and temporary part of a problem which covers the entire field of national security. Has the strategy of war been changed by the emergence of a new strategy of peace? Have the uses of army and navy been shifted in any degree from their traditional place in the realities of politics? Is there some middle ground between pacificism and militarism which will permit of an international adjustment of armaments without becoming involved in a competition which tends eternally to increase? Ten years after the close of the World War these questions which proved insoluble except in terms of conflict in the decade from 1904 to 1914 have come back upon us, not this time as a European problem, but as one in which the United States plays a major part.

PRESSING FOR A SOLUTION

If it were possible it would certainly be better to postpone the consideration of this grave question until we have caught our breath, as it were, after the ratification of Secretary Kellogg's treaty. But the pressure of events offers us no such breathing space. International questions can not be put off to suit the convenience of a nation which is not ready to consider them, if other nations insist upon their immediate consideration; and the question of armaments is a most insistent one because of the very fact which Sir Edward Grey so emphatically points out in his memoirs that failure to solve does not leave things standing as they are, but heads directly for the fatal race of nations in the implements of destruction which in turn leads toward destruction itself. Breathless or not, we must seek the solution, for the problem was already on our hands before the negotiation of the multilateral treaty was begun.

Now, the first step in the orientation of naval policy to the peace pact is to reach an understanding as to what is involved in each of them; only after we know what the one has accomplished and the other seeks to accomplish is it possible to work out an agreement between them. If the pact of Paris is only a moral gesture, and if the great sea powers are pursuing irreconcilably divergent aims, the question of disarmament is frankly insoluble. Happily, neither of these two statements is true; the pact is a real and binding obligation and the naval policies are capable of adjusting to it.

Let us see in a few words what the pact contains. It is a twofold pledge: Article 1 renounces war as an instrument of national policy and article 2 states that the solution of disputes must never be sought except by "pacific means." At first sight these commitments are vague and uncertain, but if we analyze them in terms of policy and definitely seek to apply the treaty, the vagueness disappears. For instance, insert in place of the word "national" the word "American," "British," or "Japanese"; the phrase has a very different ring. Then if we think of war not as a general concept but as definitely taking place on land, sea, or in the air, the commitment, so far as we are concerned, narrows down to this: That the United States declares that it will not wage war as an instrument of American policy wherever such a war might be waged.

Apply this to the sea and we reach the conclusion that we have renounced the belligerent use of the American Navy for the purpose of furthering our national aims and policies. This surely involves a restudying of sea strategy, although it is also part of the Navy's business to plan for those violations of the treaty which deny these very conditions. Navy policy, therefore, henceforth has a double problem, one of adjustment to the new strategy of peace and one of a safeguarding of that peace against the sort of violation which continues to present international dangers.

LEGITIMATE DEFENSE

In the discussion over the treaty it was stated that there could be no agreed definition of legitimate defense, and yet legitimate defense was excepted from the operation of the treaty. Moreover, each nation should decide for itself when it should use its belligerent forces as an instrument of national policy. If this were the full measure of the commitment and there were no indication of the way to test whether the war was defensive or not, then it would be only a gesture, and naval policy would be justified in ignoring it in the calculations of strategy and armament. But, fortunately, the treaty itself is better than its theory.

In article 2 there is a test which will establish the presumption of guilt at the outbreak of war; for the nation which proceeds to war for the settlement of its claims, instead of invoking or attempting "peaceful means" of settlement, is a violator of the pact, and according to the preamble, as interpreted by the Secretary of State, all other nations are thereupon freed from the treaty obligation to remain at peace with it.

Now the "pacific means" at hand are prescribed by other treaties to which the United States and most of the other signatories are parties. They must be kept in mind in interpreting the pact itself, for they are equally binding with it. They are treaties which prescribe the court of arbitration for issues which can be brought to trial, and conciliation and conference for those matters which lie in the heated atmosphere of political dispute. There is, therefore, a visible alternative to war, the nations must definitely choose one or the other path, and against the nation which refuses the peaceful means of settlement will stand the presumption that it has violated the pact by resort to war as the instrument of its national policy. For a treaty which covers so vast a field as the pact of Paris, the commitments are remarkably definite and clear. How do they affect the problem of armaments?

In approaching the problem of armaments from the standpoint of policy we are reversing the emphasis of all the recent discussions. Instead of basing the argument primarily upon the work of the military or naval expert whose duty it is to measure and evaluate the fighting forces of nations, we are finding it necessary to call upon the statesmen to reconsider the uses to which these forces are to be put in the future. Instead of attempting to trade cruiser for cruiser for a potential competitor, we should rather attempt to trade policy for policy and see if there is a lessening or an increasing likelihood of need for the forces themselves.

As a matter of fact, it is this political approach to the problem which has determined both success and failure in the recent history of armament negotiations, although on the surface it seemed as though the navy or military experts were determining the agreement by establishing parallel units of limitation in ships or equipment. The Washington conference, for instance, by the emphasis which it put on the ratio of 5–5–3 in capital ships seemed to be a triumph for the technical method of approach, as the Geneva conference of 1927 was an outstanding instance of failure in this line. But it was, after all, the political approach at the Washington conference which determined the acceptance of numerical categories.

The end of the Japanese-British alliance and the creation in its place of the 4-power pact in the Pacific and the 9-power agreement secured a new orientation of naval policy for Britain, the United States, and Japan, and in this new situation these powers were able to escape from the situation which had developed out of the realignment of armaments resulting from the World War. Without going back into the history of the Washington conference in detail, it is sufficiently clear that political factors dominated sea strategy; indeed, it is because the American Navy feels that the political strategy dominated to a point of disrupting its building program without due regard to the technical factors that the Washington conference is viewed so adversely by some of the Navy spokesmen. Whether the statesmanship which directed the Washington conference was wise or not is, however, a matter of history. But the Geneva conference clearly showed that the only hope of a solution of the problem as a whole lies in the field so effectively explored by Mr. Hughes in 1922—namely, that of policy as over against that of the purely technical expert.

Now, what are the major objectives of a political kind that affect American sea strategy, and what are the objectives of the British? All through American history there has been one supreme principle of naval rights which has remained an ideal unattained, and that is the freedom of the seas. On the other hand, the British have almost as consistently opposed this principle. The reason for the two national attitudes lies chiefly in the fact that the presumption of the United States has been that in most wars it would be a neutral; therefore it was but natural that it should be the champion of neutrals against belligerents throughout all its history, except in the short intervals when it itself was at war, as in the Civil War and in the World War.

On the other hand, Great Britain, involved as it is in the maintenance of a world-wide empire, has been more likely to think in belligerent terms and more likely to be drawn into wars arising almost anywhere throughout the world; but it is a strange fact that when in the nineteenth century British merchant interests were deeply engaged in neutral trade, there were intervals when Britain also gave support to ideas similar to those which are traditional in the United States.

The pact of Paris touches the very base of this controversy by its denial of the legitimacy of war as an instrument of a nation's policy, for if war is no longer the free prerogative of nations, then neutrality has also changed its character. This fact is recognized in that clause of the preamble which states that the violator of the treaty should be denied the benefits of it; for those denying the benefits are the neutrals in the war which is thus envisaged. But while no new duties are formally placed upon these neutrals, the withdrawal of their guarantee of continued peace with the treaty-breaking state is certainly out of harmony with any claim upon their part to push their trade with the power that has run amuck in the world. The situation is not the same as it was when to champion neutrality meant to lessen the sphere of

belligerency and thus to further the cause of peace. In the new attitude toward war neutrality as well as belligerency can no longer be used as the free instrument of national policy; it has acquired a moral character.

This means that the doctrine of the freedom of the seas has changed its setting. It was a claim upon the part of a neutral to retain the peace-time conditions of its trade, even with belligerents, stopping only short of those measures which would make it an accomplice or an ally of a belligerent. The method of asserting this historic doctrine, therefore, was to reduce as far as possible the interference of belligerents with this trade; and the way sought to achieve this, in part at least, as at the conference of London, was to enumerate those articles and strictly limit those conditions with which the belligerent might interfere, thus leaving everything else open to the neutral.

INCREASING DIFFICULTIES

This effort to limit the interference of the belligerent was something like the parallel effort to limit the damages on land by The Hague regulations governing land warfare. Unfortunately, the experience of the World War showed that when war has become the industry which it is to-day, there are few articles of commerce which do not serve as munitions or supplies, and the difficulty of enumerating free goods has accordingly increased.

Now the way of approach to this problem lies in the application to it of the Kellogg pact; and, by a strange paradox, it is that part of the pact which is least definite that seems likely to be most useful. The one weakness in the pact is that each nation is left free to judge for itself whether its own or other future wars are defensive—and hence legitimate—or are the forbidden use of war as an instrument of national policy.

The pact itself only classifies war into these two categories. That itself is some help. Henceforth there is one kind of legitimate war; for all the reservations to the renunciation of war come under the general category of defense. There is self-defense, which is admitted as a self-evident right. There are the obligations under the covenant of the league and the treaties of Locarno and the neutrality treaties, all of which fall under the general category of "cooperative defense" against illegal attack; and the Monroe doctrine has been happily defined within the same category. But while there is a general agreement as to the character of the exceptions, there is no provision to prevent a fatal failure to agree as to which nation is really on the defensive and which the violator. It is distinctly stated that—so far as this pact is concerned—each nation must judge for itself this final question.

AN ADDITION TO THE PACT

Unless this situation is met somehow, there is real danger of the pact failing utterly to avert the division of nations in time of crisis into hostile formations, each intent on the defense of its rights or championing the defense of others. The obstacle to the application of the pact which this possibility presents may, however, be made into a stepping-stone of progress if we join to the pact of Paris, which renounces war, the pact of the Pacific, of 1922, which offers a way to secure common judgment and therefore common action with reference to disputed questions. In short, the very agreement which formed the political substructure of the Washington conference—namely, the 4-power pact for the maintenance of peace in the Pacific—may prove the means for so clarifying the working of the Kellogg pact as to connect it directly with the problem of sea strategy.

There is nothing very revolutionary in thus joining together the recent peace pact with the existing pact which erected the structure of peace in the Pacific Ocean area; yet, by bringing these two treaties into proper relations with each other, we may find not only a way for preventing disagreement in the application of the present treaty but the path, as well, toward freedom of the seas in a new sense of the term, and through it to naval disarmament.

A BRIDGE OF PEACE

The first two articles of the 4-power pact are applicable to all problems of American policy, and if applied generally, instead of in their present limited scope, would furnish the bridge between us and the organization of peace in Europe, without undue involvement on either side. All that would be called for would be that in case of a controversy between the signatory nations there should be "consultation" in which the United States would participate. Neutrals, as well as potential belligerents, would "consult together."

The European powers have already pledged themselves to enter into such consultations, in case of war or the threat of war, through the treaty of Locarno and the covenant of the league, but the United States, remaining outside the structure of these bodies, has no such obligation. As the multilateral treaty extends over too many signatories for any workable arrangement which would call for them all to consult together—except in the League of Nations—any such agreement should be formed with special regard to practical considerations. If, for example, the preparation for the renewal of the Washington conference in 1931 were to build upon this basis of an agreement to consult together as to the determination on an alleged violation of the Briand-Kellogg pact, or on alleged policies based upon this possibility, there would be a basis upon which to build other engagements as well.

These other engagements might very well take shape in a general way along the lines suggested in the resolutions of either Senator CAPPER or Senator BURTON, although the details would be modified by both the existing pact and the agreement to which reference has just been made. It might be in the shape of either a unilateral declaration upon the part of the United States or in the form of international agreement, but the substance of it would be that there would be a declaration of policy upon the part of all the signatories, including the United States, not to protect their nationals when engaged in giving aid and comfort to a signatory of the pact of Paris which has violated that pact by resorting to war without a reference of its case to the pacific means of settlement which are indicated in Article II as implemented in the parallel treaties of arbitration and conciliation.

WILSON'S POINT

If some such program as this could be carried out—and the points raised here are not more than preliminary suggestions for the solution of one of the most intricate of all problems—then we should be able to apply to naval strategy that phrasing of the demand for freedom of the seas which was set forth in the second of Mr. Wilson's 14 points:

"Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants."

As I have stated in another connection, it may yet be found that the very one of the 14 points which was surrendered in Paris—under the belief that it was no longer valid with the United States in a League of Nations—may prove to be a means for readjusting the United States to that organization of peace, and may do this by building upon American precedent and ideals. The reason why President Wilson gave up insistence upon the freedom of the seas was that he envisaged all the world within the league, and if that had happened there would have been no neutrals left. Therefore, the doctrine which is the fundamental expression of neutral rights could, in his opinion, be no longer insisted upon in the old terms.

NEW DUTIES OF MEMBERS

Now, the pact of Paris also modifies the duties of neutrals, and hence, for the United States as well as for the league, the old historic doctrine is no longer valid in its earlier form. Yet the principle remains in a new setting. By the renunciation of war the signatories are morally bound not to aid or abet a violating power. This does not mean joining in the suppression of the violator, but it does mean a complete freedom of the seas upon the part of all the law-abiding powers and a denial of it only in two cases, either by international action under the covenant or by the concurrent action of the nonleague members after agreement through consultation as to whether a nation at war has violated the pact of Paris or not.

Thus both the pact and the covenant rest upon the same fundamental principle set forth in article 11 of the covenant that "any war or threat of war whether immediately affecting any members of the league or not" is a matter of concern to all civilized nations.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky in his able presentation of this matter referred to the discussion of Sir Austen Chamberlain and others upon a certain occasion. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Manchester Guardian that is based upon that occasion, not as a part of the Senator's speech but to follow his speech, as it refers to the same subject matter which he was discussing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GLENN in the chair). Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Manchester Guardian]

It is a good thing the Foreign Secretary should have said Saturday night that "we have no nearer and dearer friendship than our friendship with the United States." That is certainly true, and it is a good thing the British Foreign Secretary should have said so. He could have no better guiding principle for his foreign policy.

We do not for a moment doubt that he sincerely believes this principle. But are he and those who with him are responsible for the conduct of British foreign affairs guided by it? Unfortunately not. They are more impressed by French naval armaments and the Admiralty's anxiety than by the incomparably greater power and influence of the United States. They are more moved by the superficial and superfluous Francophile sentiment than by the deep and urgent call of Anglo-American friendship. This friendship is being strained, and there is justified concern on both sides of the Atlantic.

But Sir Austen hardly admits the reality of this disquieting fact. He seems to admit nothing more than passing difficulties—not any difference of principle, but "only a difference as to how we shall apply limitation of naval armaments." This difference exists but can easily be removed if only the admirals of both countries are kept in their proper places.

FREEDOM OF THE SEAS ISSUE

It is a minor and not a fundamental difference. If it is removed, as it can be, it still leaves untouched the real problem that divides Britain and the United States. This problem, which Sir Austen Chamberlain did not even mention, is the so-called freedom of the seas. So long as it remains unsolved, "near and dear friendship" is doomed, and so is the world's peace.

Senator BORAH, speaking on the United States cruiser bill last Thursday, showed knowledge far deeper than Sir Austen Chamberlain's of the crisis in Anglo-American relations. "To my mind," he said, "this uneasiness is founded on conditions now existing on the sea in reference to maritime law." He pleaded for an Anglo-American agreement that would preserve the freedom of neutral trade on the high seas in time of war.

Freedom of the seas means a complete change in Britain's traditional conception of naval warfare. Nevertheless, despite the Admiralty, the change will have to be accomplished. In the world as it is to-day the weapon of the blockade can no longer be used effectively by Great Britain unless, as in the Great War, she has most of the world, and especially the United States, on her side.

But this same weapon, effective against her enemies in special conditions never likely to recur, will be swiftly and mortally effective against herself in conditions that are extremely probable in any future war between great powers.

Freedom of the seas means permanent friendship between the United States and immunity from blockade, and therefore from destruction for this country. Continued unfreedom of the seas means enmity with the United States and sooner or later destruction for ourselves.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 34) authorizing the reenrollment with an amendment of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 171) granting the consent of Congress to the city of New York to enter upon certain United States property for the purpose of constructing a rapid-transit railway.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7200) to amend section 321 of the Penal Code.

LEVY AND COLLECTION OF COTTON TAX (S. DOC. NO. 214)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURTON in the chair) laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, in response to Senate Resolution 302, of January 21, 1929, regarding the levy and collection of a cotton tax during the period following the Civil War, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

ADMINISTRATION OF EMERGENCY OFFICERS' RETIREMENT ACT (S. DOC. NO. 215)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a report from the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau, in response to Senate Resolution 301, of January 25, 1929, requesting and directing the Director of the Veterans' Bureau to furnish the Senate at the earliest possible moment certain information in connection with the administration of the disabled emergency officers' retirement act (the Tyson-Fitzgerald Act).

Mr. McKELLAR. The report is in response to a Senate resolution. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Finance and printed as a Senate document. It is a matter of very great importance to every Senator here.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF CERTAIN DISTRICT UTILITY COMPANIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate reports submitted, pursuant to law, of the following public-utility companies in the District of Columbia for the year ended December 31, 1928, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Washington Railway & Electric Co.;
Potomac Electric Power Co.; and
The Washington Interurban Railroad Co.

CALOOSAHATCHEE RIVER AND LAKE OKEECHOBEE DRAINAGE AREAS (S. DOC. NO. 213)

Mr. JONES presented a report from the Chief of Engineers of the Army, dated January 31, 1929, relative to a review of reports on Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas, Florida, submitted in House Document No. 215, Seventieth Congress, first session, with a view to determining whether any modification is advisable in the report, particularly in the light of the flood of September, 1928, etc., and moved that the report, with the accompanying papers, be referred to the Committee on Commerce and printed with illustrations, which was agreed to.

ROCK CREEK AND POTOMAC PARKWAY

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, last evening I asked unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (S. 5339) to enable the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission, established by act of March 4, 1913, to make slight changes in the boundaries of said parkway by excluding therefrom and selling certain small areas, and including other limited areas, the net cost not to exceed the total sum already authorized for the entire project.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] asked that it go over until they could make an examination of the bill. They have no objection whatever to the bill, and I want to have it passed and sent to the House as soon as possible, as it is almost an emergency matter.

Mr. JOHNSON. What is the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. It is a bill to enable the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission to buy certain little pieces of land in order to straighten out the parking between Rock Creek Park and Potomac Park.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the authority of the commission created by section 22 of the public buildings act, approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 885), is extended to include the acquisition of such additional lands and premises lying adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of the taking lines as shown on the map on file in the office of the executive and disbursing officer and known as the map of the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway (in four sheets), dated May, 1923, as may in its discretion, subject to the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts, be necessary for the best development of the connecting parkway between Rock Creek Park, the Zoological Park, and Potomac Park: *Provided*, That the total sum expended for lands needed for this parkway shall not exceed that authorized by section 22 of the public buildings act, approved March 4, 1913, and amended by the second deficiency act of May 5, 1926: *Provided further*, That the commission may exclude such lands and premises, not now owned by the United States but within the taking lines heretofore authorized for the said parkway, as may in its discretion, and upon the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, be found not to be desirable or necessary for the connecting parkway: *Provided further*, That the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital may dispose of the lands so excluded, either by public auction or at fair appraised value or to the owners of adjacent property at a price not less than that paid for it, as the best interest of the United States may justify: *Provided further*, That after payment of the necessary expenses of said sales, the net proceeds thereof shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States to be credited to the appropriation disbursed by the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COAST GUARD STATION, STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. JONES. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably, with an amendment, House bill 14151, to provide for establishment of a Coast Guard station at or near the mouth of the Quillayute River in the State of Washington, and I submit a report (No. 1592) thereon.

One hundred and twenty miles of about the most dangerous coast in the country are at present without any life-saving station whatever. The department has placed this station at the head of its list. The bill has passed the House unanimously, and I ask for its present consideration.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, what is the amount appropriated?

Mr. JONES. Not more than $50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GLENN in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, at the end of the bill, to insert "and the sum of $50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to establish a Coast Guard station on the Pacific coast at or in the vicinity of the mouth of the Quillayute River, in either Clallam or Jefferson County, State of Washington, in such locality as the commandant of the Coast Guard may recommend; and the sum of $50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington if provision is not made for a station in this vicinity in one of the bills which have been passed?

Mr. JONES. This bill has passed the House, but no other bill has made provision for this station. This is at the head of the list of stations that the department has recommended.

Mr. KING. Creating new stations?

Mr. JONES. Yes. There are 120 miles of coast without any life-saving station.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CIVIL SERVICE AND THE BOSTON POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts and Mr. NORRIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Nebraska desires to obtain the floor to speak upon the cruiser bill. I wish to express my appreciation of his courtesy in letting me have the floor for a few minutes to speak upon an entirely different matter.

Mr. President, the Senate has now before it the nomination of a postmaster at Boston. The nomination will be confirmed, for I know of no objection which is to be raised to the ample qualifications which the nominee possesses for the post. I do not intend to discuss either Colonel Gow, whom the President has named, nor Postmaster Baker, whom Colonel Gow supersedes, both of whom are highly respected citizens.

But the circumstances attendant upon this appointment afford such a glaring example of the travesty and debasement of the principle of civil service as applied to the selection of first-class postmasters that I can not let the occasion pass without directing the attention of this body and the country to a situation which, if it is to be taken as establishing a precedent, I regard as exceedingly unfortunate, in that it would seem to indicate that we are fast reverting to the old, supposedly abandoned spoils system in the matter of post-office appointments by retaining the form and discarding the substance of the civil service laws.

The postmaster now incumbent at Boston was originally appointed in the last year of the Wilson administration as a nonpartisan business-man selection, though a Republican in politics, after a competitive civil-service examination. At the expiration of his first 4-year term in 1924, after a delay of many months, with frequent newspaper comment respecting a "fight that was being waged on Baker" by elements in the Republican organization in Massachusetts, who were said to wish to award the plum to an "active Republican," the President reappointed the incumbent.

His second term expired last spring and he has been a holdover since that time. If the postmaster was rendering inefficient service, if the good of the Postal Service required that he be ousted and a better administrator named in his place, I submit that he should have then been promptly removed and his successor named. If, on the other hand, he was entitled on his record to continuance in office, his reappointment should have been equally promptly forthcoming. The logic of that statement seems to me to defy contradiction.

The President, however, did nothing. He said nothing. Postmaster Baker, meantime, was a storm center between those who desired his continuance in office, which included practically 100 per cent of the postal employees of Boston and Greater Boston, and those few but powerful politicians who desired to oust him. The morale of the Boston post office was impaired. Months passed; but as soon as the election was over, indications appeared that the Post Office Department and the White House finally desired to "settle the question" of the Boston postmastership.

The newspapers in Boston contained frequent allusions to the "efforts of the Republican organization" to agree upon a man for the place. Subsequently Washington dispatches pictured the President as waiting for a unanimous recommendation and impatient at the further delay; and several Boston papers, as early as Saturday, December 8, on their first page, under headlines Gow to be New Post Office Chief Here, recounted that the Republican national committeeman of Massachusetts was on his way to Washington to "take up with the President" the Boston postmastership and would ask that Colonel Gow receive the place.

Three days later, following this conference, the President directed the Civil Service Commission to hold a postmastership examination at Boston. In commenting on this the Boston newspapers reported that Gow had been selected, and that he would receive the appointment "as soon as the Civil Service Commission has a chance to certify his name."

Subsequent events, unhappily, confirmed this prophecy, and clearly demonstrated what a farce the civil-service routine amounted to in this instance.

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

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator mean to say that the appointment was made before the Civil Service Commission was asked to certify any names?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. No. If the Senator will refrain until I complete the statement, I think he will understand that, while the appointment was alleged to have been agreed upon, the examination was actually held later to which I am about to refer.

Let me quote at this point a paragraph from a Washington dispatch published in Boston on December 28:

> The Civil Service Commission is making something of a mystery of the names and the number of applicants for examination for the Boston postmastership vacancy. The fact seems to be that to date the applications have been so few as to make the whole examination procedure seem slightly ridiculous. Time for filing applications expires next Monday. In theory the commission is to select and qualify three applicants out of the entire field, and the President may then appoint any one of the three so qualified. This presupposes that at least three persons within the city of Boston will make application for this important and lucrative post. But the fact has been pretty well advertised that the appointee has already been selected in advance, namely, Charles R. Gow.

The examination proceeded. As most of my colleagues know but as most persons in the country do not know, the civil-service examination in the case of a first-class post office consists almost entirely of a personal interview with the various candidates by an inspector of the Civil Service Commission and an inspector of the Post Office Department acting jointly and a check-up on the various indorsements and recommendations that may be submitted to them.

The civil-service ratings reached the White House last Monday morning, and the appointment of Colonel Gow was before the Senate within a few hours. The President acted with celerity.

On the eligible list of three submitted by the commission Colonel Gow stood first with a rating of 89.20 per cent; Postmaster Baker second with 82.20 per cent. The third candidate was rated 72 per cent. Colonel Gow's rating reflected a 5 per cent war veteran's preference. The commission explained that in the "actual examination" Colonel Gow was rated 84.20 per cent, 2 points ahead of Baker, who was postmaster for eight years.

So by all this hocus-pocus—and I submit that in this instance "hocus-pocus" fittingly describes the chain of events—the President was permitted at one and the same time to name the candidate whom the Republican organization had selected for the place and the candidate who stood at the head of the civil-service list, which the President had asked for as a preliminary to the appointment.

I ask to have annexed to my remarks and printed in the RECORD—because, after all, this statement is more for the RECORD—a statement issued by the Civil Service Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT GIVEN OUT BY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION DECEMBER 31, 1928

(Preceded by information that nine applications had been filed up to noon December 31 and that one or two more might come in before end of day.)

There should have been 25 or 30 applicants for this important position. Why this apparent lack of interest? It is the old story. The news was broadcast that some one had been selected in advance, therefore due competition was lacking.

The situation is not unusual; indeed, it is usual. The Civil Service Commission announces postmaster examinations and all other examinations in good faith and conducts them impartially. But its certification of eligibles for a postmastership is referred by the Post Office Department to some local dispenser of patronage for the selection of the one who is to be nominated by the President. It is known in advance that this will be done; the information is given wide publicity in the community. The natural result is a very small number of applicants. This increases the chance of the "favorite" to land among the high three in the rating. He can not be nominated unless he is among the high three.

There are a number of unfortunate results of this practice. Competition is discouraged at the start, and often the highest eligible, believing that an injustice has been done if he does not receive the appoint-

ment, condemns the Civil Service Commission and all its works. Under the present regulations any one of the high three eligibles may be nominated for appointment. The full possibilities of open competition in postmaster examinations can not be realized until the 4-year tenure law is repealed and appointments are made strictly on a merit basis. Such a change would establish public confidence and encourage much wider competition. Under the present anomalous conditions the Civil Service Commission suffers unjust criticism and the prestige of the merit system is lowered.

Notwithstanding all this, the commission's postmaster examinations are serving a good purpose. The unworthy and the unqualified are weeded out. The standards of postmasterships have been raised. If some one is named in advance for the appointment, he can not receive it unless he is qualified, both as to business experience and character. If he is not, the commission will not certify him as eligible.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I submit that this represents an intolerable condition. Let us have done with pretense. If postmasters are to be named for political consideration, or for any other reason, but named none the less by the Executive on his own sole decision, let the appointments be made by Executive order. If they are to be made under civil-service procedure, let us have the reality and not merely the form. To use the civil service as a mask to conceal the true considerations which dictate the ousting of one man and the selection of another is political hypocrisy with which I have no sympathy.

The Boston case is typical of innumerable other instances throughout the country. The appointment of postmasters is largely partisan under the appearance of civil-service procedure. That in this instance the appointee, Mr. Gow, is a man of ability and integrity does not remove the objection that I register to the pretense of civil service in postmastership appointments and the consequent disrepute of the civil-service system among the people.

This case illustrates also how misleading was the civil-service plank in the national Republican Party platform in 1924. I quote from that platform:

By Executive order the appointment of presidential postmasters has been placed on merit similar to that applying to the classified service.

That was the boast of the Republican Party in its platform of 1924. Let us see how far they strayed from the merit system as applied to the classified service.

Appointments in the classified service are by law removed from all political consideration, and an appointee under the classified service can not be removed except for specified causes and an opportunity for a hearing given. It is unlawful for an official making an appointment from the civil service classified service to consider the political affiliations of the three names certified. Under the method now in vogue, political considerations can be and are taken into consideration by the Post Office Department—there being no Executive order or law forbidding it, as in the case of the classified service. Further, in the case of first-class postmasters there is no examination held, merely an investigation made by representatives of the Post Office Department and the civil service.

Mr. President, I have tried to express my views as moderately as possible. I want to be correct in my statement of the facts and refrain from coloring or exaggeration. I have no objection to the confirmation of Mr. Gow, who, in my opinion, possesses excellent qualifications; I do object and protest vigorously against the sham and mockery of claiming and pretending to make these appointments upon a real civil-service status.

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

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I am very much interested in the disclosures the Senator has made. I think it is the duty of the Senator, however, to follow the matter up, and I would like to see it followed up. I would like to see what the defense in this case is. As a believer in civil service, one who has always tried to befriend the civil service law and the Civil Service Commission in what they do, I realize that very serious charges are made against them, and I would like to have the Senator introduce a resolution directing the Committee on Civil Service of the Senate to investigate the facts in this case and make an official report to the Senate.

I agree with the Senator entirely in this respect—that we either ought to have this civil service law in regard to postmasters observed in good faith, or we ought to throw away the pretense and go back to the pie-counter system and admit what we are doing.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is exactly my position. But I want to say, in answer to the Senator from Nebraska, that an investigation would serve no good purpose. The facts are, I think, substantially as set forth by me. We would finally come back to this fact, that a civil-service examination was held, Mr. Gow was reported at the head of the civil-service list as first, and what Senator could challenge, without some evidence, which is not obtainable, the fact that that examination was made in good faith?

I have set forth the story of this appointment in order that the public could draw their own inferences with respect to the extensive degree that politics and the slight degree that civil service prevails in postmastership appointments.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRUCE. I must have misapprehended the statement of the Senator, because I do not see that there was any irregularity at all. As I understand the statement of the Senator, three names were handed to the President; that is to say, an eligible list with three names on it from which he could select a postmaster. In point of fact, he selected the postmaster who got the highest rating.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is true, but the Senator must consider the earlier facts as well as the final act of appointment.

Mr. BRUCE. That rating, mind you, was given to him, as I understand it, by a representative of the Civil Service Commission along with the postal inspectors. For the life of me, I do not see where any wrong was done. It may have been my own stupidity that kept me from seeing it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Four years ago, when the first term of Mr. Baker expired, no examination was held, and the incumbent was reappointed. This year political opposition was raised, a man was selected for the office, an examination was held, and as a result of the examination, as the Senator has stated, Mr. Gow stood first on the list and was thus appointed. The Senator must take into consideration not the final step but all the preliminary activities.

Mr. BRUCE. Examinations are constantly held under those circumstances in connection with the selection of postmasters. The wrong comes where an eligible list is handed up, and the President, instead of taking the first man on the eligible list, chooses, for political reasons, to take somebody lower down in the scale of merit. That happened in the city of Baltimore some years ago. We have a very good postmaster there; I am not saying anything against him. Our present Republican postmaster is a very fine man in every respect, and I think he has made an excellent official. But there was an examination some years ago, and a Democrat, that is to say, the former postmaster, one of the most capable men we have ever had in Federal office in the city of Baltimore, had the highest rating. Yet he was not appointed.

The gentleman who is now postmaster at Baltimore—and, as I say, a very admirable official in every regard—was selected, although his rating was lower than that of the incumbent. I can see that a case like that might well justify such feelings as those which the Senator has expressed. But here, as I understand, there was an examination, in which the prior incumbent participated with two other contestants. However, his rating, as the result of the examination, was not so high, and one of his competitors obtained the highest rating, a gentleman by the name of Gow, I believe. The Senator did not give us a very clear idea as to how searching that examination was, but the examination as to the qualifications of these applicants, as I understand it, was one that was conducted by a representative of the Post Office Department of the Government and by the United States Civil Service Commission. Anyhow, the two postal inspectors rated the applicants for the position, and they rated the applicant to whom the Senator is objecting as having obtained the highest mark in the competition. The three names were handed up to the President, and I think the President would have done a wrong thing if he had not appointed the highest.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am not objecting to the appointment of Mr. Gow. I am objecting to the fact that a postmaster held this office for eight years, a man appointed under civil service originally, reappointed by a Republican President, and has been ousted after an examination which was brought about through political influence, for the purpose of giving somebody else a job. The postmaster, if appointed under real civil service, should have had the right to have charges brought against him before he was dismissed, a right to have a hearing, a right to have his qualifications determined. If he was only a political appointee, the President had the right to put him out. But under the pretense of civil service to-day no appointee has a civil-service status that is respected when politicians want another man named to supplant the incumbent.

Mr. BRUCE. I say, if the former postmaster under that examination was not able to obtain the highest gradation of merit and one of his competitors did attain it, his competitor should have been appointed.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator, as well as I, has a perfect right to draw his own inferences. Then the Senator thinks there ought to be a competitive examination?

Mr. BRUCE. I do.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Every four years?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Whether the man is retained under civil service or not, and the highest man is named? That is not the practice, except where the incumbent is to be ousted.

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; because the nature of these examinations is such that if there is a fair examination—and I think in most cases, though perhaps not in all, the examinations are fair—the chances most decidedly are that the prior incumbent of the office will obtain the highest mark.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Does not the Senator know there is no real examination at all, but all they do is to go out there and submit questions and call on some people in the community to see which is the best man? That is the only examination that is held.

Mr. BRUCE. This examination was conducted by one of the representatives of the Government. He was a subordinate of the United States Civil Service Commission and I know enough about that commission to know that it does not lend itself readily to any "hocus-pocus," to use the expression of the Senator from Massachusetts. I believe that, whatever the examination was, and until I know the contrary, it was fairly conducted. It may not have been such an examination as it should have been, but I am taking the examination as it was.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator does not suggest that it is the practice or that it has been the practice heretofore to hold civil-service examinations for postmasters who have been appointed within the service? The object of making the appointments under the civil service, as I understand it, is to take the positions out of political influence and secure persons well qualified, and that once one is admitted into the service through the civil-service examination he remains there until he becomes incapacitated. Examinations are not usually held, where there is no charge against the postmaster, after he has once been admitted through the civil service.

Mr. BRUCE. I was about to relate a case which came to my notice in the State of Maryland. There was quite a ludicrous incident brought to my attention several years ago. An examination was held. The incumbent was a Democrat. It was during the Coolidge administration. He made the highest mark and then there was a tremendous effort made——

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him? As I understand it, the actual practice is to establish a list of three eligibles, and from that list any one may be chosen. In certain southern cities I know of the actual choice is made from the list through what is called the patronage referee. He is a Republican of influence in the State and in the organization. He takes the list of three and selects any Republican on the list, even though he may be lower in grade than two Democrats—I mean lower in his civil-service grading.

Mr. BRUCE. I am not speaking of the South, because everybody knows post offices in the South are mere merchantable commodities.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do not think that is altogether true. I think the plan applies throughout the Union. The object is evidently to give deserving but somewhat qualified Republicans preference over unworthy Democrats who are highly qualified.

Mr. BRUCE. I am not speaking from a partisan point of view, because I do not believe that partisanship has anything whatsoever to do with the administration of the Federal merit system of appointment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Does not the Senator understand that a list of three eligibles or more is established for the purpose of giving the department the opportunity of recommending, not necessarily the one standing highest on the eligible list, but some one who is generally acceptable from a political standpoint?

Mr. BRUCE. I think the object of creating the appointment list in the way in which it is done is to give the appointing power a little discretion. The point in this case was that the President did not go down to the man who got the second rating. He took the man who got the highest rating.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. There was a case of a postmaster already qualified and in the service, having passed previous examinations and supposed to remain in the service until he became either incompetent or charges were preferred and sustained against him. One of the objects of the civil service is to give the incumbent the benefit of security in his position.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator may think that is the best system. I am not stopping to ask whether that is the best system or not, but it is not the system, so far as my observation goes, now in vogue. The term of a postmaster ends. He undergoes a competitive examination then with other applicants for the postmastership. My observation is that the incumbent is very apt to be reappointed because, by virtue of the special experience he has had as postmaster and the practical nature of the tests applied, he is more likely to come out from the examination with a higher rating than his rivals.

Mr. WHEELER. Does not the Senator know as a matter of fact that where the postmaster is satisfactory to the politicians in his State they do not give him any examination, but reappoint him without examination; and where he is not entirely satisfactory they do give him an examination for the purpose of getting rid of him?

Mr. BRUCE. Undoubtedly. There is no doubt that the appointment of postmasters under such conditions as those obtaining in Boston tend to create great political abuses. In Maryland a man who happened to be postmaster, the existing incumbent in the office, got the highest mark on the examination. There was a Republican woman who was also an applicant for the appointment, and a tremendous amount of influence was brought to bear to have her made postmistress instead of the existing incumbent being made postmaster. The existing incumbent, seeing what was about to happen to him, made an appeal to me and I was about to present the matter to the Senate, and present it in the most indignant terms I could command, when the Republican politicians of the State, interested in this lady securing the position, found another job for the existing incumbent. They bought him off with another job, so I never had any opportunity to present the matter to the Senate. I do not say that is the usual case. At times postmasters are undoubtedly appointed through political influence and as the result of political abuses, but not always by any means.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I would like to say for the Senator's benefit that I can tell of a similar case to that in the city of Boston which is taking place right in my own home city of Butte, Mont.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. They are taking the office away from the incumbent, despite the protests of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. BRUCE. I do not see why the existing incumbents of the postmasterships should not be reappointed. I can see that there is room for difference of opinion there, but I do not see anything bad in a system that enables the existing incumbent of a post office to become the subject of a competitive examination.

Mr. WHEELER. But they do not give him any competitive examination at all. A representative of the commission simply goes out there and inquires of a few people as to who they think would be the best man, and then they have him appointed on that basis.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator means the examination is not searching enough?

Mr. WHEELER. I mean it is not an examination at all.

Mr. BRUCE. Then the subordinate of the Civil Service Commission lent himself to a fraud in the administration of the postal laws or the civil service laws. I do not believe it. I am not saying that a perfectly reasonable and just man like the Senator from Massachusetts might not draw an entirely different inference from mine under the circumstances. It is hard for me to believe until most convincing testimony be laid before me that the United States Civil Service Commission would send to Boston a member of its staff and that that man would deliberately pervert the purposes of the Federal merit system of appointment.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, are we going to postpone our declaration of war against Great Britain until this post-office matter is settled? [Laughter.]

Mr. BRUCE. I know the Senator always favors war in any form, especially when I am the other belligerent.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland seems to fail to recognize the point I have been trying to make. I am not criticizing the Civil Service Commission. I am objecting to the absence of real civil-service methods. We now have only the name, without the substance of civil service.

Mr. BRUCE. Perhaps I did.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. In repeated instances, where examinations have been held and the incumbent has been first on the list, the second or third eligible has been chosen. My objection is not to whether the first person or second person or third person was chosen, but my objection is to giving the impression that these appointments are under civil service when they are not. It is a very unusual coincidence that the Republican national committeeman of Massachusetts was able to put his hand upon the man whom he wanted to name and whom he sought to have the President name by an Executive order without even an examination, and was finally able to have an examination held and have him selected for the post.

The thing I am insisting upon is that all the civil-service rules be applied and lived up to in the matter of the appointment of postmasters as well as other appointments on the classified list, or else done away with entirely. The appointments of postmasters to-day are largely partisan. The choice of the three names certified comes down to a political test.

I have not any objection, I repeat, to Mr. Gow. I am not opposing his nomination. It so happens that Mr. Gow is an exceptionally well-qualified man for the office. I am not challenging the examination. But I am challenging the claim that a man can be appointed under civil service, be reappointed under civil service, and finally be ousted by a group of politicians using influence at the expiration of the man's term of office, having another examination held, and a political selection made, with the incumbent's apparent civil-service rights, regardless of his efficient service, being entirely disregarded.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. President, I was not here when my colleague began his remarks, but I understand he has used the Boston postmastership appointment as an illustration of the violation of civil-service principles. I think he has taken a very unfortunate illustration. I do not blame my colleague at all for being peeved that Mr. Baker is not reappointed. He was appointed as a Democrat and although I believe about two years ago he changed and registered himself as a Republican, still I understand he has always, very naturally and very properly, been a supporter of my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the senior Senator from Massachusetts yield to his colleague?

Mr. GILLETT. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I must state to the Senator that Mr. Baker has been a Republican, so far as representations to me have been made, and that not later than the recent campaign he wrote me a letter in which he said:

> I am a Republican and I am not supporting you, and I want you to know it.

Mr. Baker has repeatedly asserted to me that he has never supported me or any other Democrat, but is a Republican and was voting for the Republican candidate. The trouble that has come to Mr. Baker is not due, in my opinion, to his republicanism, but is due to his unwillingness to use his office for partisan political ends.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. President, I am very glad to have that information, though it is quite contrary to what I had understood, but I think the statement is correct that it is only within a couple of years that Mr. Baker has become a Republican. He was appointed by President Wilson; but I admit that that is irrelevant. I have always been a hearty supporter of the civil service; I wish we could take the post offices entirely out of politics; but in this instance it seems to me the facts prove this is not a political appointment.

In the first place, Mr. Gow stood higher on the list than did Mr. Baker, who also competed, and the man who stood highest on the list was selected.

I do not come from that section of Massachusetts; I come from the western part of the State, and I do not know much about Boston or the administration of the post office there. I only know what has been told me, and I have been told that two complaints have been made against Mr. Baker; first, that he was not efficient; and, second, that he allowed the post office organization to be used to assist the Democratic Party. That, I think, was the chief complaint against him. It may be true or it may not be true, but I have been so told by a great many prominent Republicans in Boston whom I know. That is the general impression, and I know that for that reason they would like to be rid of Mr. Baker.

However, Mr. President, after the examination was held, the man who stood third on the list was one of the most influential, expert, and experienced politicians in the city of Boston as well as an experienced and efficient administrator. If the President had desired to make a political appointment, the third man would have been selected because, beyond all question—and I have known him for years—while he is an admirable, high-class man he is also one of the most experienced men in the political world in Boston.

As for Mr. Gow, I have known most of the politicians in Massachusetts for many years, but I never knew Mr. Gow, and never heard of him, to my knowledge, until he was recommended for this position. So it seems to me it is rather an exaggeration to charge that this is a political appointment, when the man who stood highest on the list was selected, and a man who has never, so far as I know, been active in political life. I admit with regret that the merit principle does not always control, but, in this instance, it seems to me clear that the best man was chosen.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, along the line of the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] with reference to postmasters, let me state what took place in my home city of Butte, Mont. Four years ago a Republican was selected for the postmastership there after having passed the civil-service examination. In December of last year his term expired. He has made probably one of the most efficient postmasters we have ever had in the city of Butte; he has the commendation of the president of the chamber of commerce, the leading merchants of the community, and of many of the leading Republicans, but notwithstanding that fact I learned that some one else was to be appointed in his place. I called up the Post Office Department to ascertain whether or not the department was contemplating any change and to ascertain whether or not there was anything against the present postmaster. I was informed that, so far as the department knew, there was nothing against him, but that the Republican national committeeman of Montana, Mr. Schurtzler, is insisting that the department appoint another Republican to take the place of the present Republican postmaster. So the department has ordered, if you please, another civil-service examination to be held in the city of Butte for the purpose, and the sole purpose, of ousting this Republican, who has given entire satisfaction to the community there, in order that it may appoint some one else whom the Republican national committeeman for that State would rather have in that place.

It can not be claimed that the present postmaster of the city of Butte is a Democrat, because he has been affiliated with the Republican Party and its organization ever since he has lived in that city. It can not be contended in any way, shape, or form that he has been a supporter of mine, because he has always supported the Republican ticket, so far as I know. I submit that if that sort of thing is going to continue, we should not contend that the postmasters are under the civil service, but should realize that the administration is merely using the civil service as a cloak for the purpose of appointing whomsoever the local State politicians may choose for these positions. In this particular instance, I think, the reason why the department wishes to punish the postmaster is because of the fact that while he was postmaster he would not turn over the post office and permit it to be used for political purposes.

As a Democrat I do not like to interfere in a Republican fight, but why claim that the civil service applies to postmasters? Why not be frank and say the politicians can and do dictate the appointments and can and do oust men who are in the service, providing that the postmaster does not donate to the Republican campaign fund or bend the knee to the politicians?

CONSTRUCTION OF CRUISERS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11526) to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, in taking the floor in opposition to the pending cruiser bill I do so with the utmost respect for the views of those who favor it. To begin with I concede that all the Members of the Senate whether they favor the bill or whether they are opposed to it, as well as a vast majority of the people of the United States regardless of which side of the question they may be on, as, indeed, all persons in the civilized world, divided as they are on the question, alike are moved by perfectly honest and honorable intentions and are trying to do what in their respective judgments they believe to be best in order to obtain and to secure international peace. To my mind this discussion, however, has disclosed that so far as this bill or the necessity for it is con-

cerned, it must be considered with relation to only one other nation besides our own.

There is no other nation comparable to the United States in naval armament except Great Britain. It seems to me that the debate both here and elsewhere has demonstrated the fact that if it is necessary or advisable to build the cruisers proposed to be constructed by this measure it is because there is danger of war with Great Britain. Without the proposed cruisers we are, with the exception of Great Britain, in a class by ourselves so far as naval armament is concerned. No other nation is sufficiently near to us in naval armament to cause any uneasiness so far as naval armament is concerned in case of war with any other nation. Therefore it seems to me to follow logically that we are building this addition to the Navy for fear there might be war with Great Britain; yet no one is willing to admit such a fear; no one is willing to admit that he even believes that there is at present anything upon the political horizon that can possibly bring on war with Great Britain; indeed, the very able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who has spoken this afternoon upon the question, has frankly stated in effect that he saw no danger now and did not believe there ever would be any danger of war with Great Britain.

I believe when he made that statement he expressed the judgment of most of the experts of the civilized world on the subject as well as the judgment of most of the leaders both in our country and elsewhere. It is hardly conceivable that Great Britain and the United States should ever engage in war.

The naval armament of the two nations, it is conceded, I think, in some respects gives an advantage to Great Britain, while in some other respects it gives an advantage to the United States, and in still other respects the two nations are tied. To my mind—and this argument is not original with me; I have heard it and read it ever since there has been any controversy over the size of our Navy—we under no circumstances need as large a navy as does Great Britain. Even if we admit we are going to war with Great Britain, we would have a great advantage, because Great Britain must have a sufficient navy to protect the island mother country from any possible interference with her trade, and particularly trade in the necessaries of life, for within 30 days, if that trade were interrupted, the British people would be starving.

She has possessions over the world which she must protect, and that requires a much larger navy than is required to protect any possessions that we may have. While in case of war there would be great distress, perhaps, if it were carried on for any great length of time and our country was completely cut off from all the other countries of the world, yet we know that if the worst should come to the worst we could practically live within ourselves, within our borders, for an unlimited length of time. Therefore, even if we should go so far as to say that we may have war with Great Britain, we would have such an advantage on account of the physical condition of our country and the possibility of supplying all our needs within our own country that we would not need half as large a navy as Great Britain would be required to have in order to protect her people for any length of time, even though it be a short time.

Mr. President, it may be that those are right who contend that the way to get an agreement with Great Britain is to build a navy as big as hers, or bigger, and then we will be in position to bring her to consent to a further limitation of armaments. I do not believe that argument is logical, although, as I said at the beginning, I am not criticizing the man who believes that that is the way to bring about this kind of an agreement. The truth is that the entire world is watching the two leading nations, Great Britain and the United States, in the race for naval supremacy, and the other nations are patterning after these two.

I read just the other day of the action of Italy, which had decided to lay down some new cruisers. The article referred to the fact that both Great Britain and the United States were increasing their navies; why should not Italy be allowed to do the same thing without any criticism being made against her for so doing?

As I say, the nations of the entire world are watching these two Governments in this race; and they are basing their action in the way of increase of armaments and increase of expenditures for additional warships upon the pace that is set by Great Britain and the United States.

I think Great Britain, since the disarmament conference, although she had a perfect right to do it, was very unwise in the steps she took to build additional cruisers. Although I do not agree with anyone who says that in any way, directly or indirectly, she was bound by the disarmament conference not to do it, I think she made a mistake in doing it. I think she is to blame in the action she has taken for at least one-half of the sentiment that has grown up in this country behind this bill, and that her action has caused in every other nation of the world a feeling that it was its duty likewise to increase its naval armament, since Great Britain had taken the lead; and I concede that if we follow along that argument it would be logical for us to say, "Great Britain has increased her navy and we ought to increase ours, because, as far as battleships are concerned, she has more of them than we have now, and she is building still more."

Mr. President, if there were either danger of war with Great Britain or a certainty of war with Great Britain, if I did not believe that we could engage in that war with a smaller navy than she had with an equal chance of success, I should feel that we were justified in following her lead, because, after all, a national armament is something that depends upon what the other governments do. I concede that. But if we admit, which I think is fair, that there is not any danger of war with Great Britain, and if we admit, which I believe a fair consideration of the subject will compel us to do, that even in a war with Great Britain we do not need a navy of the same size that she has to have, then, as I look at the matter, the reason for building these cruisers disappears.

Who has a duty before the world to perform when other nations are looking to Great Britain and the United States, the two most powerful nations in the world, and are following in their footsteps? Can either one of those nations say, "We owe no obligation to humanity"? Can either one of those governments, in the face of the present civilization of the world, fail to say, "We ought to pay some respect in this armament race to the opinions of others who are following us and trying to pattern after us"? Those two nations can, without any loss of prestige, without any possible fear of injury, even in case of war, pay some attention to that sentiment of the civilized world.

While Great Britain has not done that, as it seems to me, she ought to have done, the question comes up to us now, "Can we do it without any danger?" If we can, we owe it not only to the civilized world but to our own people—especially to our own taxpayers, who must bear the burden—to do that thing.

I see no reason why we can not do it. I do not believe there is any danger of war with Great Britain; and even if I did believe there was danger of war to-morrow, while I should vote then for additional cruisers, because I should want to surpass Great Britain if possible, yet, for the reasons I have stated before, I should not feel handicapped because Great Britain had more cruisers than we had.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that we ought to set before the world an example of our consideration, an example of our desire for world peace. Somebody must do it. Somebody must stop this interminable race, which, if not stopped, will, from taxation alone, ruin the civilized world. It is handicapping it now; and this race is one in which every nation can engage, in which every nation will engage, in which every nation will be more or less driven to engage unless somebody stops it.

We are better equipped than any other nation in the world to stop it. As far as a war is concerned, it seems to me that at the present time we stand without a peer in the civilized world. It has been truly said that under the conditions of modern warfare navies and armies do not fight the battles. The resources of the country, the private citizens, the manufacturers, agriculture, all the different classes of citizenship, must be, and in a modern war are, mobilized behind the men at the front. The scientific men, the chemists, the men in the flying machines, the men in all walks of life, between the plowhandles and behind the counter, and the women in the kitchens and in the homes all over the land, are part of the fighting forces in every modern war.

The debt that a government owes when it begins a war is a great handicap, depending upon its size. We are better equipped in that respect than any other nation in the world. Our resources are more unlimited than those of any other nation. We are now the creditor nation of the entire world. Our credit is better than that of any other nation. We have as intelligent and as patriotic a citizenship as any nation in the world. We can put behind our Navy and our Army a force in the industrial field and in all the activities of life that can not be put behind any other navy or army in the civilized world. Therefore it seems to me, without any possible danger of war with any nation in sight, with a horizon perfectly clear, that we can afford to take the step that somebody must take if we are going to stop this unreasonable, this uncivilized, this inhuman race for naval supremacy.

We run no risk in doing this; and it seems, therefore, that we can well give an example to the world that even if Great Britain has not done what we feel she ought to have done, we are ready to take the step and to say to the world and to say

to Great Britain, "We are going to wait, now; we are going to pause, and we ask you to pause with us. We call your attention to the fact that unless you do we will ultimately have to get into this race, and in that event we will do the best we can to outstrip you"; and she knows we can do it. The world knows we can do it. It is in no sense in a bragging or boastful way that I say it. It is common knowledge that we can go into this race for military supremacy, because of our resources and our financial position in the world, and outstrip any other nation. Therefore, in that respect, being the leader in the entire civilized world, it seems to me it is up to us to say, "We are willing to stop. We can go further than anybody else, but we are willing now to quit. We are going to pause, and say to you now, 'Great Britain, you pause with us. You agree with us on a limitation of armaments, and particularly as to cruisers. If you do not, of course, we can not prevent the demand that will come ultimately from our people that we enter the race and that we compete with you in this naval race.'"

Mr. President, one of the greatest advocates of a big navy in modern times was Theodore Roosevelt, a man whom I always admired, and whom I usually followed. He advocated the building of a big navy. He advocated all the time, without interruption, that the United States should increase its Navy. At that time we were away below Great Britain. We were not even second in a military sense; and in his argument, as far as I know, he never argued that we should try even to equal Great Britain with our Navy.

I want to read an extract from a book by Theodore Roosevelt entitled "Fear God and Take Your Own Part." On page 87 of that book Mr. Roosevelt said:

> There are two immediately vital needs to be met, that our Navy shall at the earliest possible moment be made the second navy in point of size and efficiency. We do not need to make it the first. Great Birtain is not a military power, and our relations with Canada are on a basis of such permanent friendliness that hostile relations need not be considered. But the British Empire would quite properly be neutral if we were engaged in war with some great European or Asiatic power.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. NORRIS. I do.

Mr. BRUCE. But the Senator, of course, should not forget that there has been an enormous expansion in our foreign commerce since Roosevelt's time.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, yes; I know there has been. I admit that.

Mr. BRUCE. For instance, our commerce with South America has gone up from about $260,000,000, as I recollect, to a billion dollars.

Mr. NORRIS. But the reasons given by Mr. Roosevelt, then, are true now. One of the main reasons is our friendliness with the great empire of Canada, a part of the British Empire, just on our north, with a boundary line extending from the Pacific to the Atlantic, much of it along the Great Lakes and navigable streams; and yet in all that stretch of thousands of miles there is not a gunboat, not a naval vessel, not an armed soldier, not a fort of any kind. Canada, lying next to us, with the possibility of becoming in the future one of the greatest empires in the world, is a demonstration of the utter lack of the necessity for trying to train armies and build forts along the boundary line, and build navies in order to keep peace.

The Senator from Maine has argued over and over again that we need this armament, not for war but to prevent war. If his argument is sound, we would have had 50 wars with Great Britain on account of the boundary line between our country and Canada, where there is no fort, and where there are no soldiers. Compare that with the boundary line between France and Germany before the World War, those countries on each side armed to the teeth, with guns and cannon and standing armies, ready at a moment's notice to grapple at each other's throats. They got into war, and where we had no soldiers and where there were no forts, there peace reigned, and still reigns, without any thought of war.

Mr. President, a race for armament will bring a combat in time. It seems to me there can be no escape from that, if we do not limit it. The World War, to a great extent, is a demonstration of that. With Great Britain armed to the teeth, with a navy the greatest in the world, and Germany at that time with the second navy, perhaps, arming every day; with every citizen in the Empire a trained soldier, with guns and ammunition and forts without comparison standing out before the whole world, they kept on arming, and they kept on and on. One would get some new guns and that would be given as a reason why the other government should do the same thing, with a result that was inevitable. They ultimately clashed. That is what we will do if we keep on in this unreasonable and illogical race.

I repeat, Mr. President, there is no danger to our country, there is no danger to our institutions, if we refuse to pass this bill. We are not going to be singled out by any country in the world and attacked; and no one believes that we will be. That will not happen. There is danger, however, if we set the example before the world which many of the nations believe we have already set. Many of the smaller nations, copying after the two models, Great Britain and the United States, are building additional warships and cruisers, training more men, building more forts. They say, "Look at Great Britain, look at the United States, towering away above us in armament. We must do something or they in time will override us." Are they afraid of us? Do they agree with Senators like the Senator from Maine that the building of this navy is no indication of war? No matter what our intentions are, by the building of these cruisers, by the expansion of our military course, we are leading on to the time when those nations may feel, to their detriment and to their injury and to their mortification, the overtowering strength brought about by our military expansion. That is what they think of us. That is why they are building ships.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. We are building these ships to a great extent because Great Britain has built cruisers since the disarmament conference.

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

Mr. NORRIS. In a moment. We are giving that as a reason. Yet Senators say this does not mean anything except peace. A man who has a peaceful intention, who is pursuing peace, does not usually go to a hardware store and buy all the ammunition there is in town, and strap it around him, and get revolvers, and march down the street. That is not the way peace is brought about.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator whether that is not just what these other countries are doing. We are the only country that has not gone ahead and increased its armament appreciably since the disarmament conference.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator think that if we did not build more cruisers we would be in danger of Brazil attacking us, or Nicaragua attacking us, or Costa Rica attacking us, or Spain attacking us, or Italy attacking us, or Bulgaria attacking us? Is there any danger from any of those countries?

Mr. HALE. Probably not, and probably there is no danger of England or Japan or France or Italy attacking us. But why should we be the only ones who can not increase our naval force when all of the other great powers are increasing theirs?

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator is now making the same argument that is made in England, the same argument that is made in every parliament in the world. It is just as he said—if all the others are doing it, why should we not do it? That is the argument that is made.

Mr. HALE. But we have not done it.

Mr. NORRIS. But they are doing it to some extent, and every time they build a new battleship they point to the United States as an excuse for building it.

Mr. HALE. All that I want, and all those who are in favor of this bill want, is to see that we keep along on a parity with other nations and to indicate that when they are willing to cut down we are more than willing to cut down.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that. I give the Senator credit for being perfectly sincere. I said that at the beginning of my remarks. I am not complaining about that. But I find fault with what I believe is the Senator's weak logic in the matter. I do not agree with his reasoning.

Mr. HALE. We have tried for six years to get them to cut down.

Mr. NORRIS. I realize what the Senator wants to do.

Mr. HALE. We have shown, in those six years, by our holding off and their going ahead, that it does not tend to get them to decrease their armament, when we have refused to go ahead and develop ours. We have shown the fallacy of the Senator's reasoning, it seems to me.

Mr. NORRIS. Perhaps we have, to some extent. I am not defending Great Britain. I think she is greatly to blame. Perhaps I am prejudiced because I am an American citizen; but I try to look at the matter fairly, and as I look at it I think Great Britain is subject to criticism for the course she has taken. I am not defending her. I think she is guilty of the same thing that the Senator from Maine would be guilty of if we let him have his way. It is unnecessary to do that, as I look at it. It is not only unnecessary, but it would be detrimental to world peace.

Who is going to stop this race? Who is going first to say, "Let us stop"?

Mr. HALE. We are not trying to get ahead of Great Britain. We are not even trying by this bill to catch up with Great Britain.

Mr. NORRIS. This bill is only a stepping stone. This bill is only the beginning. If this goes on the next bill will be for more cruisers, and, as the Senator himself said in the debate, the cruisers last only about 16 years and the battleships about 20.

Mr. HALE. Twenty for both.

Mr. NORRIS. Assuming that to be correct, that means that every year we must build one-twentieth of the size of our Navy in order to keep on the same level that we had to begin with.

Mr. HALE. Quite right.

Mr. NORRIS. When we do that, and then take on the expansion that is going to come when we get into this race, or, rather, if we stay in it, what will be the end? Where is the taxpayer coming in? If we have to build one-twentieth of the Navy every year and, in addition to that, provide for a lot of new vessels, where are we going to stop? It is going to bankrupt this country, as well as every other civilized country in the world. I am trying to make clear that somebody ought to stop it.

Perhaps we have gone as far as we ought to. The Senator says—and there is some reason in the remark—that we have not done as much building as Great Britain has and therefore it is up to her to stop. That may be. I will not dispute that. I am inclined to agree with the Senator. But if she does not stop it, and we are in no danger if we stop for a while, at least, let us say to Great Britain, "Now, we want you to stop or we will have to get in"; and they well know what the result will be when we go in with the intention of building a larger navy than they have. They know we can do it. The world knows we can do it. It is because we are able to do it that we, more than any other nation in the world, for the benefit of international peace and the survival of civilization, ought to be willing to keep out of the armament race as long as we run no risk in doing so.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, if every time we suggest——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to have the Senator from Maine observe the rules. He starts right out without getting permission. I have the floor and I can not be interrupted without my consent. I will tell him in advance that I will always consent, but I want to do it in order. The Senator from Utah addressed the Chair first and I think I ought to yield to him first.

Mr. HALE. I think that is reasonable.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine is such an authority on the subject that I give him the preference and yield to him.

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Maine, then.

Mr. HALE. I have already said to the Senator from Nebraska that I thought it was entirely reasonable for him to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BORAH. I suggest that the Senator from Nebraska go ahead.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I was about to observe that no sooner was the disarmament treaty signed after the Washington conference, than our naval authorities began agitating for bulges upon our war vessels, and for the elevation of the guns, and agitating for the construction of a large number of 10,000-ton cruisers.

In May, 1924, there was passed through the House, at the dictates of the Naval Board and Navy, a bill for the construction of eight 10,000-ton cruisers. Great Britain had not laid down a single keel for 10,000-ton cruisers. When we took that action, and they began agitating for all those modernizations upon our battleships, and forced that bill through the House for the eight 10,000-ton cruisers, Great Britain, though there was a labor government there at the time, in September, 1924, passed a bill through Parliament for the building of five cruisers of 10,000 tons each.

Our attitude has been belligerent from the beginning. It was belligerent before the Washington conference, and with the signing of the Washington conference treaty the Navy Department, or some of the board within the Navy Department, were constantly agitating for enormous increases of the Navy. Our attitude has been provocative of distrust and resentments and fear in many other parts of the world. Then a little later the navalists demanded the construction of new naval vessels, advocating 71, at a cost of more than $1,000,000,000. So all of the fault is not entirely upon one side.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HALE. In reply to what the Senator from Utah has said, I will say that in the summer of 1923 Mr. Amery, who I believe at that time was First Lord of the Admiralty, announced the program of the Government to be to build four additional cruisers.

Nothing was said at that time about the size of the cruisers; but it was stated that Japan and other countries were building, and so it was incumbent on Great Britain to go ahead and build the new cruisers. The program of 1924 that was adopted was directly carrying this out, except that they added one cruiser to it, and in 1924 they actually laid down a certain number—five, I think it was—of new cruisers.

Mr. KING. Oh, no.

Mr. HALE. That was before we had passed the bill authorizing the cruisers. If the Senator will recall, that bill was introduced in the House in May and came over to the Senate in June and passed the Senate, and the Senator himself thereafter filed a motion to reconsider, and the whole matter was carried over until December. On December 11, I think it was, the bill authorizing eight cruisers was passed by the Senate. We did not proceed to build the cruisers until a somewhat later date.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator has not contradicted what I said, that immediately after the Washington conference we manifested our displeasure—I say we; I mean some of the officials of the Government—with the Washington conference and demanded modernization of battleships, and Great Britain contended that the program which we were outlining was in violation of the treaty. Subsequently, we were compelled to admit that the charge that Great Britain was elevating her guns in violation of the treaty was not true. Mr. Hughes was compelled to make that admission. But in addition to outlining the program for the modernization of the battleships—and I think the modernization as far as it went and was contemplated was in violation of the matter if not the spirit of the treaty—in May, 1924, pursuant to this policy of the naval board, a bill was passed through the House and came to the Senate providing for the construction of eight 10,000-ton cruisers. Great Britain had not laid down a single keel at that time and not until September, when the Ramsay MacDonald government was in control, was the bill passed for the building of any of the 10,000-ton cruisers.

Mr. HALE. I have already attempted to show the Senator that this was contemplated in 1923 as laid down in the program put forward by Mr. Amery, and that they were the ones who first started the building of the 10,000-ton cruisers.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator will admit that was no official action on the part of the British Government. The facts are, as the Senator has related them, that we authorized the building of additional cruisers——

Mr. HALE. We did not authorize them until December.

Mr. NORRIS. But we did not commence to build them perhaps until after Great Britain had authorized them, and that is what we ought to expect. If we authorize the building of a lot of ships, we ought to expect every other nation in the world to immediately come in and add others to their navy, whether we commence actually building them or not.

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

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HALE. We did not authorize it until December, 1924. They began building their ships in September, 1924.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator knows that the effort was made here to do it. We can not get away from the fact that every nation in the world having a navy is watching what we are doing here now—every one, without any exception. When we pass this bill it is going to be given as a reason for the building of cruisers all over the civilized world. They are already taking our action on the bill, which is partially completed by its passage through the House, and giving it as a reason for the ships they have already laid down. Why not? We do the same thing. We always give as an excuse when we are enlarging our Navy that some other nation is doing it. That is true in Great Britain. When they build some more ships they refer to what we have done. France will do it; Italy will do it; and Japan just did it the other day. We can not escape it. We can not escape the logic of the things that must follow our action.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. HALE. I can not quite follow the Senator in his reasoning that we should not do it because the rest of the world would do it if we did.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I did not say that.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator let me finish?

Mr. NORRIS. Not that the rest of the world would do it. The Senator must quote me correctly.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator let me finish?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. I only want the Senator to quote me correctly.

Mr. HALE. The Senator said other nations will build because we are building.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. HALE. And that they find fault with our building. Am I right?

Mr. NORRIS. Not necessarily find fault. I said they give that as a reason for adding to their navies.

Mr. HALE. But they have already added to their navies, and there seems to be no indignation in the world at what they have done.

Mr. NORRIS. And they will continue to do it as we add to our Navy. Who is going to stop it? Who ought to stop it? Shall we say to Brazil and Italy, "In order to show good faith you must not build. You must not build any cruisers. You must not build an airplane carrier." We ought not to complain of some of those nations who are not in the same class with us so far as naval armaments are concerned.

Mr. HALE. It has nothing to do with those nations, but why should we lay back and be the only one to have an inefficient and improperly equipped navy, when the other nations of the world are going ahead and increasing their navies?

Mr. NORRIS. And at the same time we have the largest Navy in the world with one exception, and we have the best equipped Navy perhaps without any exception.

Mr. HALE. No; I can not agree with the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, experts disagree on that.

Mr. HALE. I do not think any of the experts disagree about our need for cruisers.

Mr. NORRIS. A good many experts claim that, taking all our armament and all our vessels, and comparing them with Great Britain, with the exception perhaps of cruisers, we are ahead in every respect. We are ahead in fighting machines and submarines and torpedo-boat destroyers, many times ahead, and our battleships are probably better—at least so the experts tell me, although I am no expert like the Senator from Maine——

Mr. HALE. I do not claim to be an expert.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator would not admit that we had a good cruiser, anyway, until the bill is passed, I suppose.

Mr. HALE. Oh, yes; we have some excellent cruisers building.

Mr. NORRIS. But the experts tell me our battleships are much more efficient and in some respects outclass the battleships of Great Britain.

Mr. HALE. I do not think that is the general view of the situation.

Mr. NORRIS. It may not be. Of course, I do not know. When experts disagree I have to hunt a hole.

Mr. HALE. I said yesterday that however our Battle Fleet may compare with the British battle fleet—that is, battleships and cruisers—we accepted the provisions made in the conference of 1922, and if we did not get battleships that were the equal of those of Great Britain it was our own fault at that time. I would certainly not say that in battleships we are ahead of Great Britain.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand the Senator would not say that, and he may be right. I do not know. There are other experts who do not agree with the Senator from Maine on that point.

Mr. HALE. I have never heard that statement made.

Mr. NORRIS. Let us take the cruisers alone, just the cruisers. If we consider our territory and the territory of Great Britain, I think we are way ahead of Great Britain, even in cruisers, in a war with Great Britain. She has to protect territory all over the world. We do not. She has to protect herself, an island that could not live 30 days if she could not get food in there. Her people would be starved. That does not apply to us. We do not need as large a navy, as Roosevelt said and as many other experts have said. We do not need as large a navy as Great Britain, and particularly with Canada on our north a hostage. A war with Great Britain would mean what? Great Britain could not defend the Canadian line, and while, even if we were in war with Great Britain, I would not want one foot of Canadian territory, yet it is perfectly apparent that our Army could overrun Canada. That is perfectly apparent.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. We tried it about 100 years ago, and were driven back inside of our own lines.

Mr. NORRIS. When the Senator compares our condition now with the conditions which existed then, when we were fighting for independence, he is giving an illustration which, to my mind, has not anything whatever to do with the case which we are now considering.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I beg the Senator's pardon. We were not fighting for independence in 1812, 1813, and 1814.

Mr. NORRIS. That was our second war for independence.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. We got chased out of Canada when we tried to invade it.

Mr. NORRIS. I presume that is true. I have no quarrel with the Senator on that point. But the Senator does not think that if we had a war to-morrow with Great Britain, with the small resources of Canada, valuable as they are, but small as compared with the United States, with the 120,000,000 people that we have against her 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 or 9,000,000, that she could defend herself against us?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Why does the Senator talk always about Great Britain? Of course, it is true we have had six major wars in the last 153 years and Great Britain has been in three of them, but might we not have a war with alliances of other nations than Great Britain?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; we might have such a war. I am glad the Senator called my attention to it, because I want to speak now of the navy race again, something that he has reminded me of. If we are going to build a navy big enough so that nobody can overcome us, then there is only one logical outcome, there is only one logical aim, and that is we must aim to construct a navy that will be bigger than all the navies of the world combined. I do not think there is any question whatever about it. We may have a war with Great Britain and Germany and France and Italy and Nicaragua all combined against us, and we would need a navy larger than all of them put together. But no one so far has proposed that we should do that, and yet if we enter a race against Great Britan, a possibility, it is said, where there might be war, I can see there is a possibility of a combination of the world against the United States and then we would need a navy larger than all the navies of the world put together. In other words, this race for naval supremacy has no end. It means destruction, not only to our country but to all the civilized countries of the world.

There is no logical stopping place. It is a race that every nation has a right to enter, the same as we have the right to enter it. It is a race in which all the nations will enter if we keep on. It will be a race among all the nations of the world. There is no end to it. When we build ships they will build ships. When they build ships we will build ships. There never will come a time when it will stop until by the destruction of our civilization, either by war or by taxation itself, when the people will become slaves, when our ordinary people will become peasants, when the debt of the world will be so great that it will be beyond the possibility of all the laborers and all the farmers and all the manufacturers to produce enough profit and enough money to pay the debt that this interminable race will bring upon us.

Mr. HALE. I do not know what the Senator means by a race. I do not think the Senator can persuade the Senate that when we are merely trying to bring our Navy up to a state of moderate efficiency we are indulging in a race with Great Britain.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me say to the Senator——

Mr. HALE. I can say, Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. Now, if the Senator wants to interrupt me he should ask permission.

Mr. HALE. The Senator yielded to me.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not. I beg the Senator's pardon, but the Senator started right out and cut me off. If the Senator wants me to yield and will ask me in the proper way I will probably yield, even though I would like to answer the question he has already asked before I yield to him to ask another one.

The Senator from Maine says our intention is philanthropic, it is Christian, it is brotherly; we do not want to use our Navy to fight with; we have no intention of offending any other nation. I concede he is honest in that expression; I concede he believes that to be true, and so other nations have no right to complain if we build a big navy. Then, we have no right to complain if they do. So, in order to satisfy the people of other countries, we ought to send the Senator from Maine around to them when they are building battleships and have him tell them, "The idea you have that we are trying to build a big navy is all wrong; we do not mean to use it at all; we are not going to use our battleships to fight with; we are not going to load our guns; we are not going to use the ammunition; we are not going to use the naval vessels that we have built; we have built them as an emblem of peace; and you are wrong in the feeling that you

have." I suppose they would all believe him and they would scrap their navies.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I should like to have an executive session. If the Senator is willing to yield for that purpose, I will move an executive session.

HAY GROWERS IN CERTAIN COUNTIES OF TEXAS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a moment before the Senator from Idaho makes his motion?

Mr. NORRIS. I will yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, the Senator who objected to Senate bill 4818 when the calendar was last called has advised me that he has withdrawn his objection. I should like to have the bill considered and passed at this time.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not hear the Senator's request.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that a bill on the calendar, objection to which has been withdrawn since the calendar was last called, may be considered and passed at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4818) for the relief of hay growers in Brazoria, Galveston, and Harris Counties, Tex., which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to examine and settle, on the basis of facts and figures to be found and reported by the Secretary of Agriculture, the claims of hay growers in Brazoria, Galveston, and Harris Counties, Tex., who were prevented during the year 1925 from harvesting their hay because of quarantine restrictions against the spread of the hoof and mouth disease: *Provided*, That the allowance made on any such claim shall not exceed the amount paid thereon by the livestock sanitary commission of Texas, pursuant to an act of the State legislature approved October 6, 1926. There is hereby appropriated, from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sufficient amount, not to exceed $218,177.50, to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay such of the claims as may be allowed by the Comptroller General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that there has been offered to the bill an amendment which is pending. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill, on page 2, line 7, after the words "Comptroller General," it is proposed to strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following:

Provided further, That no part of the amount of any item appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum which in the aggregate exceeds 10 per cent of the amount of any item appropriated in this act on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. NORRIS. I now yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. Let me say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that the Senator from Nebraska wishes to hold his place on the floor for the opening of the session in the morning.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Can it not be understood that he will hold his place with the right to proceed in the morning?

Mr. NORRIS. I am satisfied to have that understanding.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. With that understanding, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the War Department appropriation bill.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should have to object to that. I do not think we ought, while we are debating the cruiser bill, have some other bill pending. The debate could go on just the same, it is true, but I do not see any advantage the appropriation bill will gain by having that course taken, and, unless there is some particular reason why it should be done, I do not think the Senator ought to ask for it.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I was merely anxious to have the appropriation bill before the Senate, so that if the debate on the cruiser bill shall be concluded to-morrow we might go ahead with the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator can then get up the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I can renew the request then; that is true.

Mr. BORAH. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 15 minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened.

Mr. JONES. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, February 2, 1929, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 1 (legislative day of January 31), 1929

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Edward K. Massee to be United States district judge, district of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

Charles S. Davis to be judge of the circuit court, first circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

John Paul to be United States attorney, western district of Virginia.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

CHIEF OF BRANCH

Brig. Gen. Charles Higbee Bridges to be The Adjutant General, with the rank of major general, for a period of four years from date of acceptance, with rank from December 31, 1928.

POSTMASTERS

INDIANA

Paul F. Walton, Oaklandon.

MASSACHUSETTS

Charles R. Gow, Boston.

MISSOURI

Anna Tabler, Jasper.
William H. Reynolds, Smithton.
Roy E. Dusenbery, Van Buren.

NORTH CAROLINA

James V. Benfield, Valdese.

VIRGINIA

John M. B. Lewis, Lynchburg.

WYOMING

Henry H. Loucks, Sheridan.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, *February 1, 1929*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Lord, our Lord, come richly into our hearts, for if they are full of love they are safe from the fear of evil and our dispositions are sweetened by Thy grace. Our natures are teeming with tendencies, desires, and ambitions. Help us to guard our wandering wills and subdue the threatening flames of passion; clear our perceptions and enable us to keep our manhood unstained. In our minds and hearts let there be strangely mingled enthusiasm and restraint, courage and quietness. It is the Spirit of God that makes life worth while. May we open the doors of our souls to Him, and all things will brighten with every step. Just now take our lives, so full of possibilities, and in the distant years may they count as trophies at Thy feet. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 12404. An act authorizing erection of a memorial to Maj. Gen. Henry A. Greene at Fort Lewis, Wash.;

H. R. 14920. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Wisconsin to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Rock River at or near Center Avenue, Janesville, Rock County, Wis.; and

H. R. 15324. An act authorizing the attendance of the Marine Band at the Confederate veterans' reunion to be held at Charlotte, N. C.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 16301. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes.

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

S. 5129. An act authorizing Thomas E. Brooks, of Camp Walton, Fla., and his associates and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the mouth of Garniers Bayou, at a point where State Road No. 10, in the State of Florida, crosses the mouth of said Garniers Bayou, between Smack Point on the west and White Point on the east, in Okaloosa County, Fla.;

S. 5515. An act to amend section 95 of the Judicial Code, as amended; and

S. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution authorizing the reenrollment with an amendment of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 171) granting the consent of Congress to the city of New York to enter upon certain United States property for the purpose of constructing a rapid-transit railway.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14800) entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers, sailors, and marines of said war."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 15848) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WARREN, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. KEYES, Mr. OVERMAN, and Mr. GLASS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

HAWAIIAN BOXING MATCHES

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 7200 and agree to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Hawaii asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 7200 and agree to the Senate amendment. Is there objection?

The Clerk read the title to the bill, as follows:

H. R. 7200. An act to amend section 321 of the Penal Code.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, where did all these details as to the length of the round and the intermission originate?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. They originated in the House.

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

OMNIBUS PENSION BILL

Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD presented a conference report on the bill (H. R. 14800) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers, sailors, and marines of said war, for printing in the RECORD.

INAUGURATION TICKETS—RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, many Members have been disturbed by an announcement made in the local press saying that the number of tickets for the inauguration for Members of the House have been reduced to four. Where this information came from I do not know, but the Members of the House will be supplied with seven tickets, as was announced several days ago.

I want to further state that these tickets will not be ready until about a week before the inauguration ceremonies. They will be distributed by the Sergeant at Arms of the House, and an announcement will be made on the floor when they are ready.

Several have called me up over the phone and asked me about tickets for the employees of the House. We expect to have a special stand, which will seat about 1,200 people, which will take care of the employees of the House and the Senate.

Now, I would like to propose a parliamentary inquiry to the Speaker, or at least call the attention of the Speaker to something that I do not think is in accordance with the rules of the House. There has been a growing custom lately that during a roll call Members go into the well of the House and create such confusion that it is very difficult for the clerks to hear and impossible for Members in the Hall to hear their names when called. In my judgment this is all wrong. Furthermore, there is no provision in the rules that provides for a Member to explain his vote or how a colleague would vote if present. I think the Speaker should call attention to these infractions of the rules.

The SPEAKER. I am glad that the gentleman from New York has asked this question. The Chair has had in mind making a statement touching the matters he mentions. In the first place, the Chair thinks that gentlemen should not ask leave of absence for their colleagues on the floor of the House. It simply consumes time. They should be in writing and blanks are provided for that purpose. Hereafter the Chair will refuse to recognize gentlemen who ask for leave of absence for their colleagues from the floor.

As to the second question asked by the gentleman from New York, whether the announcement by Members that their colleagues if present would vote so-and-so, is contrary to the rules of the House. The Chair has no knowledge of any rule that gives Members that privilege. Of course, a Member might obtain unanimous consent to make such a statement, and the Chair hereafter will ask if there is objection to making the statement.

With regard to Members standing in the well of the House during an important roll call, the Chair thinks that the rule prohibiting it ought to be strictly enforced, and will enforce it from now on. The Chair thinks that during a quorum call it would not be necessary to apply the rule very strictly, but where there is a roll call as important, for instance, as the one yesterday a large number of Members standing in the well is contrary to the rule, and from now on the Chair will strictly enforce that rule.

BILLS ON CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DENISON. The rules of the House provide that bills must be on the Consent Calendar for three days before they can be called up. I am informed that that means three days in which the House is in session. Is that the Speaker's interpretation of the rule?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the phrase "three days" means three legislative working days, that if the House is not in session it is not a legislative day, and that day, therefore, would not be included.

The present occupant of the chair has held that a holiday was not a legislative day. The Chair thinks that a day when the House is not in session is a holiday to that extent.

Mr. DENISON. I think that ruling of the Speaker was made in connection with the resolution for an investigation, filed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA]. He called it up right after the holidays and the Speaker held that the rule requiring seven days should elapse before it could be called up were days in which the House was in session.

Mr. SNELL. Would there not be a different situation from that of a regular holiday in the case of a week day when the House might be in session but on account of a particular situation did not happen to meet.

The SPEAKER. The attention of the Chair is called to the fact that the calendar is not printed on days when the House is not in session. Therefore, it might be physically impossible to print in the calendar the bill which it is proposed to put on the Consent Calendar. Speaker Cannon ruled on December

20, 1909, that the better practice would be that bills should be upon the printed calendar for three days in order that they might be called on the Monday provided in the rule for the calling of the Consent Calendar. (Cannon's Precedents, sec. 8117.) On February 7, 1910, Speaker Cannon again ruled as follows:

The Chair in construing this rule has held that a bill on Unanimous Consent Calendar shall be upon the printed calendar. Why? So that every Member of the House by consulting the calendar may be informed what bills are subject to unanimous consent upon that calendar.

This decision may be found in Cannon's Precedents, section 8118. That being the case, the Chair thinks that the ruling with regard to holidays not counting as legislative days ought to be also applied to days when the House is not in session.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let us have a concrete demonstration. Next Wednesday is Consent Day. Suppose the House adjourned on Thursday until Monday, under the ruling of the Chair a bill placed on the calendar on Wednesday could not be called up the following Monday.

Mr. DENISON. That is the reason I made the inquiry.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. And in order to take full advantage of the Consent Calendar, the House must stay in session then even if it adjourned from day to day.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so, and in such a case the bill must have been put on the calendar on Tuesday so that it would be on the calendar for three legislative days. If the House should not be in session on Saturday, a bill, to be considered on the Consent Calendar on Monday, must have been filed on the preceding Wednesday.

Mr. LEAVITT. And what is the effect of that on Calendar Wednesday?

The SPEAKER. It would have no effect on Calendar Wednesday.

RAPID-TRANSIT RAILWAY ON UNITED STATES PROPERTY IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution 34, authorizing the reenrollment with an amendment of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 171) granting the consent of Congress to the city of New York to enter upon certain United States property for the purpose of constructing a rapid-transit railway and consider the same at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution 34 and consider the same. The Clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 34

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the action of the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in signing the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 171) granting the consent of Congress to the city of New York to enter upon certain United States property for the purpose of constructing a rapid-transit railway be rescinded, and that in the reenrollment of the said joint resolution the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to strike out the following language: "at a point on Wall Street in the city of New York on the southern boundary of the property belonging to the United States and occupied wholly or partly by the Subtreasury Building, said point lying either at the southwest corner of the Subtreasury Building or in a southerly direction therefrom on a line in prolongation of the westerly wall of the Subtreasury Building and extending thence northerly along the westerly wall of the Subtreasury Building, or along a line in prolongation thereof, beginning."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 16714) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes. Pending the placing of the motion, I might suggest that the demand for time in general debate on this side of the House at present amounts to something like four or five hours. What is the demand on the other side?

Mr. AYRES. About three or four hours, so far.

Mr. FRENCH. Then, pending the motion, I suggest that we do not attempt to limit the time for general debate at this moment. I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be controlled equally by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] and by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill, and, pending that, asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate be controlled equally by himself and by the gentleman from Kansas. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, in view of the statement made that there are to be 7 or 8 or 9 hours of general debate, can not the House have some assurance that the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule will not be undertaken to-morrow, so that Members might be free to govern themselves accordingly?

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, the inquiry is a fair one. I am not able to say whether or not Members will use all of their time or ask for somewhat more. Apparently the time to be consumed in general debate will occupy all of to-day and at least so much of to-morrow that I think I may as well say now that if we should conclude the general debate to-morrow, I shall not ask to begin the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Idaho that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill, H. R. 16714, with Mr. LUCE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 16714, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16714) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the Naval Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLARKE] 20 minutes.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Chairman, I ask the courtesy of the House in presenting my little picture that I be not interrupted.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to yield this afternoon to the walrus and the carpenter, who, as you will remember, were friends Alice encountered in Wonderland.

You will recall that meeting and at least a fragment of the conversation, which is quite familiar:

"The time has come, the walrus said,
To talk of many things.
Of ships and shoes and sealing wax
And cabbages and kings."

I have always felt, Mr. Chairman, that the walrus was discussing just one subject—the tariff. The time has come for such discussion in Congress preparatory to that tariff readjustment which we now face.

We live in the American wonderland, a wonderland of magic cities and things done with magical precision. I am going to talk to you this afternoon about one of those magic cities, of ships that bring shoes; of the present necessity for some tariff sealing wax.

I shall try to show you that "if we know our cabbages" as well as we think we do in this House, we will pay some attention to the present-day need of a few million American kings. When I say kings I mean American workmen. They are the only kings we have in this country worth consideration.

"The time has come, the walrus said." Mr. Chairman, the walrus was correct. Let me tell you something about a magic city in this American wonderland and the threat which menaces it and other magical American cities to-day, because ships bring shoes and there is no sealing wax.

THE MASTER SHOEMAKER OF THE MAGIC CITY

What Thomas Edison is to electricity, what Henry Ford is to the automobile industry, even that and just a little more is the beloved George F. Johnson to the shoe industry. Some call George F. the master shoemaker, but I feel that no such term is inclusive enough, for almost with magic hand has he translated a struggling, indifferent enterprise located in a small country town, with a single factory that gave employment to

but 200 people and produced but a thousand pair of boots per day, into three good-will cities—Johnson City, Endicott, and West Endicott—all within a radius of a few miles, with an aggregate population of 30,000, with 22 factories with a combined production averaging over 130,000 pairs of shoes per day. With 17,000 workers, each with a personal interest in the enterprise, for after a dividend has been paid on preferred and the common stock, the balance of the profits is equally divided between the workers and owners of the common stock. In addition many of the workers are stockholders in the company. There has never been a strike, production is maintained, and in 1925 the workers gathered dividends amounting to nearly $1,200,000, or practically 5 per cent, on the $21,700,000 paid in actual wages in one year. George F., the beloved, as he is called, watches over and protects the interests of every employee. Food is assembled in public markets promoted by a community organization. The magic city provides three hospitals with complete medical service, without charge to the employees and their families, pensions for the old, sick relief and death benefits, a large park and playground, swimming pools, and everything to make life attractive to the workers and promote the feeling of shareholders in this great common enterprise.

The homes which are mostly owned by the employees are built and sold at cost and sometimes less. Free band concerts all bear testimony that the heart as well as the head of George F. is giving every consideration to promoting the interest of the family and generating a higher standard of living as well as an enlarged American spirit.

For the first time in the history of the shoe industry the competition of cheap labor abroad and the introduction of American shoe machinery and American methods has threatened the magic city as well as the industry, so the workers and owners of these vast manufacturing concerns come before the Congress urging that the shoe industry, in common with other American industries, shall have protection from cheap labor and unfair competition in order to promote and continue this wonderful era of prosperity we are now in, generating better homes and finer Americans in an environment healthy and wholesome.

That Mr. Chairman, is the magic city which has arisen under propitious influences and through human genius, up yonder in the country whence I come, the district I am proud to represent.

There are many unique features to this magic city, because George F. Johnson is unique; yet I know from personal observation that in a general way it fairly reflects the life, the problems, the standards, and the people of dozens of shoe-manufacturing communities in the districts represented by nearly 100 of the Members of this House.

In the manufacture of shoes alone, Mr. Chairman, 17 of our States are vitally concerned, and by actual count there are 72 of our congressional districts where shoemaking is one of the leading industries. What I am going to say this afternoon touches the lives and the welfare of many millions of persons outside my own district. Otherwise I would not take up the time of the House in this discussion, for this is a national body, and national problems are entitled to right of way. I think that what I have suggested indicates that this is a truly national problem.

The people of the magic city, like the people of the other shoe-manufacturing communities of the country, Mr. Chairman, are fairly representative of the American standard of living. When I speak of the American standard, I mean bathtubs as well as radio sets, comfortable and hygienic houses as well as automobiles; well-dressed, well-educated children as well as fur coats; and money to put on the collection plate on Sunday as well as money to spend on vacation in the summer.

In short, I am talking about a typical American cross section of modest, reasonable, but comfortable living, which includes some things which were regarded as luxuries a few years ago. Now note, if you please, they still are regarded as luxuries in many parts of the world, but are taken as a matter of course in the American standards of living.

Some of those things, Mr. Chairman—and we will not be too specific, lest we give offense to the people of other lands, where no offense is intended—strike the line of demarcation between the living standards of the American workman and the living standards of workmen and their families in other parts of the world.

Realization of that fact is fundamental in this entire tariff question which presently the Congress will face in special session with decks cleared for equitable revision.

The American workman lives as he lives because of the prosperity attendant upon the industry in which he is engaged. Just as long as that industry continues in normal prosperity, just so long will he be able to enjoy the same sort of substantial, sensible living that his neighbors in other lines of industry enjoy.

I am not one of those who believe that Congress can or should attempt to legislate prosperity. I think that is the wrong way of looking at the whole problem. Again and again on the floor of the House and in its committee rooms I have urged that it is not the function of the Congress and it is not the intent of Government to lift this group or that group bodily from a particular economic condition through artificial means. That is not the American idea. History suggests that is a trick of legislative bodies of decadent peoples.

But I think we are all agreed, Mr. Chairman, to this general proposition—that it is the function of the Congress to insure equal opportunity. That is all we are discussing when we talk about the threat which is now menacing the magic city and the American shoe business generally.

The shoe industry, Mr. Chairman, is unique among American industries in its relation to the tariff schedules of this country. It has not enjoyed the tariff protection accorded to most of the other manufacturing industries of the United States on the bulk of its output. Now and again, as tariff schedules have been revised, there have been suggestions for a protective duty on the all-leather boots and shoes which now have no protection, but the superiority of American shoe-making machinery has been such that no real economic necessity was found to exist by the tariff makers for a protective schedule on boots and shoes.

One result of that economic condition has been to stimulate the master shoemakers of this country to a high plane of mass production. They have improved their machinery both in efficiency and in total output. They have made, and are making, more shoes and better shoes than may be found anywhere else in the world.

American brains and American hands have made that possible. Sallying forth into the world arena with no protective tariff shield to aid them, they have fought a good fight and they have held their own. As long as their mechanical weapons of production were superior, they could do that, and still pay American wages in competition with the cheap-labor made shoes of other countries.

If it had been merely a case of competing on a base of labor costs alone, Mr. Chairman, the American shoe industry would have found protection necessary, because there is a vast difference between the wages paid the American shoemaker and the wages paid the foreign shoemaker. The average wage in the magic city is $1,500 a year, and I understand the average wage of the foreign shoemaker is about $300 to $500 a year, from one-fifth to one-third of the reasonable American scale.

But there was a compensating factor and that factor was the American-invented and produced shoemaking machinery, of which I have spoken. Its mass production, its high state of perfection gave the American manufacturer an advantage in production costs which enabled him to compete with the foreign shoe manufacturer and still pay American labor a living wage.

So things went along very well until the foreign shoe manufacturer, as was inevitable, began to buy and use American machines for shoe manufacture.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will my friend yield there?

Mr. CLARKE. I do not care to yield at the moment.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield when he gets through?

Mr. CLARKE. I will be glad to do so.

As long as only the American manufacturers employed the mass-production, cost-reducing machinery, they could pay American wages and still beat the foreign manufacturer with his low-paid help and his not so efficient shoemaking machinery.

But as soon as the foreign shoe manufacturer began to equip himself with that same sort of machinery, then his cheap labor, as contrasted with the high-paid American labor, became a determinative cost factor.

In other words, with the machinery equation equal or nearly so, on both sides of the water, then the labor-cost equation, plus transportation, would govern the production and marketing cost. The man with the cheapest labor could undersell the man with the more expensive labor because his production costs would, of course, be lower.

Very well, you say, but that is just a theory and that is just a hypothesis. What we want to know is what happened. Did anything actually happen to bring about this menace you suggest? Mr. Chairman, it did. It began to happen a long time ago. It is still happening. Now, it has become a threat, and because of that threat the shoe manufacturers are going before the Ways and Means Committee up yonder and ask for a protective duty. Let me show you a few million reasons why they are compelled to do that.

Mr. Chairman, here is a picture of the menace which is threatening the magic city and every other shoe manufacturing community in the United States:

	Boots and shoes		Slippers	
	Pairs	Valuation	Pairs	Valuation
1923	398,929	$1,346,176	653,964	$280,014
1924	586,689	1,995,252	581,466	301,904
1925	814,643	2,429,374	180,322	130,860
1926	1,069,741	3,380,972	377,387	321,381
1927	1,477,435	5,199,656		
1928 [1]	2,334,594	7,437,746		

[1] Eleven months only.

In preparing this table I have begun with the Commerce Department reports of 1923, representing the general period in which the present tariff began to operate.

The importations of all leather boots and shoes duty free into the United States in 1923 are 398,929 pairs, valued at $1,246,176.

And at the same time, the importation of duty free leather slippers amounted to 653,964 pairs valued at $280,014.

The imported shoe figure of 1924, Mr. Chairman, is somewhat larger than that of 1923. It represents importations of 586,689 pairs of all-leather boots and shoes, duty free, valued at $1,995,252. And while the slipper figure is slightly smaller, representing only 581,466 pairs of all-leather duty free slippers, it will be noted that the value increases over 1923 and is $301,904.

Now we come to 1925, and what do we find?

This imported shoe is growing, Mr. Chairman; it is a size 8 now—814,643 pairs of duty free, all-leather boots and shoes imported during that year with a value of $2,429,374, in competition with the output of the magic city and the other shoe communities of the United States.

Again the slipper falls off; it is not as important, yet it represents 180,322 pairs of duty-free, all-leather slippers, valued at $130,860.

Now, it is not normal and it is not reasonable that a shoe fitting one person or one condition in one year should be two full sizes larger the next. Yet here we have the same shoe of free duty import of 1926, Mr. Chairman, and it is now a size 10. It represents 1,069,741 pairs of all-leather boots and shoes of the ordinary grades, valued at $3,380,972. And you will note the slippers are climbing again—377,387 pairs, worth $321,381.

What is happening to account for this increased army of foreign-made shoes clattering up the gangplanks to American shores—an army bigger than Pershing took to France in the first instance? Certainly it is not accounted for by an increasing army of shoemakers in foreign lands. No, Mr. Speaker, there is only one thing that can account for it. American manufactured shoemaking machinery, bought by foreign manufacturers and operated by cheap foreign labor, with resultant low production costs, is being turned against the American market.

Under the cover of those American-made machine guns an invading army of a million and more sweeps on to the American coast in 1926.

The next year—1927—as might reasonably be expected in view of what I have just pointed out, that army has increased to 1,477,435 pairs of duty-free, all-leather boots and shoes worth $5,000,000, Mr. Chairman, or nearly five times as much as the importation of 1923. In four years, then, we have watched the development of a threat which has increased almost 500 per cent. The exact valuation as indicated by the commerce reports is $5,199,656.

Only the first eight months of 1928 importations on duty-free, all-leather boots and shoes are represented by these figures.

But the size of it suggests that the progressive invasion I have been describing is a real threat and an increasing threat. In the first 11 months of 1928, 2,334,594 pairs of all-leather boots and shoes joined the army of invasion which threatens the communities of which I speak.

And that, Mr. Chairman, represented an increase of 76.4 per cent, over the 1,323,574 pairs of duty-free boots and shoes imported during the corresponding period of 1927.

The $7,437,746 represented by the 1928 imports is just that much money taken away from the American shoe manufacturing trade. Increased American demands do not compensate for it. And I ask you, Mr. Chairman, and the gentlemen of this House who have borne with me so patiently, how, when he is so threatened in the home market by American-made shoe-manufacturing machinery, plus cheap foreign labor, the American shoe manufacturer is going to be able to compete in foreign markets?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Would it disturb the gentleman to yield there?

Mr. CLARKE. It would until I complete my statement and then I will yield.

I think it is a plain case. I think everyone in this House can see that this big boot here is kicking the American shoe manufacturer, and the American shoe worker in the face. It seems to me that the threat against the magic city and the other shoe communities of America is anything but fanciful in view of the picture I have presented here.

The threat is directed not only at American business per se. It extends to the shoemaker behind the machine; to his home, his wife, his children, and the living conditions which he now enjoys. It reaches to his butcher, his baker, his clothier, his banker, and his grocer. Wherever in this country men live by the trade which is as old as civilization itself, that threat is felt.

A trampling army of duty-free, foreign-made boots and shoes is outside the walls of the magic city, Mr. Chairman.

We Americans have a habit of waiting until armies begin to move before we discuss arming. I think that it is time to begin talking preparedness for the protection of the magic city and the other boot and shoe making communities of America.

As long as our workmen enjoyed the production cost differential created by efficient American-made machinery, this was not a pressing question. Now the shoe is on the other foot, and Mr. Chairman, it is a foreign foot, aiming a swift kick at American living standards.

I listened in at the Ways and Means Committee tariff hearings the other day, and I heard my friend and colleague JOHN GARNER, of that good Republican State of Texas, tell a New England manufacturer that the Democratic theory of tariff was to give everybody the same treatment. That is the simple remedy of the situation I have described to you, so there is no partisanship involved in the discussion of this tariff schedule, at least. The shoe manufacturers of the country, who have hitherto enjoyed none of the protection accorded other industries, are now facing that economic situation which furnishes the justification for a protective tariff. In it they are asking nothing for themselves at the expense of the ranchman and the farmer. Without attempting to speak for all of them, let me put into the RECORD at this point a part of a letter I received recently from the master shoemaker himself, George F. Johnson, builder of the magic city.

ENDICOTT, N. Y., *January 1, 1929.*

DEAR JOHN: You want an argument from my point of view on why we should ask for free hides, while we are insisting that we shall have taxed shoes. I am perfectly frank, John, when I say that, from my point of view, free hides are not important to the shoemakers or tanners. If taxed to satisfy the agricultural interests, it will work no hardship to any particular single concern. It will simply react on all alike, like any other tax which is put upon articles of general use. The "ultimate consumer" pays the bill. All shoes will cost more money. If it satisfies the farmers (who, God knows, need some consideration from their Government), I would be the last one in the world to offer opposition.

In the matter of shoes it is a different story. We need a protective duty. There is a great deal of labor in shoes, and our Government has stated that they intend to protect the working man. And so let's have a tariff on shoes, and a good stiff one, so that we can pay our laboring people about $1,500 a year while our foreign competitor only pays $300 to $500.

I hope this is a clear, if brief, statement of the true situation. You are at liberty to use it in any way you see fit.

Sincerely,

GEORGE F. JOHNSON.

And there you have it, Mr. Chairman; a glimpse into the unselfish heart of this man who so well represents the industry now threatened by these millions of pairs of shoes that are scuffling up the American gangplanks each year in ever-increasing armies of invasion.

I think the case is plain—the case of ships and shoes and sealing wax, and cabbages and kings.

The ships bring shoes, and unless we use some tariff sealing wax, Mr. Chairman, our American workmen, who are the only kings we have in this country, are likely to come to the conclusion that we do not know our economic "cabbages." We need this tariff. If the shoe I have shown you fits, put it on.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARKE. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I will say I approve of everything the gentleman from New York says in regard to protecting the shoe manufacturer against foreign competition. Last year 64,000,000 square feet of upper calfskin leather came in duty free. We have some leather industry. I am going to go along with the gentleman to get a tariff for shoes, and I was wondering if he will go along with us to get a tariff for leather?

Mr. CLARKE. Reciprocity is the life of trade. I think that is a fair proposition.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I would like to know what the gentleman thinks about it.

Mr. CLARKE. I think it is a reasonable proposition.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Does the gentleman believe the leather industry should be protected?

Mr. CLARKE. I certainly do. I think every American industry is entitled to protection.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Where do we come in; we have cattle in Iowa and from cattle we get hides. Ought that not be protected?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARKE. I will.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I did not recognize the State from which I came by the gentleman's designation a while ago when he said the great Republican State of Texas, but he pictured the dire, yea very dire, situation in regard to the leather manufacturer and boot and shoe manufacturer and the gentleman read a letter——

Mr. CLARKE. From George F. Johnson, one of the largest manufacturers——

Mr. HUDSPETH. That this gentleman was willing to grant a small increase in tax on hides. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that when his party took the tariff off hides in 1909 boots and shoes went up 100 per cent?

Mr. CLARKE. I do not know the exact situation.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Well, that is so.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not know about it.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Now, can the gentleman transfer himself back down there to that good Democratic State of Texas and talk with the cattlemen, where it does not pay them in many instances to skin the old cow? Will the gentleman join me to secure a duty on hides—just a reasonable duty?

Mr. CLARKE. I will; and I will also endeavor to get the gentleman to vote the Republican ticket. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUDSPETH. He can never get the gentleman from Texas to vote the Republican ticket if he lives a thousand years. It does not pay the farmer down there in many instances to skin the cow and market the hide. I hope the gentleman will join me in giving an equitable duty on all those products of the farm and ranch.

Mr. CLARKE. I hope to be able to do so, and I hope the State of Texas will continue to be a Republican State. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUDSPETH. No; it will be a Democratic State as long as you live and then some. My district is Democratic and it produces more cattle and more hides and more beef and more goats and more sheep than any other district in the United States. [Applause.]

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

Mr. CLARKE. Certainly.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I am interested in the question of shoes. I want to ask the gentleman what the total production of shoes is in this country?

Mr. CLARKE. I have not those figures to-day, I will say to my friend from Maryland, but I propose to follow up this preliminary statement later with a detailed statement of the production of shoes and of the producers who are engaged in the trade, and give you the whole picture.

Mr. LINTHICUM. There was at least one pair of shoes to each person in the country, I understand. That would be 120,000,000?

Mr. CLARKE. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman says that in about eight months there has been imported about 2,000,000 pairs of shoes?

Mr. CLARKE. Our increase has been over 70 per cent above the figures for 1927.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Is that of the higher class or medium or low class shoe?

Mr. CLARKE. That is for the medium and some of the higher ones.

Mr. LINTHICUM. One other thing. The gentleman stated, in speaking of this magic city of George F. Johnson, that the wages paid were about $21,000,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Yes. And the workers share in the capital stock and share in the profits.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I understood the profits were so large as to pay the employees 5 per cent on their stock in addition to their wages?

Mr. CLARKE. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That does not look like hard times in the industry.

Mr. CLARKE. Here are the cold facts staring us in the face right now.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CLARKE. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Is it not a fact that the importation of foreign shoes at this time is in its infancy, and that unless we do something it will be only a little while until the importations increase to such an extent that our local shoe industries will be put out of business?

Mr. CLARKE. Yes. In 11 months of 1928 there was an increase of 75 per cent of importations over those of the previous year, which went 500 per cent above what it was in the year before.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARKE. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Is the statement true that when hides and leather were put on the free list the price of shoes went up?

Mr. CLARKE. I do not know whether it is or not. I am not familiar with that. I do not know as to the accuracy of that.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. I thought it was so stated. Is it not true that in spite of the fact that leather and hides went on the free list, shoes have held up higher than other commodities relatively?

Mr. CLARKE. I do not think so in proportion to other commodities.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Is it not true that with respect to other commodities shoes are higher now?

Mr. CLARKE. They are on about the same economic standard as other things.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Is it not true that shoes are higher? Take clothes, for example. You can buy suits of clothes and overcoats for $6.60, so advertised in the Washington papers.

Mr. CLARKE. What kind of suits are they?

Mr. COLE of Iowa. They are pretty good suits.

Mr. CLARKE. They may be good for corn husking in Iowa [Laughter.]

Mr. COLE of Iowa. We do not wear suits for that. We wear overalls and jackets.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] I am authorized to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, recently the Texas Legislature passed two resolutions upon certain important questions and has sent these resolutions to Texas Members of Congress. While they deal with important subjects they are brief, and I ask that the Clerk may read the resolutions in my time, for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the resolutions.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, by Mr. Moore

Whereas the Civil War records of the States composing the Confederate States of America were carried as spoils of war by the Federal forces to Washington and placed in the War Department of the United States, where they now remain; and

Whereas these records can now no longer be considered of any real worth to the United States Government other than historical; and

Whereas the fealty of all States comprising the Union since the Civil War has been proved and sealed by a common baptism of fire and blood; and

Whereas these old records are now but mute testimonials to the valor and courage and patriotism of southern manhood and are historical data cherished only by the States from which they were taken by the fortunes of war; and

Whereas the respective States are anxious to repossess this data and these war records for their historical value, and a worthy sentiment of proud possession: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, requested by appropriate act to return to the respective States these war records, muster rolls, and other such documents taken from the respective Southern States at the close of the Civil War, and our Representatives and Senators in Congress are urged to secure the passage of such measure.

Senate concurrent resolution, by Mr. Berkeley

Whereas an important hearing on agricultural schedule will be held within the near future in both the House and the Senate of the United States Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring), That it go on record favoring a fair and adequate tariff rate on all products of both the farm and ranch, and that we request the Members of both Houses of Congress to give careful study to such sched-

ule with special attention to the interest of the farmer and stock raiser; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be wired to each Senator and Congressman from Texas and a copy be sent the chairman of the Agricultural Committee in both Houses of Congress.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, these two resolutions that have been read deal with meritorious subjects. I shall not speak at length upon them at this time. The first resolution deals with the Confederate military records which were seized during the Civil War and which some of the States desire now returned to them for their historical archives. I think that is a reasonable and proper request, and I hope it will receive the favorable consideration of the proper committee of the House.

The second resolution deals with the subject just discussed by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CLARKE], the question of fixing tariff rates. Our legislature has asked that when the next Congress comes to write a tariff law it shall give equal protection to the products of the ranch and the farm and the orchard as is given to the products of the factory and the mine.

In the making of tariff laws under Republican administration heretofore industry has been the favorite child of protection, and the products of the farm, the ranch, and the orchard have frequently been dealt with as the stepchild of protection by those who wrote the tariff laws. I hope that the Members of Congress from the agricultural States will see to it that in the writing of the next tariff law equal treatment and equal justice shall be given to the products of the farm, the ranch, and the orchard as is given to the products of the factory and the mine. In doing that it will be necessary to follow some sort of a consistent rule, and I think the Democratic platform which was adopted at the Houston convention is as clear and fair a declaration upon the kind of a rule that should be followed as I have seen anywhere. I am going to take the liberty of reading just a brief part of that platform. The Democratic platform declares for a tariff where the—

Duties will permit effective competition, insure against monopoly, and at the same time produce a fair revenue for the support of Government. Actual difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, with adequate safeguard for the wage of the American laborer, must be the extreme measure of every tariff rate.

Now, our friends the Republicans, in the presidential campaign last fall scoffed at that declaration and that rule of tariff making; but I call your attention to the fact that that platform declaration is substantially the same as the platform declaration of the Progressive Party in 1912, upon which Mr. Roosevelt, running as a Progressive candidate, received a much greater electoral vote and a much larger popular vote than did President Taft, running upon a platform indorsing the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill. I want to read the Progressive Party tariff platform in 1912 and show that it is substantially the same as the Democratic Party platform on the tariff in 1928.

Mr. MICHENER. Also read the Republican platform in 1912.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Now, let me read the Progressive platform of 1912 with reference to the tariff:

We believe in a protective tariff which shall equalize the differences of competition between the United States and foreign countries, both for the farmer and the manufacturer, and which shall maintain for labor an adequate standard of living.

That declaration is the attitude of the Democratic Party at the present time.

Now, as I see it, there are three schools of thought in this country upon the tariff question, and I may say in passing that I look upon it as a great deal more of an economic question than I do as a political question. There are three schools of thought. One school—and I think it is distinctly in the minority—is in favor of free trade. There is another school, which has too often had the ear of the people writing these tariff laws, that believes in making the rates so high that they will exclude foreign importations, prevent competition, and become the most effective agency that can be devised for monopolizing industry.

Then there is a third school of thought which believes, as declared in the Progressive platform of 1912 and declared in the Democratic platform of 1928, that the measure of tariff rates should be the difference in the cost of production at home and the cost of production abroad. If you adopt that rule, you have some measure by which to go, some measure by which you can mete out justice and you can defend a tariff law of that kind. I commend it to the Members of the next House of Representatives and suggest that they see to it that the farmers and those who toil upon the ranches and those who are engaged in the orchard business receive a square deal in the writing of the next tariff law. [Applause.]

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

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that when the Fordney-McCumber bill was drafted all the tariff asked for by the farmers was carried in the bill with the exception of hides, and I want also to call his attention to the fact that the Underwood bill placed practically everything that the farmer produces on the free list. Is not that true?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I think that is stating the matter too broadly. I am not sure, but my recollection is that, for example, on hides the Underwood tariff law had some slight duty.

Mr. HUDSPETH. No; there was none at all.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Then possibly I am mistaken on that item, but let me say this in answer to the gentleman——

Mr. HASTINGS. I would like to inject just one statement. Is it not a fact that the farmers have been worse off since the passage of the Fordney-McCumber law than they have ever been in the history of this Republic?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I do not think anyone will dispute that. It is perfectly natural, of course, and it is a perfectly fair inquiry that I be asked, as the gentleman from Michigan has asked, for a bill of particulars as to where the Fordney-McCumber tariff law does not deal fairly with the farmer. I take as my authority that it does not do so a distinguished Member on the Republican side of the House. If the gentleman from Michigan will get the Tariff Review of September, 1928—and I believe that is the leading protective-tariff magazine in the United States—he will see there an article by Mr. C. G. SELVIG, who represents the ninth Minnesota district in Congress, in which he deals with the unfairness to agriculture of the Fordney-McCumber tariff law. The subject of his article is The Tariff and Its Relation to Agriculture. I want to read to you some of the rates he uses for the purpose of comparison. In that article he appends a table which shows that the ad valorem duty on cotton clothing is 66 per cent; on wool clothing, 48 per cent; on cotton fabrics, 44 per cent; on wool fabrics, 71 per cent; whereas on corn, he says, reduced to an ad valorem basis, it is only 17 per cent and on wheat 34 per cent.

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

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. In that table he shows that the ad valorem duty on iron and steel is 30 per cent; on copper and brass, 38 per cent; whereas on hogs, reduced to an ad valorem basis, it is 4 per cent and on pork it is 3 per cent.

No wonder that Mr. SELVIG says—

that when the McCumber-Fordney tariff bill was written the farmers did not get a square deal.

Now, that is what a distinguished Republican said, and to back up what he said he inserted in his article a table that compared the duties on agricultural products with the ad valorem duties on manufactured products, and if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], a distinguished Member of the House, will get that table and read it I am satisfied he will agree with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SELVIG] that in the writing of that tariff law the farmer did not get a square deal, and the best proof of it is the condition of agriculture at the present time. As the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] has said, I do not recall any time, scarcely, in the history of the country when, taking agriculture as a whole, it has been in a worse condition than at the present time. The situation is bad in many sections of the country, make no mistake about that.

Mr. MICHENER. And that condition commenced after the deflation of 1920.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Oh, that condition commenced——

Mr. MICHENER. Is there any question about that?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. That condition commenced and has had its full fruition during the last eight years of Republican administration.

Mr. MICHENER. And the condition is getting better.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I wish it were, but I fear not. Only last night I read a statement from a gentleman in one of the counties out in the State of Illinois, in which he stated that no

longer is it possible to borrow a single dollar on farm lands in his county. And why? Everyone knows that the value of real estate is determined by its earning power and the reason farm lands have no loan value in some sections of the country is on account of the fact they no longer have an earning power. Something must be done to correct the unfavorable situation of agriculture. The rehabilitation of this great basic industry should strike a responsive chord in the heart of every Member of Congress who is interested in the happiness and prosperity of the American people.

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

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER].

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], and I have a very high regard for his opinion on legislative matters in general and regret as deeply as anybody here the fact that he is not to continue to be a Member of this body. [Applause.] His passing is just another example of the fact that men who have the courage of their convictions, men who think clearly and speak logically and understandingly, and have what is now called initiative, but when I lived in New England we called it "guts," are sometimes not appreciated by their constituencies. [Applause.]

Of course, I can not wholly agree with him on his attitude regarding the tariff. [Laughter.] Like many other members of his party his attitude has materially changed during the last few months. It was a very interesting spectacle during the campaign, and after the campaign to see the very sudden conversion of a great many members of the Democratic Party to the policy of a protective tariff, largely as a result of the vaccine virus that was injected by telegraph with a gentleman named Raskob on the handle end of the hypodermic syringe. I am of the opinion, however, that there are some vaccinations that do not take, and while there may be very many Democrats in the coming days when we are going to consider tariff legislation who will point with pride to the section of their platform which provides for a policy of a protective tariff, I am rather inclined to believe their old prejudices will warp their judgment and cause them to discover some unconscionable items in the bill that will prevent them from voting for it.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] is concerned, as we all are, for the return of prosperity to agriculture; however, I do not think the farmers' troubles all lie at the door of the tariff. Certain it is, that when you Democrats last wrote a tariff bill you never gave the farmer any consideration at all. His basic products you put on the free list; in fact, you skinned him alive and nailed his hide on the barn door as Exhibit A in the Underwood bill, a measure designed to be for revenue only and failed to accomplish even that. [Laughter.]

Then came the writing of the Fordney-McCumber bill following the emergency tariff bill which helped to clear up the agricultural depression, and while that did not raise prices materially, it stabilized the markets as many of those in the wool industry can testify. I do not know whether that applied to Angora-goat hair in connection with wool of the sheep or not, but at any rate the general wool industry was benefited by the emergency tariff act, and you will remember that a very prominent Democrat, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], who is to be the leader on your side in the next Congress, I understand, made one of the finest tariff speeches ever made on this floor. Think of it! A tariff speech in favor of the emergency tariff act which was under consideration at that time. It has never appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but it was made in the hearing of most of us who are here to-day. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, as an old-fashioned Republican protectionist who believes that no rate of protection is too high that really protects an American industry, I always am concerned as to one particular subject and that is that the manufacturers seeking protection shall pay at least a reasonable share of their profits in good wages. Why? Because as Republicans we boast of the improved living conditions that result as a development of American industry under a protective-tariff policy. I am desirous of keeping the purchasing power of our folks who toil on the farm and in the shop as high as possible.

Being a Republican protectionist of this character, I do not want, as some Members have charged me here, to erect a Chinese wall around the country so that nobody can get in; but I do want the wall to be so high and the footing so insecure that importers are liable to break their necks trying to get in with foreign competitive merchandise [laughter], because, as I have said before, every dollar that we spend for imported goods goes into the pay roll of an importer or goes into his exchequer to pay a European pay roll.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HARDY. I yield the gentleman from New York one minute more.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas, if he will be brief.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I will be very brief. How does the gentleman stand on a tariff for the old farmers' product of hides?

Mr. CROWTHER. I am for a duty on hides.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I thank the gentleman, and I am glad to know that the gentleman has come across to that view since the last time we had a tariff bill up.

Mr. CROWTHER. The gentleman is not quite fair with me; he has charged me before with taking a position against the duty on hides, and I explained my position at that time.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I know the gentleman has explained, but the gentleman did not vote for a tariff on hides.

Mr. CROWTHER. And I explained why very clearly. You will remember that there were four words left out of the hide clause—"of the bovine species."

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes; of the bovine species. That means cattle.

Mr. CROWTHER. Of course; and that language should have been in the bill, but when it was left out that made every sheepskin, every lamb skin, and every goat skin a hide, and dutiable.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Certainly; and why not put a duty on them?

Mr. CROWTHER. Because at that time the manufacturers were paying a duty on the wool, on the skin, and we would have taxed them out of business by assessing a duty on the hides and the wool as well. The duty on wool on skins was levied according to the decision of the Director of the Customs.

Mr. HUDSPETH. We are willing to give the other man a reasonable duty, why not give the man who produces a duty and increase the number of goats and sheep in this country so that we will not have to do any importing?

Mr. CROWTHER. If that can be done by an adjustment of tariff rates, I am for it.

Mr. HUDSPETH. That can be done.

Mr. CROWTHER. I believe in a duty on these raw products, provided we have a sufficient compensatory duty on the manufactured products in which they are used.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. I hope the gentleman will insist on retaining the tariff on imported palm fiber of three-quarters of a cent a pound as protection for the Florida-grown mosses. There is a duty now on palm fiber, and our moss growers are very much interested in having that duty increased.

Mr. CROWTHER. Due to the recent election returns from the State of Florida, if it was in my power so to do, I would be most happy to grant Florida all that they need in the line of protective tariff. [Laughter.] I do not think Florida can complain of her treatment, even in her Democratic past.

Mr. Chairman, let me say this: I do not believe that the charge can be made against the Republicans that ever during a discussion of the tariff, or during the practical application of it, or in the construction of a bill, you can charge us with being sectional. We never ask a witness before the committee as to his political affiliations. No Member of the House was ever denied the duty on a commodity that was raised or produced in his territory because he was a Democrat. In the practical application of this policy we believe there should be no sectionalism—no North, no South, no East, no West—and that if it is humanly possible the effort should be made to have tariff benefits accrue to the farmer as well as to the manufacturer. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, in extending my remarks, I desire to print a letter that I sent to the Manufacturers Record on December 10, 1928.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 10, 1928.*

RICHARD H. EDMONDS,

Editor Manufacturers' Record, Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. EDMONDS: The recent Republican victory in the national campaign carries with it some tremendous responsibilities, and not least among the many is the necessity of tariff revision. Cement, brick, leather, shingles, and boots and shoes and hides are at present on the free list. The flexible clause offered a degree of relief to those manufacturers and agriculturists who were so fortunate as to be on the protected list, and the results have been extremely beneficial in those cases which have been adjudicated under this clause. However, the present law provides no remedy or relief for the folks who find their products on the free list. They have no avenue of escape and no door to knock at for relief. They must, in old New England phraseology, "grin and

bear it." When an industry has been hanging by its eyelids for several years, as in the case of shingles and leather, they may have accustomed themselves to "bearing it," but they certainly owe us no apology for "not grinning." As an old-fashioned protectionist who believes that no rate is too high that really protects an American industry that pays its honest share of profits in decent wages I, of course, welcome the conversion of my Democratic colleagues to the policy of protection. Before they serve actively in the preparation of a tariff bill I think, in view of the hysterical haste with which they crowded to the front at the telegraphic call of their candidate, that they should serve a reasonable period of probation. I have heard of vaccinations that did not take.

I trust that we shall have a special session closely following the close of the session on March 4, and that we may revise the agricultural and industrial rates to the satisfaction of everybody—producer, wage earner, and the farm folks. It must be done as quickly as possible if it is to be of any value to agriculture in 1929. The present law has proved its value to American industry, but changed industrial conditions abroad demand that its weak spots be strengthened. Let's do it now.

Yours truly,

FRANK CROWTHER.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, the question of a more rigid enforcement of the prohibitory law is an acute one in the minds of the people of to-day. The Senate amendment, known as the Harris amendment, now in conference, provides as follows:

For increasing the enforcement force, $24,000,000, or such part thereof as the President may deem useful, to be allocated by the President, as he may see fit, to the departments or bureaus charged with the enforcement of the national prohibition act and to remain available until June 30, 1930.

The people will not be deceived by the parliamentary tactics to avoid a direct vote on the Senate amendment. Unanimous consent was requested to take up the bill with the Senate amendments and consider them, and if this course had been pursued a direct vote could have been secured on the Harris amendment. This was refused. The leaders in confusion adjourned the House. Instead of a direct vote on the amendment a rule was brought in to send the bill to conference, in the hope that the Senate conferees would recede and thereby avoid a direct vote on the amendment. That was the plain and only purpose of the special rule. Analyze the vote and you will find that all of those opposing the rigid enforcement of the prohibitory law voted in favor of the previous question, which had the parliamentary effect of preventing an amendment to the rule which would have permitted a direct vote on the Harris amendment, which provided the necessary appropriation to enforce prohibition.

It is argued by those opposed to prohibition that the law can not be enforced and it is maintained by those who favor prohibition that sufficient funds are not appropriated to enforce the law.

This amendment will provide funds for a fair test. It places $24,000,000 in the hands of the President and permits him, in his discretion, to allocate it to the various departments or bureaus charged with the enforcement of the national prohibition act. This answers the argument of those who have heretofore maintained that sufficient funds have not been provided. The issue here is clear-cut. Everyone in favor of the better enforcement of prohibition voted against the previous question, because that would have enabled the friends of prohibition to offer an amendment to the rule providing for a direct vote on the Harris amendment, and all those who are not in sympathy with the rigid enforcement of the prohibition law and who do not want to give the law a fair test voted against it. The question can not be dodged by a special rule. The people throughout the country will understand the vote.

I do not see how any Member of the House who is in favor of the eighteenth amendment and the legislation enacted to vitalize it can find any objection to this amendment or to the language of it. It places in the hands of the incoming President sufficient funds to enable him to utilize every department and bureau of the Government charged with the enforcement of the prohibitory law to the very best advantage. There is no question but what the sentiment of the country is in favor of prohibition.

The eighteenth amendment was submitted to the legislatures of the several States by resolution passed by Congress on December 17, 1917, and was declared to have been ratified in a proclamation of the Secretary of State, dated January 29, 1919, by 36 of the 48 States of the Union. The record shows that the legislatures of 46 of the 48 States finally ratified the amendment.

After the amendment had been ratified by the legislatures of 36 of the States, this being sufficient to adopt it, the amendment was thereafter ratified by the legislatures of the States of Missouri, Wyoming, Minnesota, Wisconsin, New Mexico, Nevada, and Vermont. And it was ratified by the State of New York on January 29, 1919, the date of the issuance of the proclamation by the Secretary of State; by the State of Pennsylvania on February 25, 1919, and by the State of New Jersey in 1922.

I call attention to these dates in order to emphasize the number of States that ratified the amendment after the proclamation was issued by the Secretary of State.

This record conclusively answers the argument frequently heard that this amendment was not adopted as other amendments submitted by Congress to the several States.

Only two States, Connecticut and Rhode Island, did not ratify this amendment.

Violent protests against prohibition are heard, particularly from the Representatives in the House and Senate from the States of Illinois, Massachusetts, Maryland, Missouri, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and Wisconsin; but all of these States, in the method defined by the Constitution, ratified this amendment.

The eighteenth amendment differs from any other amendment to the Constitution in that, first, it postponed the enactment of legislation to enforce prohibition until one year after the ratification of the amendment; second, the power to enforce the article by legislation is concurrent with Congress and the several States; and, third, the amendment was required to be ratified within seven years from the date of submission.

This amendment places the responsibility for the enforcement of prohibition upon both the Federal and State authorities.

The principal argument made against prohibition is that it can not be enforced. This I deny. Every criminal enactment by Congress or by the legislatures of the several States can be enforced by conscientious and sympathetic public prosecutors. Of course, if the prosecuting attorney does not favor the legislation and does not have the proper cooperation by the marshals and sheriffs of the respective communities, he is greatly hampered in the enforcement of the law. Generally speaking, those who argue that the law can not and has not been successfully enforced do not want it enforced. They want to embarrass the enforcement officers in every possible way.

On the other hand, some enforcement officers, in an effort to find an excuse for their failure to rigidly enforce the law, urge that they do not have sufficient funds to employ subordinate officers or that the funds appropriated are not sufficient to bring into the service employees of a high type.

It is also argued that funds have not been available for patroling the Canadian and Texas borders. This amendment provides the funds and places them in the hands of the President of the United States and charges him with the responsibility of the enforcement of the prohibitory law. He need not spend more than is deemed necessary to give the enforcement of this law a fair test.

My record in favor of prohibition is well known throughout my State. I have always lived in a part of the State of Oklahoma, which was formerly the Indian Territory, where prohibition has always been in force.

I appeared before the committee when statehood was being urged for the present State of Oklahoma in support of the provision requiring prohibition in eastern Oklahoma for 21 years from statehood, and when this was submitted to the people by the constitutional convention I voted for state-wide prohibition.

Since I have been in Congress I have consistently voted for all prohibition measures and for all appropriations reasonably necessary to enforce the prohibitory law.

I am the author of an amendment added to the Indian appropriation bill approved May 25, 1918, which had for its purpose assisting the officers in eastern Oklahoma to enforce the prohibitory law. It put teeth into the law and made the possession of intoxicating liquor in the Indian country a criminal offense.

I voted for prohibition for the District of Columbia and I am in favor of the present amendment, because I believe that this additional appropriation is reasonable and necessary to enforce the law.

I voted to override the President's veto of the Volstead Act. If this amendment is adopted and vetoed, I will vote to override it.

My judgment is that inferior courts should be established or the number of commissioners authorized to be appointed by the Federal courts enlarged and these commissioners given jurisdiction over first-offense violations of the prohibitory law. Second. I favor making a distinction between the possession of intoxicating liquor and the manufacture or sale of it for profit. If the inferior courts were given this jurisdiction and the violators of

the prohibitory law were tried as soon as apprehended, it would greatly aid in the effective enforcement of the law.

Everyone knows that those who make and sell liquor for profit hope to avoid conviction by delays through postponement of their cases, in the expectation that in the meantime witnesses will have removed from the country or disappeared, and that the Government will be without testimony to convict them.

The vast majority of the violators of the law have no defense other than to rely upon technicalities and the inability of the Government to make out its case. If they were brought to trial immediately the witnesses will not have disappeared and their memories will be fresh and convictions will be almost certain.

For the second and each subsequent offense I would increase the penalty, first to one year in the penitentiary, and second, to a minimum of not less than three years. Enact such a law and place at the head of the enforcement bureau a man in sympathy with it and one in whom the public has confidence, and then appoint or elect prosecuting officers and marshals and sheriffs who are really in sympathy with the law, and with sufficient funds appropriated the law can be enforced.

It is urged that because many cases are made public in which the law has been violated and no convictions had that therefore it should be repealed. This is true of every criminal statute, State and Federal. Because criminal statutes are violated is no justification for their repeal.

I favor prohibition because I believe that it is best for the individual himself to abstain from the use of alcoholic beverages, and in proportion as you make it more difficult to secure, the less amount, of course, will be consumed. Persons addicted to the use of alcoholic liquor, who drink occasionally, will at times, unfortunately, drink to excess, and this leads to a loss in efficiency and earning power of the individual. It is an economic waste.

You no longer see officials or prominent men intoxicated in public. Attorneys are not employed who drink to excess. No one wants to ride on a train in charge of an engineer who drinks. Physicians and surgeons are no longer trusted or their services availed of who are known to be habitual users of intoxicating liquors. And these illustrations apply to all professions, laborers, and classes without exceptions. Why? The people know they are unsafe and not reliable. The public is being educated away from the use of intoxicants.

I favor prohibition because I believe alcoholic liquor destroys, in a large measure, the happiness and contentment of the home; wages are spent upon drink which should be used to clothe, feed, educate, and otherwise maintain the family; and I think no one will deny that the excessive use of alcohol does tend to destroy the happiness of the home.

I favor prohibition for the reason that, in my judgment, alcoholic liquor is directly or indirectly the cause of a very large percentage of the crimes committed and is responsible for the very great cost of our criminal courts. Most of the serious criminal cases in my district, involving assault with intent to kill, murder, or manslaughter, are directly traceable to the excessive use of intoxicating liquor. I am sure the same is true in a large measure in every section of the country. These trials are a very heavy burden upon the taxpayers of the country.

The Volstead law enacted to vitalize the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution and all amendments thereto should receive the support of every officer—municipal, county, State, and Federal—from coast to coast.

Alcohol tends to blunt the moral sensibilities, weakens the mental powers, and lessens personal efficiency. I think no one can successfully controvert that statement. It does not bring sunshine and happiness to the home, but distress and misery. Its use leads to excessive indulgence and this does not increase the attendance at Sunday schools or churches. The day of the corrupting influence of liquor and saloons has gone never to return. We must educate our children, not debase them. Let us give them the advantage of our full earning power instead of dissipating our earnings in the purchase of alcohol and passing our time in idleness.

I have never heard or read a satisfactory defense of use of liquor. The following are usually urged:

The first defense is that it interferes with our personal liberty, which, of course, is unsound, if not for our best interest, and no one contends that the use of liquor is; and, second, that it can not be enforced and this, I repeat by way of emphasis, I emphatically deny; and, third, the question of the expense in the enforcement of prohibition is urged, which, of course, is nothing as compared with the expense of our criminal courts added to the economic waste due to loss of efficiency and earning power of the individual; and, fourth, the loss of revenue to the Government, and if we are correct in our belief that alcohol tends to debase instead of uplift the individual, the Government should not be maintained through revenue derived from this source.

It is being urged through speeches made on the floor of the House and in the Senate, and throughout the country, that there is much sentiment for the modification or repeal of the Volstead Act, and many bills to that effect have been introduced from time to time and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Their introduction enables various organizations to solicit funds for propaganda purposes.

I think this committee should promptly, each session, report one of these bills and place it upon the calendar for an early vote at the beginning of each session. If this were done, in my judgment, it would disclose that there is only a handful of Members favorable, upon a direct record vote, to the modification or repeal of the Volstead Act, and the public would not then be longer deceived. Until this show-down is had, the sentiment in Congress will continue to be misrepresented on the floor of the House, through the public press, by letters, and by individual conversations. In my judgment there would be an end to the solicitation of funds for the repeal or modification of this law if a report were made by the Judiciary Committee and a record vote had in the House early after the meeting of each session.

As long as this amendment is a part of our Constitution it is the duty of Congress and of the various State legislatures to enact legislation and appropriate funds to insure its rigid enforcement.

I sincerely trust that the Senate conferees will not yield upon the Harris amendment and that this amendment may yet be brought back to the House by the House conferees so that a direct test vote may be had upon it. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen of the committee, I am almost tempted to apologize for talking on a subject which was considerably discussed yesterday afternoon, and which was again discussed a few moments ago by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS]. Yet the subject is so much on everybody's tongue as to excuse my offering it again for discussion. I refer to prohibition.

I desire to approach this subject from a somewhat unusual angle and to point out to you some of the peculiarities, some of the very anomalous circumstances connected with the enforcement of these prohibitory statutes.

I hold in my hand a bulletin, No. 1075, issued by the United States Department of Agriculture as a farmers' bulletin. It tells those who might read it how to make nonfermented grape juice in the home. If you will peruse the pages of this bulletin you will find the most up-to-date method of how to make not only nonfermented grape juice, but how to make wine.

Mr. TUCKER. What distillery issued that?

Mr. CELLER. No distillery issued it; it is issued by the United States Department of Agriculture. You can get these bulletins at the Department of Agriculture, and you will find that it tells you of the old methods of making wine. It tells of the new methods of making wine—how to crush the grapes, how to ferment the grapes, how to decanter the juice, how to bottle it, how to increase or decrease the degree of fermentation. It gives you the whole history of the process of making wine. You are not told with any degree of emphasis where to stop as far as alcoholic content is concerned. You are not told when to stop the process of fermentation. You simply let your conscience be your guide.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I am glad to yield to my friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. McKEOWN. I wonder if the Government is putting out this bulletin to offset the one put out by the wine makers telling you how not to make wine.

Mr. CELLER. Well, I am not aware of that. One thing is certain, this bulletin is surely encouraging wine making in the home. Now, it is difficult to understand how in one breath we endeavor to appropriate millions of dollars in what we consider to be an earnest attempt to enforce prohibition and in the other breath countenance the issuance of bulletins of this sort from the Department of Agriculture. The one action is surely contradictory of the other. The "drys" ought to be the first to rise in wrath against the issuance of these bulletins. They are outrageously silent.

What has been the result of these bulletins? I have gathered some data from the Department of Agriculture on the grape production, and I find that in my own State of New York and in the State of California a great impetus has been given to the production of grapes, not for table use, but primarily for the use of manufacturing wine. I presume, as the result of these bulletins which are scattered broadcast throughout the

Nation, this great encouragement has been given to the art of grape growing, grape crushing, and wine making. The Department of Agriculture, Division of Crops and Estimates, gives the following startling increases in grape production:

	1918	1919	1920	1921
California	1,184,000	1,330,000	1,273,000	1,100,000
United States		1,561,000		

	1922	1923	1924	1925
California	1,706,000	2,030,000	1,535,000	1,912,000
United States	1,981,171	2,227,395	1,777,722	2,064,085

	1926	1927	1928
California	2,114,000	2,364,000	2,178,000
United States	2,423,413	2,605,238	2,636,076

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Is the bulletin dated; and if so, what date does it bear?

Mr. CELLER. This bulletin, Farmers' Bulletin 1075, was issued October, 1919, and revised September, 1925. I will say, for the edification of the gentleman or any of his constituents, that he or they can get all of these wanted down in the Department of Agriculture.

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

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman remarked that it seemed peculiar that the Government should issue a pamphlet like that, telling how to make grape juice and wine and at the same time try to enforce a law against the making of wine.

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Is that much different from the practice of the Government in that it seeks to prosecute the bootlegger, and yet if the bootlegger makes some money, makes him make a return and pay taxes to the Government?

Mr. CELLER. No. I think the gentleman is correct in his observations, and the question answers itself. The practice in both instances is indefensible. Let us take another angle of the situation, and I assure you that I do not in any wise intend to be personal in my observations. I respect the wishes of any man or woman in this House with respect to their attitude toward prohibition. I have my own views and I desire at times to express them. What is the situation with reference to the production and manufacture of corn sugar in this land? Prior to prohibition there was not very much use apparently for corn sugar, because, as you know, corn sugar is the main ingredient in the manufacture of what is known as "white mule," "moonshine," "rot gut," or "third rail," beverages that used to be in common use among the negroes of the South, but which now are in quite common use the entire country over.

In 1909 there were in round numbers 159,000,000 pounds of corn sugar manufactured. In 1914 that had increased to 174,000,000 pounds. In 1919, at the advent of prohibition, it decreased to 137,000,000 pounds, only to jump, in 1923, to 537,000,000 pounds, and to 580,000,000 pounds in 1925. In 1927 the figures almost doubled. There were produced in this country 904,830,682 pounds of corn sugar. Let me tell you something very interesting about corn sugar: In 1922 a process was invented whereby they could crystallize corn sugar. Theretofore it had to be shipped, if shipped at all, in a semiliquid state, very much like molasses. In 1922 an entire new industry was developed, and its great growth was abetted by prohibition. They were able to crystallize corn sugar and send it forth in cans. It is now shipped dry, crystallized, and air-tight. That is why you have this tremendous increase in the production and sale of corn sugar. What do the people do with this corn sugar? It is notorious that all over the land they are learning in the homes how to distill spirits out of corn sugar by the mere addition of yeast and water and the distillery process. The obnoxious part of the "moonshine" process was always the dreadful, foul smell of the mash. The smell always led to detection. The crystallized corn sugar does away with the mash and its awful smell. To the corn sugar Mr. Home Distiller adds yeast and water and rye; sometimes he uses barley or malt. The mixture is allowed to ferment and then is run through a distillery apparatus, which is readily purchased in a malt and hop store, a department store, a mail-order house, or in the chain-grocery store. And so we are fast developing into a home-distilling Nation. I forgot to tell that caramel is used for coloring.

The following figures from the United States Bureau of the Census concerning corn sugar tell a tale that compels attention. The legitimate uses for corn sugar are limited to baking, ice cream, and confectionery trades. Those trades could not possibly absorb the staggering number of pounds of corn sugar now produced. Corn sugar has become the handmaiden of the bootlegger. It is strange that while the per capita consumption of sugar is declining the per capita consumption of corn sugar is tremendously increasing. I am told that "racketeers" and "higher-up" bootleggers are fighting for control of distribution of corn sugar in the Central and Western States.

United States production of corn sugar (also known as dextrose and grape sugar)

[United States Bureau of the Census]

Year	Pounds	Per cent of increase or decrease	Value	Per cent of increase or decrease
1909	159,060,478		$3,620,816	
1914	174,368,818	+9.63	3,765,515	+3.99
1919	157,276,442	−9.19	9,314,977	+147.37
1921	152,055,872	−3.32	4,542,238	−51.24
1923	537,909,513	+235.75	16,797,033	+269.79
1925	580,370,043	+7.89	19,505,495	+31.40
1927	904,830,682	+55.90	25,635,262	+16.12

Source: Census of Manufactures, 1927, U. S. Bureau of the Census.

You can not disregard these facts and figures. I appeal not only to the prohibitionists but to the antiprohibitionists of this House and elsewhere, and I hope you will take what I say in a kindly light. I mean nothing vindictive against prohibitionists. I want to see the laws of the country enforced. I want to do all in my power to have them enforced. I am just as desirous for temperance as any man or woman in this House, but we must not lose sight of these facts. They spell intemperance. We must not blind ourselves just because we happen to be on one side or the other of the prohibition question. We must not be impervious of the truth.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Does the gentleman know whether or not the bootleggers' protective association has applied to the Ways and Means Committee for an increase in the tariff to protect them?

Mr. CELLER. What is the situation with reference to another product in this country, and that is malt sirup? I could not get the exact figures from the Bureau of the Census or the Department of Agriculture, but I am told that in 1927 there were produced in this country $30,343,478 worth of malt sirup. That is the wholesale price. I do not care where you come from, from what city or hamlet or village, but you can go into any grocery store, you can go into any chain grocery store, you can go into any department store in the larger cities, and buy malt sirup, or you can order it from any mail-order house and receive it in cans. Before prohibition there was not this tremendous demand for the sale of malt sirup. The only use to which I know malt sirup was put in those days was for flavoring in the manufacture of confectionery or ice cream, or it was prepared especially to give nutriment to feeding mothers. There are foods known as Mellon's Food and several others—and that has no relation to the Secretary of the Treasury—that contain this product, but there was no tremendous demand or use for malt sirup prior to prohibition. Now there is a tremendous demand for it. Every grocery store or delicatessen store throughout the land can supply you with it. What do the people do with it? I venture the assertion that there is more beer produced, home brew, in this land to-day than was produced by all of the brewing companies combined.

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

Mr. CELLER. When I finish my thought. The process by which home brew is made, because of this improved method of distribution and sale of malt sirup, is quite simple. At this very moment in thousands of homes throughout the land they are taking these cans of malt sirup and dumping their contents into crocks or stone jars or boilers, or even bathtubs, and by the addition of raisins or yeast and water, by bottling it, by putting it into the ice box for 10 days, are producing what is known as "home brew." It usually contains 4 to 8 per cent by volume of alcohol. It is a very serious situation, something that should compel your interest, be you dry or wet. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does the gentleman not think that by his last remarks he is contributing considerable information to the uninformed as to how they may use this malt sirup?

Mr. CELLER. Maybe no; maybe yes. I think it is information that is known to everybody in this room. I am simply giving you current history. It is known throughout the length and breadth of the land. I am sure the gentlemen know me too well to think I would in the slightest degree encourage law violators.

Mr. McKEOWN. Would the gentleman be in favor of forbidding the use of grapes, of stopping the sale of malt sirup, and such things, so as to try to have the prohibition laws enforced as the gentleman would like to see them enforced?

Mr. CELLER. No; these articles have legitimate uses. I stressed this because there seems to be an inherent, fundamental desire for those things. The people will get them whether you have prohibition or not. They will, in order to get the drink you deny them, go to these extremes. You can not stop them. No law can curb them. That is why you have this tremendous increase in the production of malt sirups, corn sugar, and such like.

Mr. UPDIKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I will.

Mr. UPDIKE. I was very much interested in the gentleman's figures. I just wondered if the gentleman from New York had any figures in reference to the amount of liquor destroyed by prohibition-enforcement officers during the period of time he has set out here?

Mr. CELLER. I do not doubt the enforcement officials in some parts of the country are doing the best they are capable of, and that a good number of barrels of whisky and barrels of beer, or whatever it might be, are being destroyed, but that does not change the situation. I am giving these facts for your mental digestion so that you who may not agree with me may offer something constructive, change a law which has not succeeded in driving out "drink." I think I am bringing to bear upon this subject something of a constructive nature by bringing these facts to your attention. There is another vexatious proposition connected with the question. I refer to diplomatic liquor. I addressed a communication to the Commissioner of Prohibition, or rather to Doctor Doran, of the prohibition-enforcement office, and I asked him whether he would be willing to give me the amount of liquor imported into this country by the attachés and the consular and diplomatic agents accredited by foreign governments to this country, and he said that he could not give me those figures although that in our customs regulations, to wit, 405, there is the following:

SEC. 405. Members and attachés of foreign embassies and legations may receive articles imported for their personal or family use free of duty upon the department's instructions in each instance which will be issued only upon request of the Department of State. Collectors will take charge of all packages addressed to diplomatic officers of foreign nations which arrived in advance of the receipt of instructions for free duty. Notifications of such arrivals should be sent to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Now, the practice under that regulation is for the embassy to indicate to the Department of State that somebody in the embassy, or a number of persons in the embassy, desire to import some liquor, and then the collector at the particular port is notified that that liquor, or whatever it may be in the way of intoxicating beverage, shall come in duty free. The collectors have the figures. They compile them and send those figures to the customs department in Washington and that department in turn sends them to the Prohibition Commissioner. Now, heretofore we have always been able to procure the amount of importations of all goods and commodities which were made by the diplomats or attachés of the consular offices. We are told, for example, how much olive oil is imported, how much clothing, how much household goods, but we can not find out, I have not been able to discover, how much liquor they import. Why secrecy? Is there any need for secrecy in that regard? There must be something wrong if we are unable to get those figures, and I am sure you will all quite agree with me that they should be made public. They always were made public prior to prohibition. Why not now? Why should they be hidden from Members of Congress at this present day? Well, it seems to be quite notorious that you can get embassy liquor of all sorts. Benedictine and crême de menthe, vermouth and crême de cocoa, Haig and Haig and Dewar's Scotch, Bushmills Irish, Martel and Hennessy brandies and Canadian Club whisky, and many other foreign brands, quite readily in the city of Washington. It spills over legal barriers, and you can readily procure it in Washington.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CELLER. In a moment.

Now, trucks gather these diplomatic importations at the Canadian border, at Baltimore, and New York, and they come to Washington under Government escort. There, by a house-to-house delivery the embassies are furnished with these delectable refreshments.

We are told that just before Christmas several hijackers attacked one of these trucks and were about to deprive the diplomatic community of about $10,000 worth of Christmas cheer. And, furthermore, see how far this diplomatic immunity is carried. I recall an instance where, in one of those dance or amusement places in Washington called the Madrillon, one of the clerks or attachés of an embassy had liquor on the table. He was accompanied by one or two female companions. The agent seized the liquor. The attaché was apprehended but soon let go when he declared his identity and claimed immunity. His ladies were held. His two companions suffered when he, with diplomatic immunity, went unpunished. There is something fundamentally wrong about this discrimination. Surely it is undemocratic to deny to one group of persons that which is not denied to another group of persons. Both drys and wets can subscribe to that principle. I am sure no harm will be done to diplomacy if we take away this immunity. Our citizens want the same privileges or immunities that everyone here enjoys.

Mr. MICHENER. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman believe in the eighteenth amendment?

Mr. CELLER. I believe in the eighteenth amendment if it can be enforced. I believe in the principle underlying it—namely, temperance. Since it can not be enforced we should drop it. But since we have tried it for 10 years and have been unsuccessful there must be something wrong with it. I am trying to get some sort of modification. After 10 years we must come to the conclusion that the eighteenth amendment is unenforceable.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman, as a very intelligent man, has taken much interest in this matter, and has taken up much time in the House in the last few years in discussing this question. Does the gentleman believe in the principle involved in the eighteenth amendment?

I say, evidently the gentleman does not believe in the principle involved. The next question is this: The gentleman has concerned himself, as I suggested, with this question. Have his efforts been for the purpose of enforcing the law or for the purpose of discrediting the law?

Mr. CELLER. I offer these facts for whatever they may be worth to anybody in this Chamber or to the whole country. To my mind the only conclusion you can come to from facts of this sort is that the eighteenth amendment is unenforceable.

Mr. MICHENER. But the gentleman——

Mr. CELLER. I refuse to yield further. I am sorry. But I think I have answered the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman evidently has missed the point of my question. Certainly he has not answered it. I admire the gentleman's courage. I asked him whether his efforts have been directed to the purpose of assisting the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment or to breaking down and destroying it?

Mr. CELLER. I can not after its 10 years of failure subscribe to any kind of a doctrine or any kind of plan or procedure that seeks to enforce the eighteenth amendment, because all the money used to enforce it would be absolutely wasted and hopelessly expended. I think it is like a rope of sand. Whatever funds you might appropriate would be just as useless as endeavoring to whisper in the ear of a corps or pouring water through a sieve.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Would the gentleman be in favor of severing relations with those countries that import those liquors?

Mr. CELLER. I do not think we have to do that. If it is a matter of treaty negotiation, I think we have a right to call upon the President with the advice and consent of the Senate to deny those privileges to diplomats which are denied to me or any other citizen.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The same rights are afforded here to a representative of a foreign country as are accorded to our representatives by foreign countries, as, for example, in the importation of Boston baked beans.

Mr. CELLER. No. If only a diplomat could import Boston baked beans, I contend that the other people there should have the same right; otherwise they would have just grounds for complaint.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has three minutes remaining.

Mr. CELLER. I would like to have seven more minutes. I have something that I want to disclose.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I give the gentleman seven more minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I have brought here something to show the anomalous situation of which I told you at the inception of my talk. I show you here [exhibiting a bottle] something called a "tonic." It is produced and bottled in my town in great quantities. You can readily identify it in any drug store. It is alleged to be a "tonic"—maybe it is. It is good to drink. It is made from white Tokay wine and is bottled under a permit—permit N. Y. H. 13369—authorized by the Commissioner of Prohibition. What a farce! What a joke!

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GREEN. I would like to inquire of the gentleman what is in that product that he is exhibiting?

Mr. CELLER. I refuse to yield to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Florida is out of order.

Mr. CELLER. I do not offer this just to be smart or even facetious. I am quite serious.

Mr. GREEN. I make the point of order that the speaker is out of order when he exhibits the contents of a bottle and does not tell us what is in it.

Mr. CELLER. I am going to tell the gentleman. I will say to the gentleman from Florida that I will not only tell him what is in it but offer him some if he wishes it. This is a wine product. It is nothing but white Tokay wine with a 20 per cent degree of alcohol, or 40 proof, as they call it in the trade, and there, I believe, is a slight trace of pepsin in it. It tastes very much like the famous French appetizer called "Dubonnet."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

Mr. CELLER. It is legal and it can be purchased in drug stores, grocery stores, department stores.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the gentleman is exhibiting something that is in violation of the law and in doing so he is violating the rules of the House. I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. About one year ago a similar matter was under consideration and the Chair has asked the parliamentarian to refer to it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman from New York inform the committee that it is being sold under permit?

Mr. CELLER. Yes; it is being sold under permit. It is a lawful product for that reason.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Tell your colleague it is sold under permit.

Mr. GREEN. I insist on the point of order.

Mr. CELLER. In order to quiet the gentleman from Florida——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend until the parliamentarian refers to the ruling directly bearing upon this matter, when an identical matter was under consideration a year ago.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard in opposition to the point of order which the gentleman from Florida makes, his point of order that the gentleman from New York, who now has the floor, is violating the rules of the House, to quote the gentleman from Florida's own words, because he has in his hands a bottle the contents of which the House is not informed. Now, it is no violation of the House rules for a speaker to offer an exhibit, whether or not the contents of the particular exhibit or the possession of it is a violation of law. That is the responsibility of the gentleman who now has the floor. I submit it is no more a violation of the rules to display a bottle than it is to display a map. The gentleman has already stated to the committee that what he has in his hands is sold under the law under a permit and the permit is stated on the bottle.

Mr. GREEN. But, as I understand it, the gentleman from New York in his speech has stated that it contains 20 per cent or more of alcohol and therefore it is an intoxicating beverage, and if that is the case I insist that the gentleman is out of order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Every tonic contains alcohol, even hair tonic. If the gentleman will give attention to conditions in his own State of Florida——

Mr. GREEN. I will say to the gentleman that my State is dry.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is rotten wet, and that is why you have all the people there.

Mr. GREEN. I beg the gentleman's pardon. He does not know conditions there.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I have seen them. I have been in your hotels and seen it served openly.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I want to impress upon the Chair the statement made by the gentleman from New York when he says this is a drinkable substance; that it contains 20 per cent of alcohol by volume, and that it is used as a beverage.

Mr. CELLER. No; I did not say that.

Mr. MICHENER. No other inference could be drawn from what the gentleman said. He said, in fact, it was wine; he named the kind of wine and stated it had a slight tinge, as he said, of pepsin. Therefore it certainly would be intoxicating.

The Chair, I hope, is able to take judicial notice of the fact of what is or is not intoxicating, and if the Chair follows the holdings of the courts in this land to-day, he will conclude that what the gentleman holds in his hands is intoxicating. I insist that if it is intoxicating and that if it is in violation of the law of the land, to possess an intoxicant for beverage purposes, that it certainly is a violation of the rules of the House to bring that which is a violation of the law of the land into the House, and openly proclaim that he has in his possession and that there is being sold throughout the land a thing which is in violation of the law.

Mr. CELLER. May I be heard on the point of order, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. CELLER. Yes; I will be very brief.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to bring anything of an intoxicating nature into the House if it is a beverage, but as I said at the inception of my remarks this is a tonic, and that is clearly indicated upon the label on the bottle, where it is stated that it is a constitutional tonic; an appetizing, blood-building preparation. It happens to contain 20 per cent by volume of alcohol, but, as I stated, it is medicated with pepsin or peptonoids. There may be only a small trace of pepsin, but yet it is sufficiently medicated so that they have a permit. Thus, since it bears the seal of Government approval or "permit," it is perfectly legal to buy, sell, carry, drink, and bring it into this House.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. May I say to my colleague that if he does not watch his exhibits they will get into the hands of the drys and he will lose them.

Mr. BEEDY. I make the point of order that the gentleman is out of order, inasmuch as he has not addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained and the gentleman will be seated. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has the floor on the point of order.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, as I endeavored to state before I was interrupted in an unparliamentary manner, I assure you I have no intention to bring anything into this House which might be deemed unlawful. This exhibit, as I said at the inception of my remarks, was issued under a permit that came out of the office of the Commissioner of the Prohibition Department. It is just as lawful, therefore, as any medicated product that contains alcohol that you could buy in any drug store. It just so happens I purchased this in a drug store in Brooklyn, and I purchased it as a tonic, and I was told it was a tonic, and subsequently I discovered that what was a tonic, and may be for certain purposes a tonic, is nothing but Tokay wine, a wine which we know to be fortified with brandy of a percentage by volume of alcohol of 20, medicated with pepsin or peptonoids.

Now, it just so happens that there is only a small amount, as I gather from my knowledge of chemistry and of these ingredients, of peptonoids, merely to give it flavor, a certain bitterness, probably to make it somewhat unpalatable, yet anyone tasting that beverage would have his appetite whetted for an additional quantity. It gives no sense of repletion like a food would give, and it may be unlawfully used as a beverage, but it is not an unlawful beverage. It may be abused in its use, but as it has been sold it is perfectly lawful.

But this is what I desired to convey to the membership of the House. Because of the absurdity of prohibition, the hopelessness of enforcing it——

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman is not addressing himself to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will confine himself to the point of order.

Mr. CELLER. I have concluded, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard very briefly on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Whether this exhibit is permissible on the floor depends on the character of the exhibit and not on what the gentleman from New York thinks or says it is. This is a medicine, sold in the open market, and with the approval of

the United States Government, under a permit issued by the Internal Revenue Bureau. If that is the case, there is no reason for barring it from the floor of the House or barring it from the possession of anyone. Because the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] makes assertions or allegations concerning it which are not proof or evidence of anything, that has no bearing, because the exhibit must stand on its own merits and on its own character.

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

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does not the gentleman remember the decision of last year when Doctor SIROVICH, a Member from New York, wanted to use certain exhibits here? It was not a question of what was contained in those exhibits, but it was a question of getting unanimous consent of the House to produce those exhibits on the floor here.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I do not know whether the cases are on the same basis or not.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I remember that very well.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York, in the course of his speech, has stressed the fact that it contains 20 per cent alcohol and that something was placed in it to give it an unpalatable taste. Then the gentleman mentioned that pepsin was mixed with it in order to make it a little more palatable, and the whole trend of the gentleman's speech is that the contents of this bottle are being used as an intoxicating beverage, and therefore I contend it is out of order.

Mr. MICHENER. And, if the Chair will permit, the very purpose in bringing it here, as stated by the gentleman himself, is to bring to the House the fact that there are being vended and sold in the country intoxicating liquors under misbrand. There could be no other purpose that the gentleman could have in bringing that remedy in here, any more than if he brought in a a pound of Epsom salts or any other medicine or remedy. His real purpose in bringing the matter here is to call to the attention of the House the fact that he holds in his hands a beverage which is in fact intoxicating and which is being sold in violation of law under the permit of and with the consent of the officers whose *duty it* is to enforce the law.

Mr. TILSON and Mr. BLACK of New York rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I understand that this was brought in and offered merely as an exhibit to illustrate some portion of the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. MICHENER. Oh, no.

Mr. TILSON. Perhaps, I was misinformed. I was out of the House when the gentleman began his remarks. But is not this the usual case of an exhibit, for which the gentleman would have to have unanimous consent, and that is all there could be to it so far as the rules of the House are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KETCHAM). The Chair is ready to rule. It seems to the Chair that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] has stated the real heart of the matter in respect to this point of order.

The Chair refers to section 427 of Jefferson's Manual where he finds this statement which seems to be controlling:

> A Member has not a right even to read his own speech, committed to writing, without leave.

And further, from section 891 of the rules, the Chair finds this statement:

> The reading of papers other than the one on which the vote is about to be taken is usually permitted without question, and the Member in debate usually reads or has read such papers as he pleases, but this privilege is subject to the authority of the House if another Member objects.

Objection has been made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] and it seems to the Chair that the statements from the manual and from the rules are controlling, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order, that if the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] objects to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] displaying this article the gentleman from New York must remove it, and the gentleman from New York will proceed in order.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, the point of order should have been raised when leave was impliedly requested. When exhibits are brought here, as the manual says, as a matter of course it is admitted unless there is objection; but objection is to be made, as all objections are, at the time the exhibits are offered.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KETCHAM). The Chair does not think the position taken by the gentleman from New Jersey is correct. The point of order was made as soon as the purpose of the gentleman was apparent. The point of order was made in proper time. The Chair sustains the objection raised by the gentleman from Florida, and the gentleman from New York will proceed in order.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, what has taken place after the point of order was sustained should be stricken from the RECORD.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LUCE). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. During the absence of the present occupant of the chair the then Chairman overruled a point of order and suggested that the gentleman from New York proceed in order. The gentleman [Mr. CELLER] having the floor has in his possession, as he has stated to the House, a bottle which contains a liquid substance which he says is 20 per cent alcohol; that it is potable, and is used as a tonic or beverage; that it is sold on the market, and he presents the bottle for the purpose of stating that the law is being violated; that he holds in his hand an article sold in violation of law.

Mr. CELLER. No, Mr. Chairman; I did not say that. I did not say it was unlawfully purchased or unlawfully sold or that it was potable as a beverage or used in any illegal fashion.

Mr. MICHENER. That was the plain inference from the gentleman's statement. The point was made that if this substance was an intoxicating beverage, as contended by the gentleman when he presented it, it would be a violation of law for him to possess it openly and flaunt it to the public. Therefore, it was my conclusion that it would certainly be a violation of the rules of the House unless the House wanted to abrogate its rules by unanimous consent, and he has not asked unanimous consent.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully take exception to the characterization of my remarks by my colleague from Michigan. I did not say, nor did I by any inference indicate, that this liquid was unlawful. I clearly indicated that it was issued under a permit.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made to the display of the article in question. The Chair is ready to rule, and the gentleman from New York can not proceed until the article in question is removed from the Chamber.

Mr. CELLER. I assure you, my good friends, it was not my intention to bring anything of an unlawful character into the House. Let the bottle, of course, be removed. I am sure you gather the plain intent of my bringing the tonic here. It gives dramatic carriage to the idea of the hopelessness of prohibition, its hypocricy and deceit.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the ruling of the Chair has not been complied with; the article has not been taken from the Chamber, but has been secreted in the messenger's desk. [Laughter.]

Mr. CELLER. At the beginning of my talk—and I say this for the benefit of those who were not in the Chamber at the time—I said I desired in all sincerity and good faith to point out certain anomalous situations that cluster around prohibition. It was not my purpose to be facetious or smart, but to bring out facts, and I did show by the increased manufacture of malt sirup and corn sugar and wine that there were violations of the prohibitory statute all over the land. I ask, What are you going to do about it? I ask in all sincerity. I also answered some questions by saying that prohibition is not the solution, and if it is not we must effect some changes, that we must not blind ourselves to the facts that stare us in our face and leap out at us, as it were. I say that we must experiment and try something else. Only by trial and error will true temperance come. [Applause.]

Under extension of remarks I submit a statement obtained from the Department of Commerce showing exports from Canada and imports into the United States of intoxicating beverages.

Trade of Canada with the United States

[Exports from Canada to the United States]

Alcoholic beverages	1926	1927	First 10 months 1928
Total	$21,454,310	$23,772,829	$19,312,304
Ale and beer	5,521,902	5,455,841	4,209,012
Whiskey	15,475,270	17,884,043	14,788,879
Others	457,138	332,945	314,413

Is this not proof positive of a tremendous illicit traffic—a traffic in the face of all the absurd praises of prohibition? Notice the yearly increase. The total figures for 1928, which I was unable to procure, would show a tremendous increase over 1927. This vast quantity of liquor carefully kept track of by the Canadian Government through consular invoices flows into the United States despite a rigid border control.

An examination of the Balance of International Payments of the United States tells the same story. Assistant chief of finance and investment division, Ray Hall, Department of Commerce, in the pamphlet entitled "Balance of International Payments," 1926, said:

SMUGGLING OF LIQUORS

The official balance of payments for 1924 was the first to contain an estimate of illicit-liquor imports. This was based upon a careful study of the recorded imports and exports of liquor of border and distant countries. The total was estimated at $40,000,000. This, in the opinion of some officials connected with the Customs Service, was low; but some prohibition-enforcement officers, on the other hand, challenged it as too high.

In the official balance of payments for 1925 the same figure, $40,000,000, was adopted. The estimate is necessarily a rough one, but it will be adopted for 1926 as the net sum actually paid to foreigners on this account. According to official Canadian statistics, Canada exported to the United States during 1926 whisky valued at $15,475,270 and ale and beer valued at $5,521,902, and other alcoholic beverages, raising the total to $21,454,310. Smuggling out of Canada must have increased this figure. In addition, it appears that rum running along the Atlantic coast from Europe and the West Indies is a factor.

Mr. Hall "got the devil" from prohibitionists in publishing these truths, and the figures for subsequent years are not available to us. In the pamphlet entitled "Balance of International Payments, 1927," Mr. Hall says the following:

The last three bulletins on balance of payments have contained estimates of the sums paid to foreigners for smuggled liquor, as indicated by the recorded exports of liquor by border and other countries. A section of the press stressed these estimates to the exclusion of the more important results of the surveys, and certain public officers found ground to object to such publicity. Similarly there are objections to publishing "official" estimates of the smuggling of narcotics and other articles, of understatement of imports to evade ad valorem duties, or of loss by bad debts in foreign trade. Yet this group of items has an important influence on the balance of payments; its debits are much greater than its credits. The best way to meet the situation seems to be to bulk all the estimates in the group. By this method the writer concludes that, for the special purpose of a balance of payments, a debit entry should be made in the commodity group of items of about $189,000,000 in 1927 and of about $180,000,000 in 1926. Estimated payments by American exporters to foreign consular offices in the United States for consular invoice fees are also included in this debit entry; in some instances these fees are so high as to resemble taxes.

I herewith submit a letter which I wrote Prohibition Commissioner Doran and his reply thereto:

JANUARY 16, 1929.

Hon. JAMES M. DORAN,
Commissioner Bureau of Prohibition,
Treasury Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DOCTOR DORAN: I have searched in vain for data concerning the amount of wines and liquors imported into this country since prohibition for diplomatic uses.

Based upon international custom and comity, duties on goods imported by consular and diplomatic offices are remitted. The Treasury Department, through the collectors, keeps a record of those importing and the amount and kinds of goods brought in.

Section 405 of Customs Regulations is as follows:

"Members and attachés of foreign embassies and legation may receive articles imported for their personal or family use free of duty upon the department's instructions in each instance, which will be issued only upon request of the Department of State. * * * Collectors will take charge of all packages addressed to diplomatic officers of foreign nations which arrive in advance of the receipt of instructions for free duty. Notifications of such arrivals should be sent to the Secretary of the Treasury."

The publishing agency for giving out the information concerning diplomatic imports is the Department of Commerce. That department gives me the following figures of imports for diplomats and consuls, exclusive of liquor:

Fiscal years:	Value
1919	$67,309
1920	72,891
1921	47,904
1922	34,339
1923	33,486
1924	45,565
1925	69,150
1926	36,353
1927	83,133

The above merely includes clothing, olive oil, household effects, etc., but no liquor. The Department of Commerce says it can not publish liquor imports because it has been refused the information by both the Bureau of Customs and the Prohibition Bureau. It published the liquor data prior to 1919 because it received the data from the Treasury Department. Amounts were then inconsequential because liquor was easily purchased here prior to prohibition.

Why the secrecy? Why the concealment? Is the amount now imported so staggering? Will publication cause a scandal?

I have discovered that most of the liquor comes by way of Baltimore—the nearest port to Washington—and armed Government guards escort the trucks into the Capital City and deliveries are made at the embassies and homes of foreign officials in a sort of house-to-house delivery.

The Washington Post recently told how two highjackers imperiled the transportation of a truck load of rare wines and liquors destined to bring Christmas cheer to several legations.

These trucks, thus guarded by United States officials, are frequently seen on the highways from Baltimore and Washington. Some come down from Canada and New York under Government escort.

It is common knowledge that much of this diplomatic liquor trickles down the throats of many who do not wear the braids of diplomacy. Diplomatic liquor is peddled all over Washington.

There is a well-defined market for benedictine, chartreuse, crême de cocoa, crême de menthe, Paul Roger and Moet & Chandon champagne, as well as French Three-Star Martel and Hennessy brandies, Bushmill's Irish, and Haig & Haig, and Dewar's Scotch whiskies.

Not long ago at the Madrillon, a restaurant and dance place in Washington, prohibition or police officials broke up a table where liquor was used. I believe two girls were arrested and later released. Their escort was untouched. He claimed immunity as an attaché of an embassy. It was his liquor. I doubt the validity of such a claim as to liquor in a public place.

However, the incident shows the extreme to which diplomatic-liquor immunity may be pushed.

I desire for public purposes, therefore, the amounts of liquor imported by consular and diplomatic officials. We may watch them drink, but, unless you tell us, we may not know how much they drink.

Very truly yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

JANUARY 17, 1929.

The Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have received the letter of January 16, 1929, from your office requesting that you be furnished statistics showing the amounts of liquor imported by consular and diplomatic officers for beverage purposes since prohibition.

I desire to invite your attention to House Document No. 598, Sixty-seventh Congress, fourth session, from which you will note that similar information concerning the importation of intoxicating liquors by the members of foreign missions in Washington was requested of the Secretary of the Treasury in House Resolution No. 503, and that the Secretary of the Treasury replied under date of February 13, 1923, to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary that the Treasury Department could not properly give out any reports or other information as to importations of intoxicating liquors by foreign diplomatic representatives in view of their diplomatic status and the protection of persons and property which that entitles them.

As to the privileges and immunities to which a foreign ambassador, duly accredited to this Government, is entitled, I have to refer you to a letter dated February 20, 1923, addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives by the Secretary of the Treasury, which is also included in House Document 598, and which reads as follows:

"In permitting the free entry of intoxicating liquors consigned to representatives of foreign governments having a diplomatic status in the United States, the Treasury acts in accordance with the established principles of international law and the statutes of the United States, including the provisions of sections 4063 and 4065 of the Revised Statutes of the United States."

I am, sir, very truly yours,

J. M. DORAN, *Commissioner.*

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, if the preparation of the Navy appropriation bill and its presentation to this body were limited to the consideration of ships and provisions and fuel and docks and guns and armor and machinery and long columns of figures representing money, it would be a dreary and monotonous task that your committee would be called upon to perform.

Only to one whose vision is limited can the great supply bill for the Naval Establishment carry any such meaning. The bill that you are called upon to consider is concerned with engineering and scientific investigations that are of incalculable value to commerce and industry and progress; it is concerned with efficiency in use of coal and fuel oil, with the procurement of helium, with the discovery and adaptation of means of radio communication and the development of electrical energy; it works through its laboratories and experiment stations; it is concerned with health, and through its hospitals and medical staff is making its contribution to public welfare; it is concerned with programs of relief in hours of disaster on land and sea; it is concerned with navigation, with charting new lanes for commerce, and protecting and fostering trade; it is bound

up with the relationship of your country to other powers; it marks the measure of your country's responsibility in world affairs; it has to do with programs that mean peace or war, stability of civilization, or its destruction. The very money totals may be translated into terms of human life and human welfare.

The appropriations for the support of the Navy for the several years commencing with 1921 have been as follows:

Appropriations

Year	Direct	Indirect	Total
1921	[1] $433,279,574.00		$433,279,574.00
1922	[1] 410,673,289.23		410,673,289.23
1923	294,873,697.00	[2] $8,000,000.00	302,873,697.00
1924	294,456,528.00	35,450,000.00	329,906,528.00
1925	275,105,067.00	22,500,000.00	297,605,067.00
1926	302,862,378.00		302,862,378.00
1927	319,917,575.00	5,000,000.00	324,917,575.00
1928	338,826,626.22	5,945,000.00	344,771,626.22
1929	364,233,362.00		364,233,362.00

[1] Naval act only. [2] Maximum.

The pending bill carries as it is reported by the Committee on Appropriations $347,450,488 in direct appropriations, and in addition a reappropriation of $1,128,500, contract authorization in the amount of $10,000,000, and authorization to draw upon the naval supply account fund to the extent of $3,500,000.

With the exception of the current year's appropriation this is the largest bill for the support of the Naval Establishment since the conclusion of the treaty limiting naval armaments.

Should the cruiser bill that is pending in the Senate become a law more money may need to be added to the construction program, and unquestionably additional funds will be required through deficiency bills on account of our service in Nicaragua and the Orient; and probably increased expenditures on account of additional costs of submarine construction, where the earlier estimates as to costs have proven too low.

SHIPS IN COMMISSION

Next year we plan to have in commission approximately the same ships that we have in commission to-day, and to increase the number by five cruisers that are under construction and by two submarines of the V type.

OFFICERS AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL

The situation touching officers and enlisted personnel ought not to change greatly from year to year. We have at present, or as of September 30, 1928, 5,378 officers of the line as against an authorized strength of 5,499. The shortage as of that date was but 121 and the officer strength will be filled or practically filled by the graduating class from the Naval Academy of June.

Your committee believes that the officer personnel should be maintained at all times at approximately the authorized strength.

The enlisted personnel was fixed at 84,000 for the current year. For 1930 your committee has increased this number by 500 men, making a total provided for in the bill of 84,500. The increased number of men will not meet the number of men required for the complements of the ships that will be brought into commission. Rather your committee expects that the men for these ships will be found chiefly through withdrawing from active service the older cruisers and placing in reduced commission certain other ships, the wisdom of whose present full commission status is open to serious doubt.

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

Mr. FRENCH. I would like to proceed with my statement and then yield.

Mr. BRIGGS. My question is in connection with the gentleman's discussion of this point. The newspapers report that the personnel is being so cut down in this appropriation bill that they will have to retire a number of ships for the Navy. I would like the gentleman to give us some expression upon that.

Mr. FRENCH. Under the current appropriation the enlisted personnel of the Navy is 84,000. The bill that we are reporting proposes to add 500 enlisted men to the personnel of the Navy, making a grand total of enlisted personnel of 84,500. I have indicated that probably five cruisers will go into commission, two possibly in December and January, at approximately one year from now, and the other three at the close of the fiscal year, and these ships will require some 2,400 men. The two submarines will require nearly 100 men in addition. Naturally, as you cast up in your mind the number of men who will be required to man those ships, you will see that the new men—that is 500—will not meet the need. The rest of the enlisted men should be found in the present enlisted personnel. It will not be necessary to retain all of the ships in commission that are now in commission. In other words, we have at this time five cruisers of the so-called second line, old cruisers. Those cruisers ought to be withdrawn from the service, and if they shall be withdrawn there will be released more than 2,000 enlisted personnel who can be applied to the new ships that will go into commission. In addition to that, there are certain ships of the naval establishment that by another year ought to be withdrawn from the active commissioned status. It will not require very much reduction, and we have not the slightest doubt that in those ways the personnel can be found that can man the ships that will be in commission, including the ones that will be brought into commission upon their completion.

ALLOCATION OF EXPENDITURES

At the opening of my remarks I indicated that the bill that your committee is presenting at this time carries a less sum than for the current year. The difference is $14,895,364. Broadly speaking, this difference is on account of two items—increase of the Navy and major alterations of naval vessels. If the cruiser bill shall pass the situation may be altered.

For 1930, on account of the Welch Act, we have added $800,000, and we were required to include another $700,000 on account of wage adjustments in the different navy yards. For the Bureau of Engineering the bill carries $19,686,300, an increase of $264,600 over the current year. For the Bureau of Construction and Repair we are proposing $17,927,500, or an increase of $699,900 over the Budget for 1929. For the Bureau of Ordnance we have made a decrease in the amount of $282,650, and the figures carried in our bill represent an amount of $11,669,400.

Your committee has proposed money for the replacement of tools in navy yards to the extent of $1,500,000 in excess of the amount recommended by the Budget. We did this in the interest of what we believe to be soundest economy. It was disclosed to the committee that through the use of certain types of machinery and tools that are obsolete the cost of work in the placement of material has materially increased. We were advised that it was costing $2.94 in labor to put into place $1 of material, whereas with machinery and tools of modern type coupled with efficient labor, the labor cost could be reduced 44 cents for every dollar of material expended. When you think of the large expenditures that must be made annually under the Bureaus of Engineering and Construction and Repair, it is a matter of vital consideration that we give to these bureaus tools and machinery with which they can best accomplish their work.

The program that we have in mind of replacement will cover a period of two years; it will cost $3,000,000, but it will return, in our judgment, an equal amount of money value through bringing more nearly up to date the items of repair that must be met in the maintenance of the Naval Establishment.

BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS

That your committee recognizes the importance of the aviation arm of the service is apparent from the fact that for years the amounts carried for aviation are in large figures. The current appropriation is $31,956,000. The estimate for 1930 is $31,560,000. The committee recommends $31,360,000, which is $596,000 below the current appropriation and $200,000 under the estimate.

Of the funds proposed for 1930, $10,000,000 will be employed to satisfy contracts for planes ordered under the authorization contained in the 1929 appropriation, and the bill includes authorization for contractual obligations in 1930 to the extent of $10,000,000 in excess of the appropriation proposed for such year.

In addition to the direct appropriation for naval aviation there are many instances where expenditures incident to this branch of the service are lodged against other appropriations. For the past three fiscal years the entire expense incident to the air arm has averaged in excess of $44,000,000 per annum.

The fiscal year 1930 will be the fourth year of the 5-year 1,000 useful plane program authorized in 1926. The pending bill makes provision for the procurement of 273 additional planes to apply on the program, over and above 36 for the Naval Reserve, bringing the total of new planes purchased and to be purchased since the commencement of the program in the fiscal year 1927 to 1,124. When the program started there were 351 useful planes on hand and 288 on order. The predicted status at the end of the next fiscal year on the basis of the estimate is 910 planes on hand and 208 on order. The large wastage figures suggest that we have been proceeding too fast, if anything.

The bill includes $1,000,000 toward the construction of one of the two rigid airships authorized by the act of June 24, 1926. In explanation of what has been done and is proposed with respect to these dirigibles may I quote from the statement to the committee by the Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics:

Following the appropriation made for the fiscal year 1929 and based on authority contained in the act of June 24, 1926, contracts for two

rigid airships of approximately 6,500,000 cubic feet capacity each were made October 6, 1928, with the Goodyear-Zeppelin Corporation, of Akron, Ohio, the winner of the design competition and the low bidder. The contract price for the first ship is $5,375,000 and for the second $2,450,000, a total of $7,825,000 for the two, or $175,000 less than the limit of cost fixed by the statute.

The first ship is to be completed by April, 1931, and the second 15 months after trials of the first have been completed and the ship removed from the contractor's shed. Contract for the second ship, however, may be canceled without liability at any date prior to the preliminary acceptance of the first airship.

In accordance with the terms of the contract, the contractor is to be paid his actual costs as they are earned, following in this respect the same procedure as is customary in connection with contracts for other naval vessels. The estimated rate of these payments, based on a close study of probable labor roll and material expenditures, is approximately $150,000 per month, or a total of $1,800,000 for the fiscal year 1930. To meet this obligation it is estimated that $800,000 out of the $2,000,000 available for the current year will remain unexpended and will carry forward June 30, 1929, thus leaving the sum of $1,000,000 only to be supplied as a new appropriation for 1930.

PERSONNEL UNDER AERONAUTICS

The situation touching pilots in connection with the 1,000-plane program is not as satisfactory as we could wish.

Upon December 1 last, under the 5-year 1,000 useful plane program, we had 959 planes on hand and 192 on order, whereas on September 30, 1928, we had 520 officers qualified as pilots in both the Navy and the Marine Corps and enlisted-men pilots from both of these groups numbering 175, or a total number of pilots of 695.

On the basis of the figures that I have indicated, our program for the training of pilots is not keeping pace with the procurement of planes. Up to the present the main source of officer pilots for the Navy has been from the officer personnel. The number needed, however, is such that it can not be supplied from the officer personnel, and other ways must be found. The bill as it comes to the House from the Budget proposes a more liberal program for the training of reserve officer pilots, and for the coming year we are planning that 75 reserve pilots will be attached to the fleet. This will not meet the situation, but the plan proposed may point out the way for the solution of the problem.

THE NAVAL RESERVE

The pending bill does not propose material change in the Naval Reserve situation except as it pertains to the training of aviation pilots. The current appropriation for the Naval Reserves is $4,075,820. The Budget estimate for 1930 is $4,750,000. The committee is proposing $4,697,931, or $622,111 more than the current appropriation and $52,069 less than the estimate. The expansion proposed under this head is interrelated with the Navy's problem of developing pilots of the desired caliber in numbers sufficient for current and prospective requirements. Like the Army, the Navy, too, is looking beyond its officer school to supplement its officer-pilot personnel; but, unlike the Army, which has authority of law to commission as second lieutenants in the Regular Army qualified aviators of the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Navy, under present law, is restricted in the augmentation of its force of commissioned-officer pilots, outside of Naval Academy graduates, to yearly details to fleet air duty of such qualified Naval Reserve aviators as may consent to serve. This bill makes provision for 75 reserve-officer aviators to be so detailed during the fiscal year 1930, as against 50 the current fiscal year. It is this program and the plan to continue and possibly enlarge upon it that accounts for the additional funds proposed in the Budget and the pending bill.

The sum proposed in the Budget for the aviation branch is $1,684,834.

THE MARINE CORPS

I shall not need to discuss the program touching the Marine Corps as it is indicated in the pending bill. No material change is in contemplation.

We are carrying money appropriations for 18,000 men and for approximately the same number of officers as are provided for in current law, save as this number will be modified by attrition or by normal increase from time to time.

MAY WE REDUCE THE NAVY BURDEN?

After thus speaking somewhat of the general situation touching the Naval Establishment and indicating something of the sizable items and the programs provided for in the pending bill, I am going to ask this House to consider with me for a few minutes the question of our naval program as we look ahead.

In 1922 we entered into an agreement with other leading nations of the world for the limitation of armaments. Last week the Senate of the United States ratified the multilateral peace treaty, which has been referred to as the treaty for outlawing of war.

When I remind you, as I have done to-day, that the naval burden upon our people exacts an annual expenditure of something like $350,000,000, and when I point out to you that unless our naval programs shall be modified as we approach the years that are immediately ahead, our annual expenditure will be vastly greater than it is to-day, it becomes imperative that we pause and consider whether or not a better program may not be devised.

If the people of the United States and the people of foreign countries meant what they said when, through the means provided in the several countries in their organic acts, they ratified the multilateral peace treaty, may we not hope that the immediate corollary of this action upon the part of nations will be the lessening of the burdens of war that rest upon our peoples.

Unquestionably the peoples of the world recognize that by reason of natural resources, a population that is not crowding upon our area, the freedom that we have had from some responsibilities that have weighed heavily upon other nations, the people of the United States are in the strongest position financially and economically of all great peoples of the world. If this is true, then what I indicate in my remarks as a course that ought to be welcome to the people of our country ought to be welcome in even more impelling degree to the populations of Great Britain and Japan and France and Italy, the German-speaking peoples, and in fact to the peoples of all nations.

To-day the papers carry a statement by the chief lord of the British Admiralty, Hon. W. C. Bridgeman, indicating that Great Britain is prepared to go still further in reduction of armaments if other nations are prepared to do the same. Mr. Bridgeman says:

> I don't wish to criticize the number or size of anything America thinks necessary in the matter of cruisers, because I believe that the future peace of the world will be much safer in the hands of countries who have a generous confidence in each other than in the hands of scare mongers who try perpetually to make us believe there is grave risk of war.

I like those words from Mr. Bridgeman. They echo the thought that is in the minds of the thoughtful people on this side of the Atlantic. The people of our country generally and the people of Great Britain generally do not look upon these nations as even potential enemies. They look upon our nations as bound together by such ties of blood and community interests as will make war between them impossible. But even so, as Mr. Bridgeman has stated, when he says Great Britain is willing to cooperate with other nations looking to a reduction still further of armaments, we can not hope for a reduction by going alone. We can not attain reduction of armament of the world through the United States making an example and alone reducing. Nations have pride, and, whether it be right or wrong, this very element suggests that the program for naval armament reduction can best be carried forward by teamwork. It can best be carried forward by teamwork on the part of such countries as the United States and Great Britain and upon the part of such nations as were parties to the conference looking to the limitation of armaments that met in Washington nearly seven years ago.

Under the terms of the limitation of armaments treaty, page 3, article 21, a treaty that was entered into nearly seven years ago by the five nations of the world that at that time undoubtedly represented the overwhelming power of the world when measured from a military point of view, it is provided that a conference of all contracting powers shall convene as soon as possible after the expiration of the eight years from the coming into force of the armaments treaty. This conference will consider what changes, if any, in the treaty may be necessary to meet new developments. This conference will fall due in 1931.

As we look forward to that conference, what have we a right to expect?

The treaty that it will be called upon to consider did not undertake to limit the number of types or the tonnage of all the types of naval craft. In tonnage the treaty referred to battleships and aircraft carriers alone. But the treaty went further and limited the caliber of guns that could be borne and the numbers that could be carried upon other types.

REPLACEMENT COST

The replacement cost of ships of the Naval Establishment of the United States, in a rough way, may be said to be upward of $1,200,000,000.

There is pending to-day in the Senate the cruiser and aircraft carrier bill under the provisions of which, if it shall be enacted into law, there will be added values of $275,000,000. You will

then have a grand total of approximately $1,500,000,000, representing an investment in naval craft by the time the conference will meet, after making allowances for the striking off of present values that in another two or three years on account of obsoleteness or obsolescence will need to be removed.

This brings me to the question, What is the life of a ship? and, necessarily, the question that goes with it, What is the replacement cost?

In the Geneva conference that was held nearly two years ago different lengths of life were suggested for different types of ships. Hon. W. C. Bridgeman, for Great Britain, suggested:

	Years
Capital ships	26
8-gun cruisers	24
Submarines	15

Our own representatives to the conference suggested somewhat shorter periods of life.

Now, as a matter of fact, the life of a ship is in part an arbitrary factor. When we speak of the life of a ship we mean the period of years within which the particular ship will be effective. We recognize that ships that are filled with delicate machinery or machinery that is subject to frequent change must necessarily have a shorter life than ships of sturdier type with less intricate machinery, and where everything pertaining to the ship has come to be more nearly standardized.

If we shall say, however, that the length of the life of a ship is 20 years, it is merely to say that the entire Naval Establishment of our country, if it be kept up to a standard of efficiency suggested by that period of time, will need to be replaced within a period of 20 years.

But I said that the life of a ship is in part arbitrary. Nations are competing with each other not only in numbers of types and in sizes and in range of guns, but in machinery, in devices of all kinds that have to do with greatest effectiveness of ships as weapons of war.

Upon the basis of an average life of a ship of 20 years, the annual replacement cost of ships of the United States to-day will average close to $60,000,000.

In three years from now by the addition of ships that you are proposing to lay down the annual replacement cost will have been increased by from $12,000,000 to $15,000,000, or an aggregate total of cost for replacement will have been attained by that time of more than $70,000,000 every year.

One of the things that I could hope the conference of nations that will meet in two years from now will take into consideration would be the fixing of an arbitrary age for the life of ships of various types. If the average life could be extended to 25 years—a proposition that would be as fair for one nation as for another—it would scale down the annual replacement cost 25 per cent, or reduce it $15,000,000 to $18,000,000 annually. This would be the effect upon the Naval Establishment of our country upon the basis of its present and proposed strength.

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

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Of course the replacement of cruisers now in contemplation will not occur until 20 or 22 years from now.

Mr. FRENCH. Of course.

Mr. BRITTEN. Then that expenditure will stop.

Mr. FRENCH. Of course, but the gentleman will also remember that other ships—ships of other types—will be approaching their age limit when these ships will be put into commission. In other words, in order that there may be an orderly program of shipbuilding and replacement going on, necessarily the newer ships will be put at the last end of the replacement program, while the older ones will undergo replacement first of all.

Mr. BRITTEN. And the gentleman I think will also agree with me that of all the cruisers we have, not counting the obsolete ones, none will be ready for replacement for 15 years.

Mr. FRENCH. That is true, but I am speaking of replacement that will occur for the entire Naval Establishment—battleships, cruisers, submarines, destroyers, aircraft carriers, everything that goes to make up the ships of the Naval Establishment.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Does the gentleman regard that this cruiser bill now pending in the Senate is a replacement program?

Mr. FRENCH. Personally I supported the bill a year ago upon the theory that it is part of a replacement program. I believe it is a replacement program, and I think that upon the adoption of that program we ought to wipe out and withdraw from our active fleet all of these old cruisers to which the gentleman from Illinois has referred.

REDUCING NUMBER WITHIN TYPES

When the armaments conference shall meet in some two years from now, why should we not reduce the numbers of ships of different types whose numbers and tonnage are fixed in the present treaty?

Of capital ships, the United States and Great Britain are limited to 525,000 tons each; Japan, to 315,000 tons; France and Italy, each, to 175,000 tons. This is the limit following the replacement program that will be complete in 1934. Pending that program, the tonnage of these nations will approximate in relative importance the figures given. Under the terms of the treaty, after 1931, a replacement program may be begun. Some of the older ships will be replaced by new. Three battleships will be withdrawn from our fleet, not to be replaced. Adjustment by replacement and withdrawal will be made likewise in the battle lines of other nations that are parties to the treaty.

But why do the United States and Great Britain require 15 capital ships each, and why Japan 9? Why not 10 each for the United States and Great Britain and 6 for Japan, and corresponding ratios for other nations?

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. In just a moment. If we were to do what I propose, having in mind that it would mean a reduction of five capital ships for the United States and the same for Great Britain, having in mind that the replacement cost of one battleship is approximately $40,000,000, it would mean a saving to the United States Treasury of $200,000,000 for replacement of capital ships alone, the same saving for Great Britain, and a comparable amount for all the other nations that may be parties to the compact.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does the gentleman believe that if the capital ships, so-called dreadnaughts, are reduced materially in number in all the navies in the world, that in the case of a government having a preponderance of merchant marine that government would not profit by such reduction?

Mr. FRENCH. Not necessarily. When you speak of reduction of capital ships you would have to equalize through maintenance of other types of ships. There is no question of the advantage to any nation of a strong merchant marine.

Mr. BRITTEN. Then, in the gentleman's estimation, call it suggestion; no, I will not say he is making a suggestion, but an argument; that by reducing the capital ships you are playing into the hands of Great Britain in having the supremacy of the seas.

Mr. FRENCH. No; not at all.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman spoke of the advantage to a nation of a preponderance of sea power in merchant marine, and that would mean Great Britain?

Mr. FRENCH. Other factors are to be taken into account—cruisers, destroyers, submarines, aircraft, and so forth. We would not run down merchantmen with capital ships. We would use other types and other means.

Mr. BRITTEN. Suppose we are inferior in cruisers to Great Britain; is not the gentleman playing into the hand of Great Britain in offering a suggestion of that kind to the House?

Mr. FRENCH. Not at all. I am offering a suggestion looking to the meeting of the next conference, looking to some elements that ought to be taken into consideration in the shaping of a program at that time. The question the gentleman raises will of course enter into the deliberations.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. TABER. I understand the gentleman from Illinois to mean that the merchant marine takes the place of capital ships in the line?

Mr. BRITTEN. The merchant ship takes the place of a gunboat in the destruction of commerce. The gentleman knows that as well as I do.

Mr. THATCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Gladly.

Mr. THATCHER. Would the gentleman state to the House his opinion on the time limit touching the 15-cruiser program, in the matter of their construction?

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman is referring to the present bill in the Senate?

Mr. THATCHER. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. Last year when the cruiser bill was being considered in the House I indicated my approval of the program of building 15 cruisers. I said at that time, however, that I was opposed to the time limit. I am opposed to the time limit now on principle, but I said at that time that I did not think that the time-limit feature should mean the defeat of the program. I shall tell you why. From the standpoint of economies in construction and unknown future contingencies the question of the time when a ship should be built should be left for the administration and the Congress from year to year to work out. The Congress now ought not to attempt to project itself into the situation to such an extent that it will undertake to control the amount of money that next year, two years from now, or

three years from now could wisely be put into a particular program.

Your question leads me to a problem that I had hoped to discuss, and I had just as well do so now; that is the question of orderly construction of and replacement of ships of the Navy.

REPLACEMENT UPON THE BASIS OF EVEN LOAD

For the current fiscal year the appropriation bill carried for the increase of the Navy $54,775,000.

The bill this year, including direct appropriations and reappropriations, contract authorizations, carries approximately $37,000,000.

It is quite likely that it will be necessary for the Congress to appropriate additional sums to complete certain of the fleet submarines. More than that, it is possible that money may be asked for the commencement of construction of ships under the cruiser aircraft program. It is quite conceivable that the amounts appropriated for increase of the Navy for 1930 will exceed $40,000,000.

In my judgment it is of highest importance that new construction work for the Navy shall go forward upon the basis of an even cost per year. We ought to anticipate the future as nearly as may be. We ought to arrange our replacement programs as nearly as may be that an even load of replacement may be carried at all times.

This principle, I believe, is in the interest of sound policy for two reasons.

It is in the interest of sound policy from the standpoint of international relationships. There is nothing more calculated to arouse the suspicions of rival nations than a vast expanse of building program of the Naval Establishment. Witness the rivalry in Europe that began some 25 years ago. Witness the apprehension as reflected by chancelleries and legislative bodies and editorials of leading papers and magazines of the world every time an unusual program is adopted by any nation. If a definite policy may be worked out and maintained looking to an even flow of replacement of ships of our Naval Establishment, and if that policy may be so reasonable as to meet with the natural accord of other great nations, it will go far toward maintaining friendly relations between the peoples of the United States and of foreign lands.

An even program of replacement should be adopted and followed for economic reasons. It should be adopted and followed in the interest of economy and efficiency in construction. It should be adopted in the interest of and for the greatest well-being of the men who are employed in all types of work in navy yards, from the skilled designers and technical forces, upon the one hand, to the skilled artisans and craftsmen upon the other.

It is nothing less than disastrous for fluctuations to occur in the steady run of work of a type that requires training and skill and where it is not easy for those who are trained and acquainted with the work to adapt themselves to other lines in event of a slack period, and when it is quite impossible in a short period of time to build up an adequate personnel with any degree of fitness and skill for the carrying forward of the work.

When the World War came to an end there were something like 25 private shipbuilding establishments in the United States of rather sizeable dimensions. We had something like six navy yards under the Federal Government that were capable of carrying forward ship construction of types up to and including the cruiser and a less number that were capable of building ships of the first line. Then what happened?

Ship construction in the United States almost came to an end. We have to-day less than one-half the private yards in the country that we had 10 years ago. The navy yards of the Government reduced their forces, dismantled their ways, put out of use and out of repair machines and tools that with the slowing down of construction work were no longer needed.

From the point of view of economy and efficiency, it seems that I need hardly do more than call to the attention of the House the situation that I have just outlined to indicate its utter ruthlessness.

Properties in navy yards were reduced in value. As to much of the property there was no salvage. Financial disasters overtook private builders. Men who were skilled in drafting, in designing, in working out details of construction, men who were equally skilled in the shops as artisans and craftsmen of all kinds were dismissed from their employment. They sought out new activities in which they could earn a living. Their places were not taken by new employees because there was no demand. Can you realize what such a revolution as that meant to an industry from an economic point of view?

Consider for a moment the other angle of the question. Suppose that after a program of no replacements being carried forward, it should suddenly be agreed that large replacements would be the order of the day. It could well be that the present shipyards under the Navy and under private ownership would not be adequate to carry forward the work. It might well be that new companies would be organized and new plants built. Whether or not this would be true, a reaction that inevitably would occur would be the reaction of competition of companies, upon the one hand, against the Government, and the Government against the companies, upon the other, for the assembling of forces in the technical room, in the drafting room, forces of machinists and technicians capable of carrying forward efficiently and well. More than that, new men of limited experience or no experience at all would be inducted into service in blocks too large to be properly absorbed.

To barely recite that which I have outlined is again to indicate the enormous inefficiency that would necessarily flow from such procedure.

Consider the question from the standpoint of the employee of the navy yard or of the private shipbuilding concern, and what I say now has reference to all employees. Navy-yard employees are a fine type of men. Those employees are of the type on which the best in our Nation rests. They are trained; they are skilled; they are industrious; they are men who love home; they have families, many of them, and probably most of them. They are not different from other people in their desire to acquire a property that they can call home. They want to be able to make plans for community life, plans for the education of their children, plans as they look ahead for advancing on through the years, during the rearing of a family, and plans for the laying by of something for the day when the earning power may be less.

To people such as I have just referred, a program of vacillation, a program that means the building up of navy yards during a period of two or three years only to see them dismantled during another period of two or three years is nothing less than tragic and disastrous.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. May I say, in connection with the very interesting and thoughtful statement the gentleman has made, and one which, I am sure, will commend itself to the business judgment of the House, that it is important to remember, if we are to keep an even load of replacements, to add each year proper types of ships to the Navy, so that we can be sure of replacing in an orderly way those types of ships needed to be replaced and not add simply certain types to the exclusion of all others.

Mr. FRENCH. The statement made by the gentleman is absolutely correct and it is pertinent in connection with the time-limit principle as applied generally. I think the gentleman will agree with me, however, that so far as the cruisers that are now proposed are concerned they do constitute a type which could fit into the replacement program most economically and, very wisely from the standpoint of national defense.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think that was the opinion of every member of the subcommittee.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. I have no desire to interrupt the gentleman's speech, because I am always interested in what the gentleman who now has the floor has to say on these subjects, but I would like to ask this question: Is there anything in the claim that by the time we get the 15 new cruisers built they will be obsolete? For instance, the statement is made, as published in the newspapers a few days ago, that in Germany they have invented a new kind of cruiser, one that is lighter than our 10,000-ton cruisers, one that carries more guns, one that carries 11-inch guns, and one that has a speed of 20 knots an hour.

It is claimed by those who oppose this cruiser program that with such new developments under way in other nations it is believed that by the time we could get these cruisers completed they would be obsolete. Is there anything in that expressed fear, in the opinion of the gentleman?

Mr. FRENCH. I would say in reply that the question of obsoleteness is always a relative one. As to some types of ships and some methods of warfare and defense changes occur very slowly and gradually while as to others changes occur very rapidly. I think that so far as our committee is concerned the most rapid changes of all are occurring with airplanes, where, for instance, airplanes that three years ago stood as the most approved and best type are to-day so well on the road of obsolescence that the department is putting them out of service as fast as they can be replaced. Now, what I say with regard to airplanes is not true with regard to cruisers. I am acquainted with the reports in the papers touching the type of cruiser that the German people are said to have developed. I do not know any more about it than the papers have indicated, but I would say that as to a ship of the cruiser type I would hope and believe that replacement on account of obsolescence would not be so fast as to make any cruiser that we would build in another several years, in the light of the information we now

have, so obsolete as to call for its being thrown into the discard before a reasonable time of life. That is a question, though, that will need to be met as we undertake the construction of the cruisers, and it is a question, too, that again goes back to the time element. The Congress and the administration ought to be free, as a matter of general principle, to take advantage of anything new that comes along to slow up, if necessary, and not be projected into a construction program just because it is said by law that certain ships must be built before a certain day. I do not think the change in major ships is going on so rapidly that we need to feel that obsolescence is going to overtake them and that they will be worthless within a comparatively short period of life.

Mr. ANDREW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. ANDREW. Are we not estopped and are not the British also estopped from constructing a cruiser with 11-inch guns, as the Germans are reported to be constructing? Are we not estopped by our agreement?

Mr. FRENCH. Under the agreement we could not put 11-inch guns on cruisers; no.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. If we adopt this program for 15 cruisers now and if some new invention should be made or some new type developed we could avail ourselves of that; could we not?

Mr. FRENCH. We could to the extent that it would be within the treaty. The particular feature, however, touching size of guns, we could not avail ourselves of because of the treaty.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman, of course, has confidence in the Navy Department taking advantage of every modern and new improvement in the construction of cruisers in the next three or four years?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, I feel that our engineers would be on their toes to see to it that our ships were the best that could be built.

Now, let me refer to the Dallinger amendment and the language of the pending bill which may have some effect upon that amendment. You will recall the language of the Dallinger amendment as being in substance to the effect that as applied to the proposed 15 cruisers the first ship and each alternate ship thereafter shall be constructed in a Government navy yard. I think my colleague, the author of the amendment, will say that is a fair summation. That amendment was added upon the floor of the House without an opportunity for any great consideration by the Members, without having had the benefit of the discussion and consideration that was given to the general bill itself by the committee that reported the bill and without being referred to the Committee on Appropriations which, generally speaking, looks after the economic factors in detail of the construction of craft for the Naval Establishment. We have carried language for several years, which language is the result of conferences between the conferees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, language that after a great deal of spirited discussion, exchange of suggestions and ideas, has finally come to be accepted as fair by the membership generally in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. That language, in general, is to the effect that no part of the moneys appropriated in the naval appropriation bill shall be available for the Naval Establishment for use or expenditure under contracts, for the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, of any naval vessel, machinery, article, or articles that at the time of the proposed repair, purchase, or acquirement can be repaired, manufactured, or produced in each or any of the Government navy yards or arsenals of the United States, when time and facilities permit, and when, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, such repair, purchase, acquirement, or production would not involve an appreciable increase in cost to the Government. In other words, under the language we have carried the advantage would rest with the navy yards of the Government, although the Secretary could avail himself of the opportunity of awarding a contract and of making purchases elsewhere if time and facilities permitted or if considerable economies could be effected by so doing. In the bill we have brought before you we have used the same language with this exception. We have said:

No part of the moneys appropriated and/or made available for the Naval Establishment for the fiscal year 1930 shall be used or expended—

And so forth.

Mr. DALLINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. DALLINGER. Then the object of putting the language you just speak of in the bill is to defeat the Dallinger amendment, which has been adopted by both the House and the Senate; is not that correct?

Mr. FRENCH. The object of it is to put all construction work for 1930 under a common program, a program that has been heretofore approved by the House and Senate, a program that your committee has approved as to all construction work for 1930. We could not, unless we used the language for the year 1930, bring under this provision all moneys that might be carried in other bills.

It is expected that money will be carried in the deficiency bill for certain naval work. Estimates were not ready for us to consider. The items had not been submitted to the Congress. I do not know that they will be, but if they shall be they will need to be considered by the deficiency subcommittee. We think that language ought to be carried in this bill that will permit the same principle to attach there. Again, if the bill providing for cruisers shall be passed before this bill shall become the law, then undoubtedly this language would attach to that bill and to the building program there so far as moneys carried for 1930 would be concerned.

In my judgment, I think that is the right course. I think it is the right course, as one who concedes that the navy yards ought to be given the preference, as one who thinks that an even load ought to be carried for the navy yards, as one who thinks, however, in addition to that, that this Government of ours ought to have the benefit of competition on the part of private industry of this country as industry competes with itself in the offering of bids for the construction of the ships for our Naval Establishment.

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

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for possibly 15 minutes, so I may round out my statement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. BLACK of New York. I am wondering if the gentleman anticipates, in case the cruiser bill passes, that in the deficiency bill there will be an appropriation for the plans or for the construction of any of the new cruisers?

Mr. FRENCH. I would not want to say anything on a subject I am not advised upon. I do not know.

Mr. DALLINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. DALLINGER. The gentleman speaks about the competition between private yards and navy yards. Is the gentleman from Idaho aware of the fact that when the navy yards have been asked to bid upon the construction of one of these Government vessels, the officials of the yard have been ordered in every case to add a certain amount to their bid for overhead, amounting in many cases to a very considerable sum—an amount of overhead that is carried in your regular appropriation bill anyway—so that the net saving to the Government or the net cost to the Government of these vessels has never appeared? Is the gentleman from Idaho aware of that fact?

Mr. FRENCH. I am aware that, for a great many years, there has been an indefinite line between the amount that should be charged up to new work and the amount that should be carried as overhead. I want to say very frankly I do not think the overhead for an establishment ought to be added into new work as a part of the cost of the new work when that overhead must be carried on anyway.

Mr. McMILLAN. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. McMILLAN. Is it true, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has said, that the department orders these yards in that connection to include that as a part of the cost in the construction of a vessel?

Mr. FRENCH. Certain yard expenses must be included.

Mr. McMILLAN. I think it is very important, if I may say so, that that should be considered and brought out if such a thing is the case.

Mr. DALLINGER and Mr. BRITTEN rose.

Mr. FRENCH. I yield first to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER].

Mr. DALLINGER. Is the gentleman from Idaho aware that after the debate in the House in which it was alleged that the cost of these vessels would be more in the Government navy yards than in private yards that the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee in the other body admitted the other day that after careful investigation by his committee, considering all the testimony, the net cost of the construction of these

vessels in Government navy yards is at least no greater than in private yards?

Mr. BRITTEN. Following the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] a few moments ago about the overhead, it is barely possible that the Navy Department directs its estimators in the navy yards to add a certain amount for overhead that goes into the actual construction of the ships and yet is applied throughout the yards. In other words, a man may do a certain amount of work on the construction of a new ship and a certain amount of his time may be employed on repairs in another direction; and the overhead that the gentleman refers to might include items like that and, I think, properly so.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is not overhead; that is actual cost.

Mr. BRITTEN. I think they construe it as overhead.

Mr. FRENCH. As a matter of fact, as has been suggested, and as I suggested a few moments ago, this question involves the meaning of words used differently by different persons. The fact of the business is there are certain overhead expenses that ought to be charged to any new project that would be charged if it were in a private institution, and ought to be charged in a Government institution. The overhead to which I referred a minute ago and said I did not think should be charged, is overhead such as is incident to the invested capital in the plant. I do not think such overhead should be charged. I do not think that the cost of maintaining the plant in a way that it would need to be maintained but for the new work should be added to the new work. On the other hand, the overhead apart from that, in a rough way, it seems to me it is fair to allocate upon the new work that is cared for within the plant.

Mr. NEWTON. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON. What is the practice of the Navy in connection with the salaries of the officers who are engaged in a Government yard in construction work? Is that figured as a part of the expense of construction?

Mr. FRENCH. I do not understand that it is.

Mr. NEWTON. It does not seem to me it should be, because their salaries are going to be paid anyway, regardless of the particular task they have in hand.

Mr. FRENCH. That is true, and that would fall into the first class to which I referred a moment ago.

Mr. NEWTON. Yes; I thought so.

Mr. FRENCH. As overhead that would go on just the same whether the new ships were built or not.

Mr. DALLINGER. In spite of the fact to which I have just referred, that the chairman of Naval Affairs Committee in the Senate admitted that the net cost to the Government of the construction of a cruiser was not greater than that in a private yard, is not the gentleman from Idaho aware that those in charge of the Navy Department are not disposed to build any of the proposed cruisers in a Government navy yard unless compelled to by statute?

Mr. FRENCH. I do not think that is true. I think the gentleman is entirely wrong. The fact is we have three cruisers to-day being built in the navy yards. More than that, in yards where we are not building cruisers, in order that they would be ready to do construction work, we would need to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars in improvements in order that they might be in shape to fabricate ships.

It may be a desirable thing to do that thing. I think probably it is. But it seems to me that the greatest service can be rendered by permitting the matter to be handled under the language your committee has proposed. We ought not to meet the question by removing competition, by saying that a navy yard shall build the first ship and that no private concern may compete, and a navy yard shall build the third and the fifth and every alternate ship throughout the list and private shipbuilding companies shall not compete. By such provision you will say, though not in words, that navy yards will not compete when it comes to building the fourth, sixth, eighth, and tenth and other even-numbered cruisers that will be built under the program. I want to see competition that will bring out the best in the navy yards and the best in private industry. Our country deserves it and the Navy deserves it.

Mr. DALLINGER. It ought to be fair competition, but it never has been.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. In the last construction of cruisers the navy yards from the east coast were not permitted to compete. The navy yards on the west coast got it all. New York got the hull of the *Pensacola*. There has been no competition between the navy yards and the private yards on the east coast, and that is the reason of this language.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. About what percentage of cost of a cruiser is chargeable to labor?

Mr. FRENCH. I think it would run about 65 per cent. Take the great repair work in the navy yards where we are doing work that is not altogether comparable, it runs about $1 material to $2.45 for labor, where we have good tools and labor that is efficient.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I yield.

Mr. KETCHAM. In that connection would the gentleman be willing to state the percentage of cost that is to be charged for overhead?

Mr. FRENCH. I can not make that statement.

Mr. KETCHAM. Can not the gentleman make it in connection with the proposed statement?

Mr. FRENCH. I do not know that it could be definitely made, because there may be varying factors attaching to different yards.

Mr. KETCHAM. The point is made that as between private yards and navy yards overhead is going on anyway in the navy yards, whether we build the ships or not. I thought it might be helpful if the statement could be made just what the overhead should be.

Mr. FRENCH. I do not think a statement that would be illuminating could be made. For instance, here is a large yard in which was originally invested ten or twenty million dollars. It may be that the yard has been running on a reduced basis for years. To build one cruiser might draw upon only a small part of the facilities of the yard. It would not be fair to charge as overhead any undue part of the expense of keeping up the yard for the building of that one cruiser. If several cruisers were built manifestly the overhead would be much less. Other yards might be used where the investment cost is much less.

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

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. All of the ordnance on these ships is made at the Government arsenals, is it not?

Mr. FRENCH. Not all of it; we purchase small-arms ammunition for target practice; we purchase a limited number of forgings, some powder, besides projectiles which we assemble in torpedo stations.

NAVAL AND MARINE ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN AREAS

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion may I refer to the activities of the Navy and Marine Corps in connection with special services that these organizations have been called upon to render.

During the last year, as the people of our country well know, the situation in the Orient has been such as to cause gravest concern and to require the presence of expeditionary forces from our country and other countries that disorders might be suppressed; that hasty and ill thought-out conclusions flowing from the volatile state of mind of a people undergoing revolution might not react unfortunately upon nationals of foreign lands, and that in general the peace of the world to the greatest extent possible might be maintained.

In carrying forward this program, ships of our fleet have been in Chinese waters with officers and enlisted men, and officers and men from the marines have rendered service in Tientsin, Peking, and Shanghai. These forces are being reduced, already instructions have been issued for the withdrawal of marines from Tientsin, and a happier situation apparently is in prospect for the people of the Republic of China. Words of praise can not express too highly the appreciation with which the American people hold the services of the officers and men of the Navy and the Marine Corps, as with dignity and forbearance they have extended helpfulness and good will in behalf of the people of the United States.

In Nicaragua the heaviest responsibilities have fallen upon the marines.

Prior to August, 1925, for 13 years there had remained on duty in Nicaragua a legation guard from the United States marines of about 125 officers and men. Shortly after the withdrawal of this guard, in August, 1925, troublesome times again set in and by September, 1925, there were difficulties and unrest of grave portent. In 1926 a revolution was under way on the east coast. Shortly thereafter a limited number of marines and sailors were landed for the protection of the lives and property of American citizens and of other foreign people.

In 1927 the situation was more unsettled and in the late spring, under an arrangement that had been entered into following the visit to Nicaragua of Henry L. Stimson upon the part of the President, marine forces of the United States were called upon to help maintain orderly government under a program that

had the approval of the people of Nicaragua who stood for law and order and decency in government.

I need not follow in detail the activities of the Government of Nicaragua as it was assisted by the marine forces of the United States in the suppression of banditry, the breaking up and dispersing of lawless gangs, and the establishment of order.

In November, 1928, carrying out a part of the agreement that had been made by the responsible authorities of Nicaragua and Mr. Stimson representing the Government of the United States, the marine forces assisted in the Nicaraguan election, an election the result of which has commanded the respect and confidence of the Nicaraguan people.

Upon the part of Nicaragua and in harmony with the Stimson agreement, the Nicaraguan Government built up and trained a nonpartisan national guard or constabulary with the assistance of the officers of the Marine Corps and the Navy, and the result of the whole program has been most fortunate from the standpoint of peace and orderly processes and good government in our sister Republic. The work that has been done by the officers and men of the marines and by the officers and enlisted men of the Navy has been at sacrifice of life and has meant an additional burden upon the Tresaury of the United States.

You will find in the hearings conducted by our committee a printed list of the names of the officers and men of the Marine Corps who have died in the Nicaraguan service, together with their home addresses.

It is most unfortunate that at any time orderly government can not proceed in every land. It is fortunate, however, that when at times the orderly processes of government are supplanted by lawless forces it is possible for peoples who are not involved to assist in the safeguarding of property, in the protection of human life, and in the restoration of government.

The naval and marine forces in Nicaragua are being reduced.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that the forces in Nicaragua are being reduced. Does the gentleman intend to convey the information that the marines are being withdrawn from Nicaragua?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; that program is going on as to marines no longer needed.

In our hearings it was indicated that the peak was reached when we had in Nicaragua on July 31, 1928, 456 officers and men of the Navy and 5,365 officers and men of the Marine Corps, or a grand total of 5,821. This number is being diminished. The naval forces have all, or practically all, been withdrawn. The marine detachments that had been borrowed from battleships are now being returned to their ships, and there will be left of the marines in Nicaragua upon the completion of this program approximately 3,650 men.

I have no doubt that with the further establishment of orderly processes this number will be reduced, and again I am sure that I express the thought of the people of our country when I say that we take deep pride in the courage, the earnestness, the fidelity, the self-sacrifice, the devotion of officers and men of the marine service and of the Navy who have contributed so conspicuously to the well-being of humanity in a sister Republic.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I was informed by the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and I should think the RECORD ought to show it clearly, that the marines that have been withdrawn are those marines that were taken from the ships.

Mr. FRENCH. That is correct.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And that of the expeditionary force not a single solitary marine has been recalled to date.

Mr. FRENCH. No. We will have upon the completion of the program of withdrawing of forces that is now going on approximately 3,650 marines in Nicaragua. I am not able to look into the future and indicate what the conditions will justify our country in doing and to what extent the Government of Nicaragua will need our cooperation.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The fact remains that we have 3,000 marines in Nicaragua to-day.

Mr. FRENCH. And probably will have a few more than that for an indefinite period.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. The fact that Sandino, whom the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] has at intervals defended on this floor, is resuming activities is evidence of the other fact that our marines are being withdrawn.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, now that Admiral COLE of Iowa has subdued Sandino, I say the fact remains that 3,600 of our marines are in Nicaragua and not one marine that was sent there with the expeditionary force has been withdrawn to date.

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

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] has paid just tribute to the Navy and the marines in connection with the supervision of the recent election in Nicaragua, but I am sure the gentleman would not have it overlooked that the chief commissioned man supervising the election was a very distinguished officer of the United States Army, Brig. Gen. Frank L. LaCoy, assisted by others of the military force.

Mr. FRENCH. I am sure that words of mine can not adequately express the sense of appreciation that the people of the United States feel toward the officer to whom my colleague has referred and toward the officers and men of the Marine Corps and officers and men of the Navy who have rendered this arduous and fine service in Nicaragua with such dignity and such resourcefulness and helpfulness in the maintenance of peace and good order, looking again to the establishment of orderly processes in our sister Republic.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And it is only fair to state that the Liberal Party that we went down there originally to destroy won the election and established law and order.

Mr. FRENCH. And is in highest accord with the conduct of our officers and men in the election that was held.

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

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. There are only 15 per cent whites in Nicaragua, and if the United States Government can skeletonize the marine force in Haiti, which is all black, I am in hopes that they can skeletonize the marine force in Nicaragua, with its 15 per cent whites, and in time that we may be able to teach them how to run their own Government.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. We better learn to run our own Government first.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. I do not think the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] that our forces went down there to destroy any particular party ought to go unchallenged on this floor. We did not go down there to destroy anybody, but to preserve peace.

Mr. FRENCH. The statement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COLE] is, of course, correct. The Government of the United States has never sought and never has had a part in the political differences of the people of Nicaragua. The thing that we are interested in and were interested in is protection of our nationals and their interests, and protection of the nationals of other countries and preventing, if possible, a lawless condition to exist and to expand, threatening the peace of the Americas, and led by lawless bandits who respected not the rights of others, even the people of their own land.

Mr LAGUARDIA. And that was exactly the way the Liberal Party was characterized and described when we first sent the marines down there.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is my understanding also that the marines are remaining in Nicaragua at the request of the President of the Liberal government.

Mr. FRENCH. Not only the Liberal government but the outgoing government were in accord in inviting the forces of the United States to go there and take part in preserving order and in conducting the election.

Mr. KETCHAM. In that very connection, is it not interesting to observe repeatedly in the case that the Conservatives are not so greatly concerned in having the marines remain there, but the Liberals are?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. And if it is not a fact that the presence of American marines in Nicaragua was followed by the settlement and cessation practically of a bloody revolution in that country?

Mr. FRENCH. In my judgment that must be the inevitable conclusion of thoughtful people.

May I close, as I did one year ago, with the assurance to this House that through the contact and touch the members of your committee have at all times with the Naval Establishment we have pride in its officers, we have pride in its personnel, we have pride in the spirit that permeates the institution itself and that has become a part of its splendid traditions. I thank you for the fine attention you have accorded me. [Applause.]

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, in view of certain references made to the senior Senator from Georgia in the discussion of House

Resolution 303 on yesterday, and a recent article published in the Washington Post, I wish to read into the RECORD three brief editorials from three Georgia newspapers. I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks, and I wish to insert in the RECORD those three short editorials.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks——

Mr. TILSON. May I hear that request repeated? I did not hear it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks and to insert therein three short editorials.

Mr. TILSON. I wish the gentleman would reserve his request until we are in the House instead of in committee.

Mr. COX. I hope the gentleman will not object, because I will feel forced to ask for sufficient time in which to read them.

Mr. TILSON. Of course, the gentleman could not read them if anybody objected, even if he had the time. This question of putting editorials in the RECORD is one to which several Members of the House have consistently objected, and the gentleman ought not to ask that privilege in the Committee of the Whole. If the gentleman will wait until we are in the House, I shall make no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I will say this is not an unusual request.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It has been done a great many times.

Mr. TILSON. But it ought not to be done in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BEGG. One minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time is in the control of the gentleman from Idaho and the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. BEGG. I will ask the gentleman from Idaho to yield one minute in order for me to ask a question.

Mr. AYRES. I yield one minute additional.

Mr. BEGG. I would like——

Mr. COX. For the present, I withdraw the request.

Mr. TILSON. I hope the gentleman will do so for the present.

Mr. BEGG. Is it not, in fact, a violation of the rule for a Member to ask unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the committee at any time?

Mr. TILSON. Oh, no.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Not if the Member has the floor at the time.

Mr. BEGG. It is my impression that it is a fact. I know the Speaker has made a statement repeatedly to that effect.

Mr. TILSON. A Member may ask unanimous consent to extend his remarks in committee, but no general request can be made in committee giving to Members generally that privilege. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] is no doubt within his rights in asking unanimous consent to extend.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] is not here.

Mr. TILSON. He had an opportunity to be here.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAPES. Is not this a fact: Did not the Speaker at a former session of Congress state that it was desirable that Chairmen of the Committee of the Whole should not submit unanimous-consent requests to extend remarks on subjects other than those under debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MAPES. Then I make it as a statement of my recollection of the matter. [Laughter.]

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HOWARD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this afternoon has been to a very considerable degree confined to the discussion of the tariff. I rise to discuss that question also, but propose to confine my discussion to one great industry which is in need at the present time of rehabilitation and to the same kind of treatment that is extended by the Congress and the Nation to other great industries. I refer, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, to the oil industry.

The oil industry has in the last few years grown to be one of the most important in America. It is also one of the most necessary. For the last two years, however, as a whole it has suffered a depression that has been felt by labor, by the producers of crude petroleum, and the farmers and landowners from whose land oil is produced.

This depression has resulted from two causes. One of them has been overproduction in this country, caused mainly by the peculiar conditions under which oil is produced. In the last few months leaders of the industry have sought, through the American Petroleum Institute, the Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, and other organizations, to adopt a policy of conservation that will be beneficial and for which they are to be congratulated. In this effort they deserve the support of every public official and the public.

Another and very important reason for this condition comes about on account of the large amount of oil imported into this country from Mexico, Venezuela, and other foreign countries. This oil comes into the United States free of duty. It can be produced with the cheap labor of these foreign countries at a less cost than can our oil, with the result that, in my opinion, there can be no great revival of our American oil industry until it is protected from the unwarranted competition just referred to.

To adjust this condition, on December 3, 1928, I introduced in the Congress H. R. 14462, a bill to amend the tariff act of 1922 by placing crude mineral oils on the dutiable list.

In the placing of a protective tariff on any commodity it is but natural that we ask to what extent are importations interfering with American production? The records disclose that about 77,000,000 barrels of crude oil are coming into this country each year and on it the importers are paying no duty. The records of the Department of Commerce show that for the six months ending November 30, 1928, the imports and exports of crude and refined oil were:

	Barrels
Exports, from Atlantic coast only:	
Crude	312
Refined	11,170,812
Imports for same period:	
Crude	35,269,961
Refined	3,611,660

Naturally this great flood of duty-free oil with our comparatively small amount of exports is of great injury to the American industry, and this also discloses a source of revenue to the Government and a protection to an American industry that would be of benefit to both.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. I understood the gentleman a moment ago gave the exports and imports of oil from and to the Atlantic coast.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Have you the figures covering the imports to and exports from the Pacific coast?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. No. These figures do not include the exports from the west coast.

Mr. BARBOUR. Do the figures apply to oil imported to America and exported from the Atlantic coast?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes. My figures apply to the total amount brought into this country, and the total amount that was exported from Atlantic coast ports only.

Mr. BARBOUR. Most of our exports of oil go from the Pacific coast, do they not?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I do not know what the proportion is.

Mr. BARBOUR. I am very much interested in the question which the gentleman is discussing. May I ask him a further question?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I shall be glad if the gentleman will.

Mr. BARBOUR. Is it the gentleman's intention to urge a protective tariff on oil in the coming tariff bill?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARBOUR. May I ask the gentleman this question: What is the attitude of the oil producers of Oklahoma touching the proposal to place a protective tariff on oil?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I have been told by those whose interests lie with the importers that they are in opposition, and that the independents, whose full interest in the industry is American oil entirely, are in favor of the tariff.

Mr. BARBOUR. I am interested in this because I represent a large oil-producing district in California. I have received communications advocating a protective tariff on oil, but so far as I am advised, none of those requests have come from oil producers. I am interested in knowing what the situation is in the gentleman's State.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I will say to the gentleman from California that I introduced the bill I referred to for the purpose of bringing the matter before the Committee on Ways and Means. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, has informed me

that, either on February 20, 21, or 22, the committee will give anyone interested an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman permit one other question?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Are the independent producers of Oklahoma organized?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. The oil producers in Oklahoma, independent and others, are practically all members of the same organization, the Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association.

Mr. BARBOUR. Is it their intention to support this proposal?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I have had several letters and telegrams from large independent producers in which they say they are supporting the measure and will probably be here at the time I mentioned.

Mr. BARBOUR. Can the gentleman state what the attitude of the American Petroleum Institute is?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I understand from the newspaper reports that Mr. Reeser, the president of the American Petroleum Institute, has stated that he thought the plan of conservation would be sufficient and did not know that a tariff would be necessary or beneficial.

Mr. BARBOUR. Would the gentleman express an opinion as to that suggestion? That suggestion has been made to me, that we could accomplish the same thing by not producing so much oil at this time; in other words, by conserving it in the ground.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Let me say to the gentleman on that point that in the last year or two in Oklahoma through a plan of conservation we have reduced the production at times approximately 300,000 barrels a day, but at the same time the imports on the Atlantic coast have increased very materially. A great many producers believe they might bring about a plan of conservation that would remedy the situation. But I call attention to the fact that since the American Petroleum Institute meeting, since the matter has been under discussion, the royalty owners in Kansas, in Texas, and in Oklahoma have had meetings and have protested against the State legislature in either of their States entering into any attempt to pass legislation that would control the production of oil.

Mr. BARBOUR. The royalty owners are the people who own the land and have leased it on a royalty basis to the producers.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. They are the farmers and those who have bought an interest in royalties of the farmers. But it is my contention that both conservation and this tariff will be needed before the oil industry is put on its feet again.

Mr. BARBOUR. I want to say that the gentleman has raised a very important question. I have been seeking information in regard to it and I appreciate the information the gentleman has given us.

Mr. NEWTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON. The gentleman has given us some very interesting information. Can the gentleman give us some idea as to what our natural resources are in oil and about how many years it will be before it will all be consumed?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Well, let me say to the gentleman in answer to that question that it is about like the question of how old is Ann, for I call his attention to this fact, that 10 years ago the geologists made estimates as to the amount of oil in the earth at that time, and since then we have taken out of the earth more oil than they estimated was in it.

Mr. BARBOUR. We are continually bringing in new fields.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes. That is true in your field in Los Angeles, where less than two months ago they went 1,000 feet deeper than they have ever gone before and brought in larger wells.

Mr. BARBOUR. I will say to the gentleman that is not in Los Angeles but in the San Joaquin Valley of California.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. The same is true at Wichita, Kans., and the same is true at Oklahoma City, where 10 years ago they imagined there was no oil and it was condemned, but recently, close to Wichita and close to Oklahoma City, they have brought in wells producing from 5,000 to 8,000 barrels a day.

Mr. NEWTON. Then the gentleman feels there is no limit to the oil supply?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. On that point I think it is problematical. If the gentleman is referring to the conservation of natural resources, I call his attention to the fact that in this country there are billions of pounds of shale that will produce oil and science will bring forth an economical way of producing oil out of that shale. Further than that, science is bringing forth now substitutes for gasoline and the day may not be far distant when gasoline will not be in demand, and then, if we follow the argument made by some, of conserving our American oil and using that from foreign countries, we might find that through this policy we will have left millions and millions of dollars' worth of natural resources in the bowels of the earth that will have practically little, if any, value.

Mr. WOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. I will say to the gentleman that eight years ago this winter we had some of the experts before the Appropriations Committee and they then gave it as their expert opinion that within 10 years from that time the oil fields of this country would be entirely exhausted.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. And to-day there are 600,000,000 barrels stored on top of the ground in the State of Oklahoma alone.

Mr. CRAIL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. CRAIL. I want to say that the price of low-gravity crude oil in southern California has been reduced to 45 cents per barrel in some fields, and in other fields lower than that, below the cost of production; and it seems to me that instead of trying to interfere with the oil industry there ought to be a tariff duty levied on low-gravity crude oil.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I will support a tariff on all grades. In answer to the gentleman, let me say this: That within the last few days, in the Mid-Continent oil field, they have reduced the price of oil from 20 to 35 cents a barrel, but the consumers have not felt that reduction in the price of the gasoline or lubricating oils they use.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield to me for the purpose of asking the gentleman from California a question?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Has the gentleman any information as to whether the California oil producers are in favor of a tariff on oil?

Mr. CRAIL. I will say that I have had considerable correspondence and some telegrams in regard to that, with the information that there are 250,000 barrels of crude oil per day being shipped into the United States from South America, which is making it necessary for the independent producers to sell low-gravity crude oil at a price less than the cost of production.

Mr. BARBOUR. That is, this correspondence and these telegrams have come from the producers of oil?

Mr. CRAIL. Yes. The oil producer, as distinguished from the refiner, has had hard times the last two years, largely as a result of the importation, free of duty, of large quantities of crude oil from foreign countries.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. JONES. I would like to suggest that I have had complaints to the effect that certain companies, with the privilege of the free importation of oil, feed in just enough oil to keep the crude price down to a low point, and at the same time maintain the refined price, ostensibly, or at least these people think, for the purpose of getting the control out of the hands of the local people into the hands of certain concerns.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I am going to cover that shortly.

Mr. JONES. I have had numerous complaints to that effect, that they feed in just enough oil to keep the price down to where the local people can not afford to produce it or own it and thus lose control of it, and these certain companies have such control that the price of the crude oil makes little difference to them, because they sell it in the refined form at the full price.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I will say to the gentleman that both the independents and others joined to cut down the production in Oklahoma nearly 300,000 barrels per day within the last year, and the other fellows brought it up the coast.

Mr. JONES. And when they try to put on a conservation program they simply feed in still more and keep the price of the crude down just the same.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. That has been the result, and nothing but a tariff will remedy it.

Mr. JONES. It seems to me so.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. We have heard a lot about the producers' views on a proposed tariff; can the gentleman give any information as to what would be reflected with respect to the consumers?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I will say to the gentleman that I am going to touch on this shortly, but I will say now that if you can name me a natural resource or a manufactured article where the tariff does not have some effect in raising the price, then I will answer the gentleman's question.

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

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. That Congress may have a fuller conception of the situation, I desire here to read to you a letter, which is based on sound logic and facts, that I received a few days ago.

AMARILLO, TEX., *January 12, 1929.*

Congressman E. B. HOWARD,
Tulsa District of Oklahoma, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is my understanding that you are preparing a bill providing for a tariff on oil and that you now have this bill or will have this bill before the present session of Congress.

Notice that you are working on this matter should be interesting to independent oil producers, royalty companies, landowners, and even States throughout the entire oil-producing districts of the United States.

A disastrous condition has occurred and been maintained for the past two years, which has adversely affected every investment in or contingent to the oil-producing business, save and except those investments which are so organized that they represent a vertical line of business, having production, transportation, refining, and marketing. The last-mentioned interests have benefited largely and comprise large corporations only, and actually represent but a small fraction of the commonwealth of this country, and should not be permitted to maintain a condition and special interest which operates adversely and disastrously to the vested rights and the welfare not only of individuals but of counties, towns, cities, and even States.

An examination of producing-oil areas and geographic surveys of the Nation shows that there are millions of acres of proven, semiproven, and potential oil lands. This land is the vested property of individuals, States, or of the Nation. The act of proving this land to contain great mineral wealth immediately enhances the value of such lands far above that for which it could be valued for any other purpose. The finding of oil in any community or State represents an increase in local and national wealth; that is, providing such increase in wealth accrues to those to whom it rightfully belongs.

It is a common fallacy for the public at large to think and believe that the discovery and production of oil confers benefits only upon that particular landowner and that particular oil company which is so fortunate as to enjoy the direct benefits of such discovery. However, a most casual investigation will show that this is not correct.

Railroads haul immense tonnage to such oil fields and generally invest much capital in extensions, switch tracks, terminal facilities, etc.

Supply houses, material men, lumbermen, and countless lines of manufacturers are at once interested, investing capital in warehouses, labor organizations, and untold millions of dollars of storage supplies.

Adjacent towns and even cities are at once made famous by the fact that new sources of national wealth are found at their doorsteps, and generally reflect an immediate expansion and growth in the way of new industries, new office buildings, jobbing houses, and untold millions in investments in real estate, home building, and countless other lines affecting the welfare of that entire community. Because of this added population and contingent lines of business, cities expand and grow and counties undertake bond issues for paving highways.

The State in which this community is located immediately becomes the beneficiary of increased taxes, and even the income-tax men of the Federal Government at Washington find this new community of sufficient interest to send special agents to check the income of the Government, which is a beneficiary from income taxes in these new and flourishing districts.

When it is considered that not only thousands of small towns, hundreds of thousands of individuals, and the welfare of countless counties of various States throughout the Union are affected by the possibility of production and the oil industry, but also that great cities, such as Los Angeles, Austin, Dallas, Shreveport, Beaumont, Fort Worth, Amarillo, Tulsa, Oklahoma City, and numberless other large cities throughout Indiana, Pennsylvania, Louisiana, Wyoming, Montana, Colorado, and other States, can suffer and do suffer tremendous losses in wealth, population, and shrinkage in business due to the violent fluctuations in the revenue received from the production of oil without any local power or machinery to prevent these disasters, then it is time for the people or their constituted authority to investigate the conditions that permit such a situation to exist and reoccur from time to time.

The marketing of the products of petroleum oil is a well-organized and profitable business, the bulk of the business being conducted by about 200 powerful corporations throughout the entire United States.

The refining of these oil products is a highly technical and well-organized business, also largely under the control of these same corporations.

The transportation of oil is also a well-organized business, allied with and largely under the control of the above-named corporations.

It will be noted that the sales price of petroleum products which the public at large obtains is well regulated and suffers no violent fluctuations that would cause disastrous losses and disorganization to either the transportation, refining, or marketing companies in the petroleum industry.

It is only in the production department of the industry which has the most to do with the welfare of the greatest number of individuals, small corporations, allied industries heretofore mentioned, and the taxable value of cities, counties, and States that boom conditions are enjoyed or disaster suffered, which wipes out the investments of literally hundreds of thousands of people, either in the oil-producing business or in allied lines of industries and community activities.

This situation is brought about by the violent fluctuations in the price of crude oil, which is arbitrarily set from time to time by those corporations which are primarily interested in the transportation, refining, and marketing of crude oil and its products.

The law of supply and demand governs the actions of this last-named group. When the production of crude oil shows to be in excess of current refinery demands and at the same time new crude-oil discoveries are encountered, the posted field price for crude oil is ruthlessly put down, thereby paralyzing smaller producing companies in all allied lines of industry and depreciating property values through the entire district, adjoining cities, States, and the Nation.

This disastrous shrinkage may occur overnight upon the discovery of one or two new potential oil fields which show promise of furnishing sufficient additional oil to warrant safety in such procedure to the transporters, refiners, and marketers of crude oil.

Although this new strike may be in a far-western State, yet every field throughout the Nation and every community in which such fields exist immediately suffer by this general marking down in the price of crude oil.

There appears to be no proportional relation whatever between the price which the public at large pays for refined products and the price which producers and marketers receive for the production of crude oil.

When the posted price of crude oil was $3.60 a barrel throughout the midcontinent field the public paid from 20 to 30 cents per gallon for gasoline and 20 to 40 cents per quart for lubricating oils.

With the posted field price at an average of 80 cents per barrel in the Panhandle oil fields, the price of refined products still hovers around 20 cents per gallon for gasoline and a good fair price for lubricating oils.

It then can not be stated that a fair profit to independent oil producers, which affects the welfare and taxable values of landowners and property owners in adjoining cities and communities, is the yardstick by which the petroleum industry is operated and that the public at large in buying the refined products are gainers through the fact that the producers are suffering such losses.

There are too many intermediate stations between the production and valuation of crude oil and the ultimate purchase of its products for such condition to exist.

The oil industry and its allied lines of business is to-day the biggest industrial business in the United States. Its ramifications affect more people than any other line of business. As such, it is the only line of business that has been marshaled, organized, and controlled by a relatively few closely allied corporations without any endeavor on the part of the commonwealth to intelligently comprehend and better regulate this industry.

Great credit should be given to those corporations who have developed this tremendous industry, and in writing you this letter it is not to be construed as a disparagement or attack upon any of them in the conduct of their business.

It is most likely that this condition would exist in any other line of business which affected the public largely if no protective tariff were obtained to safeguard the vested interests of this country.

If it were possible for a great merchandising corporation, such as Montgomery Ward or others, to obtain an unlimited supply of cheaply manufactured articles from Europe and import same to this country and distribute into a vast organization of retail stores owned and controlled by it, you would immediately note the same depression in business in countless towns and cities, due to the fact that tens of thousands of small merchants would be forced to close their doors, thousands of allied lines of industry would close down, and untold millions of dollars of wealth would be wiped out solely to the benefit of this one big merchandising corporation.

In the universal interest of landowners, tens of thousands of small independent oil producers, communities, counties, cities, and States, some sensible and flexible tariff should be considered and adopted which will protect and safeguard the vested rights and interests of all those directly connected with or whose business depends upon the production of crude oil throughout this Nation.

Trusting that you will give this matter the serious thought and earnest work which it deserves, and believing that the very act of making a comprehensive effort to stabilize this industry will meet the approval not only of the people to be benefited but also the sympathetic cooperation of transporters, refiners, and marketers of crude oil and its products, I remain,

Very truly yours,

JOHNSON RANCH ROYALTY CO. (INC.),
By ED. R. MAYER, *President.*

Mr. Chairman, there is no greater field for securing sound and valuable information than the newspapers of this country, es-

pecially is this true of any discussion of a subject in their editorial columns. Naturally a newspaper published at the center of oil production in America would have given thorough and scientific study to the question of a tariff on oil before commenting on it editorially. Tulsa is the center of the oil-producing industry of America. Newspapers published in that city naturally give mature and sober thought to the good of the industry and all its branches. They naturally, also, give due consideration to the interests of the consumers, for they realize that any injury to him, any undue advantage of him, would be detrimental to the producer's market and to the industry as a whole. Here I desire to read to you an editorial published in the Tulsa Tribune, commenting on the bill which I have introduced, and may I say to you before reading it that the Tribune is a well-edited, conservative, and fearless publication that gives thought to subjects of this kind before expressing an opinion. The editorial says:

FOR THE OIL TARIFF

Congressman E. B. HOWARD's bill, proposing a tariff on petroleum imports, although deplored in the keynote speech made to the Chicago convention of the American Petroleum Institute by Axtell J. Byles, of the Tide Water Oil Co., may yet command the undivided support of independent oil producers of the United States and of the public. Mr. Byles, failing to enumerate his reasons for opposing the tariff, pointed out the only possible alternative when he urged adoption of a world-wide plan for cooperation in the production of oil.

A condition inimical to the security of the independent oil producer whose production is confined to domestic fields has already developed in increased importations of Latin-American oil. British and American operators of prolific leases in Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, and other Latin-American countries are able to deliver petroleum products to the markets of the United States at prices that threaten the profits of the domestic producer.

Leases secured by the concessions route, cheap labor, low water freight rates, and lower foreign taxes all combine to reduce the costs of production of Latin-American oil and of its delivery to American ports. The producer who pays the Oklahoma, Kansas, Texas, Louisiana, or Arkansas landowner a high price for a lease, who pays his employees the American wage scale, whose holdings are subject to taxation by city, State, and Federal Governments, and who uses his wealth toward the industrial and social development of his community and Nation can not meet the competition of the importers.

The tariff as proposed by Congressman HOWARD is at present not only necessary to the continued prosperity of the American oil industry, but the interests of all the people of the oil-producing States are also involved. It is largely due to the independent oil producer that the oil industry has become an integral part of the economic life of the oil-producing States. It is Bill Skelly, Waite Phillips, and others of the type who have used the profits of production of oil in Tulsa territory to build Tulsa. Similarly in every other oil-producing section of the United States.

One objection that may be raised to Congressman HOWARD's bill by Congressmen from other States is that it might increase the costs of petroleum products to the American consumer. But if the independent producers should be forced out of the industry by the trust importing foreign oil, the dangers to the interests of the consumer would be infinitely greater than any that lie in the proposed tariff. The independent producer, developing American leases as rapidly as the oil could be absorbed by the growing army of gas engines, has kept prices down to a fair level and thus has aided the growth of the automobile industry and served the whole American public. As long as he holds the upper hand in the oil industry, the interests of the motoring public will be safe. It would be well for representatives of automobile manufacturers and motorists, who will consider the Howard bill, to keep this in mind.

The Howard bill is thoroughly in accord with the policy of protection. If New England factories turning out products used by the whole American public are protected by the tariff, the oil industry, which benefits a greater area than these factories, obviously is entitled to the same protection. No section of the country, nor any other industry, should begrudge it.

Should the independent producer be given a pledge by the importers that importations of Latin-American crude will be cooperatively curbed to remove every element of unfair competition, they might be willing to pass up the protection of the tariff. Mr. Byles has suggested this, and there is a possibility that his suggestion may be heeded by the producers who have seen the effectiveness of the Oklahoma proration agreement, which he so highly praised. But before declining to enter the fight for the tariff, every independent producer should be convinced that his interests will be safe without it.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the editorial just read I want to call your special attention to the following paragraph, which answers one question that naturally arises in the minds of everyone considering a tariff on any commodity and also answers the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER]. That paragraph reads:

One objection that may be raised to Congressman HOWARD's bill by Congressmen from other States is that it might increase the costs of petroleum products to the American consumer. But if the independent producers should be forced out of the industry by the trusts importing foreign oil, the dangers to the interests of the consumer would be infinitely greater than any that lie in the proposed tariff. The independent producer, developing American leases as rapidly as the oil could be absorbed by the growing army of gas engines, has kept prices down to a fair level and thus has aided the growth of the automobile industry and served the whole American public. As long as he holds the upper hand in the oil industry, the interests of the motoring public will be safe. It would be well for representatives of automobile manufacturers and motorists, who will consider the Howard bill, to keep this in mind.

The Howard bill is thoroughly in accord with the policy of protection. If New England factories turning out products used by the whole American public are protected by the tariff, the oil industry, which benefits a greater area than these factories, obviously is entitled to the same protection. No section of the country, nor any other industry, should begrudge it.

The above quotations are but a few of the many that I could give you in justification of this tariff, but under the circumstances I see no necessity for lengthy argument. The next Congress and the next administration will be entirely under the control of the Republican Party, which is pledged to a protective tariff in all its platforms, which have contained the following language:

We reaffirm our belief in the protective tariff to extend needed protection to our productive industries.

Then the leaders of the Republican Party are pledged to a protective tariff for American industry. Recently, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], Republican House leader, a man in whom I have the greatest confidence, and I have never seen a man that I considered more sincere or reliable in any statement he makes, made this statement throughout the country:

The principles and benefits of a protective tariff must be extended to all American industries.

And then, further than that, in a speech at Tulsa, the oil capital of the world, on Thursday, September 27, 1928, Senator CURTIS, then candidate and now Vice President elect, said:

In the last two revenue bills I proposed a duty on oil. You, in Oklahoma, I see, have requested the limitation of oil production. I took a market report and found that last year we imported 77,000,000 barrels of oil into this country. I suggest that we shut out those 77,000,000 barrels and you would not have to shut down production here.

This means a promise from the Vice President elect that he will give the oil industry a tariff. I plead with him, although I should not need to, because certainly Senator CURTIS will keep his promise, and with his great power he should be able to deliver a tariff to the oil producers of the country and they are expecting it. [Applause.]

Not only this, Mr. Chairman, but I call the attention of the Democrats to the fact that in their platform written at Houston, Tex., they said that they favored—

a tariff for any industry that would make up the actual difference between cost of production at home and abroad, with adequate safeguards for the wage of the American laborer.

Now, I want to say that when I am home this summer as a private citizen and you are perspiring over this tariff bill, I can not but expect that the Republican Party, through the leaders of the party, including Senator CURTIS, and the Democrats, standing on their platform made at Houston, will place an equitable tariff on crude oil and its products, and give the American independent producer, the American laborer, and the American farmer on whose land this oil is produced the protection that you will give to other people in the coming tariff bill. [Applause.]

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes; if I have any time.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman has presented a very forceful argument in favor of a protective tariff policy, and I agree with the gentleman entirely and I am in favor of putting a tariff on crude oil. I want to say that the gentleman's remarks are very interesting, coming from a Democrat and one of the leading Democrats of Oklahoma, and coming from Oklahoma. I am wondering if my friend from Oklahoma believes in the application of that same policy or that same principle of protection to other things produced in this country.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for asking me that question, because as a Member of this Congress I have voted for every tariff presented, calling the gentleman's attention to the fact that after the war, when we had found we had begun to manufacture in this country articles that we had

not manufactured previous to the war, and you presented bills here to that effect, I supported those bills. Of course, the gentleman knows that I was not a Member of Congress when the Fordney-McCumber bill was passed. I supported an emergency tariff on agriculture and have, and always will, support every tariff bill that equalizes the opportunities of American capital with that of foreign nations and protects American labor from the ill effects of cheap foreign labor. [Applause.]

Mr. DENISON. I am very glad to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS].

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, on January 11, 1929, I presented to the House a report on fiscal relations between the United States and the District of Columbia which has been printed as House Document No. 506.

January 29, 1929, the Evening Star carried the following statement made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia.

Without reading the whole article I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the gentleman is this going to create any controversy with reference to the attitude of the United States Senator——

Mr. SIMMONS. I take it not.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think we are going pretty far in our debates recently in criticizing acts and activities of Members of the other body. That is against the rules.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not violating the rule. The matter referred to is not a discussion on the floor of the other body. This is a press report carried in outside publications and has no reference to anything that took place in the other body.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I will.

Mr. TILSON. Does the article serve as a text for the gentleman's own remarks?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; that is the reason I ask that it be printed as a part of my remarks.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman is going to proceed to discuss that statement?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

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

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

A study of this report leads to a feeling of satisfaction that there has been prepared such a detailed independent study of the taxation and fiscal affairs of all cities in the United States having an estimated population of between 300,000 and 1,000,000.

It is obvious that the city of Washington, with a population of something more than half a million, has very similar problems and that in attempting to judge the nature of the fiscal relations between the Government of the United States and the District of Columbia such figures are of help.

As has been pointed out by Representative SIMMONS, the chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations in charge of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, some matters have been left out which should have been given consideration. I understand that in accordance with his suggestions a supplementary report is in progress of preparation and I shall read it with interest when it appears.

INCLINED TO AGREE WITH BUREAU

I am inclined to agree with the Bureau of Efficiency that the solution of the problem of fiscal relations lies in determining the Federal Government's liability toward the cost of running the District of Columbia along the lines of the tax liability of the Federal Government as a municipal taxpayer in connection with the ordinary costs of government and also its liability on account of extraordinary expenditures occasioned by the fact that Washington is the National Capital and that the District is not at liberty to tax Government property.

Four interesting questions rise: (1) What is the liability of the Federal Government as a municipal taxpayer? (2) What is the loss of tax revenue to the Government of the District of Columbia on account of excessive exemptions of real property? (3) How much of the cost of excess park acquisition and maintenance should be met by the Federal Government? (4) How much of the liability of the Federal Government as a municipal taxpayer should be offset by reason of the very considerable economic benefits accruing to the District owing to the presence here of national monuments and great public buildings which make Washington the mecca of hundreds of thousands of tourists?

HOLDS $7,440,939 FAIR CHARGE

According to the report a fair charge on the Federal Government as a municipal taxpayer would be $7,440,939. As a matter of fact, the Federal Government makes a contribution of $9,000,000, which leaves a balance of $1,550,061 to be applied to the items of excess park acquisition and maintenance and recovery of revenue lost on account of excessive exemptions of real property from taxation.

It appears to me that there might properly be added to that balance the $451,857 with which the report charges the Federal Government as a tax on intangible personal property. I have grave doubts as to the justification for such a liability on the part of the Federal Government. If this were added to the balance, it would give us $2,011,000 to be applied to the excess items.

A study of the tables would seem to show that a fair charge in connection with the parks would be about $1,100,000, leaving about $900,000 to apply to the loss of revenue due to excessive exemption.

A careful study of the schedules of exempt property valuations shows that the ratio of exempt to taxable real property is three times as high for Washington as for other cities. At first sight it would appear that this would justify a very great increase in Federal aid to the District. However, when there is deducted from the exempt property United States property on which it may be assumed we are now paying taxes under cover of the $9,000,000 appropriation, there still remains a total of $283,991,600 of exempt property apart from that owned and used by the Federal Government. This item is made up of exemptions for educational and scientific institutions, religious purposes, hospitals, charitable and benevolent institutions, embassies and legations, and a very considerable amount of public property used for parks and for the benefit of the city of Washington. A study of the tables shows that this is larger than that of any other city in the country of comparable size except the city of Boston, where there is an unusual amount of United States and Massachusetts State property.

A fair average amount of exempt taxable property for a city of this size is about $180,000,000. By reason of this being the Capital of the Nation there is located here an unusual number of nontaxable institutions and an unusual amount of nontaxable public property, bringing the total to more than $100,000,000 in excess of that amount. It seems to me fair that the United States should pay toward the expenses of the District of Columbia an amount of money equivalent to normal taxes on that $100,000,000 of real property that is in excess of ordinary average exemptions for a city of this size. That means something over $1,700,000. Of that amount it is fair to say that the Federal Government is at the present time paying $900,000, or the balance of the lump-sum contribution, in my opinion.

A study of the report offers the further thought that the District taxpayers are not being taxed more heavily than other cities of this size.

Finally, the showing regarding the extraordinary amount of park area provided here by reason of this being the Nation's Capital and which makes our park area nearly twice as much as most cities of this approximate size, would justify the Federal Government bearing the amount equivalent to the difference between the cost of parks in average cities of this size and that of the Nation's Capital, or, say, $1,100,000.

In conclusion, it would seem to me fair that the United States should contribute something over $800,000 more as its share of running the government of the District and I would suggest that the bill be amended by adding $800,000 to the $9,000,000 lump sum now included in the bill.

My study of the report leads me to believe that the Federal Government ought to make an effort to pay taxes on its tangible property in the District of Columbia and the lump sum contributed by the Federal Government to the District revenues ought, I believe, to vary as the value of the property of the Government varies.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator in the statement asks four questions and answers three of them. The question unanswered is No. 4 of the above, which I quote:

How much of the liability of the Federal Government as a municipal taxpayer should be offset by reason of the very considerable economic benefits accruing to the District owing to the presence here of national monuments and great public buildings which make Washington the Mecca of hundreds of thousands of tourists?

The Senator does not answer the question and does not attempt to give the United States any credit for the "offset." I feel that the "offset" suggested is too restricted in its scope. In my statement on fiscal relations in the House last week, Wednesday, January the 23d, I suggest the scope of the "offset" and several easily determinable amounts. Repetition here is not necessary Senator BINGHAM answers the first question: "What is the liability of the Federal Government as a municipal taxpayer?" by reaching the sum of $6,989,082 as the proper amount and rejects the Bureau of Efficiency figure of $7,440,939. The Senator shares the same "grave doubt" that I expressed as to the justification of a charge against the United States as an intangible tax and he therefore deducts, properly, I think, from the $7,440,939 which the Bureau of Efficiency reached, leaving a total of $6,989,082 as the normal "tax" bill of the United States to the District of Columbia. The Senator, however, accepts without question the "tax" on tangible personalty of $1,536,315—in spite of the fact that that charges the United States for the fiscal year 1928 with 51 per cent of the taxable tangible personal property of the District. I submit, as I did in my previous statement, that that is an absurd charge against

the United States. Either it is too high as a "charge" against the United States, or it means that the District citizen is not paying his full share of District tangible taxes. In either event the charge is unfair to the United States on a comparative basis. But let us accept the Senator's figures of $6,989,082 as a proper "tax"—leaving $2,010,918, which the $9,000,000 lump-sum payment gives to the district over and above a normal "tax." The Bureau of Efficiency in its report on fiscal relations, page 5, arrives at a tax "payable by the United States to the District of Columbia of $7,440,939," divided as follows:

Real property tax	$5,452,767
Tangible personalty	1,536,315
Intangible personalty	451,857
Total	7,440,939

The Senator then asks question No. 2:

What is the loss of tax revenue to the government of the District of Columbia on account of excessive exemptions of real property?

This question is answered in table No. 5 of the report, page 11. The table shows that Washington has exempt from taxation $283,991,600. The Senator says that this is excessive in comparison with other cities, and says that $180,000,000 is a fair average amount for a "city of this size." Presumably he has selected Buffalo as the model city, for Buffalo has as its ratio of exempt to taxable property 17.33 per cent as against 17.35 per cent as the average of all cities shown in the table except Washington. The Senator, therefore, assumes that Buffalo's exempt property and Washington's ought to be equal and proposes to charge to the United States $100,000,000 of "excess exemptions." The error in the Senator's calculations arises from the fact that he does not include the whole equation. Buffalo has assessed real estate of $1,031,770,390. Washington has assessed real estate of $1,438,844,177 (this figure includes $320,751,015 of United States real property, on which the Bureau of Efficiency figures a real tax of $5,452,767).

The ratio of exempt to taxable real property in Buffalo is 17.33 per cent. The ratio of exempt to taxable real property in Washington is 19.74 per cent.

Table No. 2 shows that Buffalo has an assessed value per capita of $1,865.77, while Washington's assessed value per capita is $2,740.66. The Detroit bureau of governmental research table inserted in the hearings on the District of Columbia bill, page 572, shows that Buffalo is assessed on an estimated basis of 78 per cent of actual value, while Washington is assessed on an estimated basis of 90 per cent actual value. The Bureau of the Census figures that Buffalo real property is assessed at 75 per cent of its real value, while Washington is assessed at 100 per cent. (See table, p. 1076, hearings on District of Columbia bill, fiscal year 1929.) It is perfectly obvious that Buffalo has lower percentage of value as the basis of the assessment of real property and that this lower percentage is reflected both in the amount of real property exempt and real property taxed. The true comparison between Buffalo and Washington is not the isolated table of exemptions alone but by a comparison of exemptions to real property taxed in both cities. On that basis Washington has 19.74 per cent exempt, while Buffalo has 17.33 per cent exempt. The average exempt ratio is 17.35 per cent, thus making Washington 2.39 per cent above the average in real property exemptions. Washington is 2.41 per cent above Buffalo in exemptions. For facility in figuring let us accept 2.4 per cent as the proper figure; $1,438,844,177 is the total assessed taxable real property; 2.4 per cent of that is $34,532,260; add, then, $35,000,000 to the assessed "taxable" property charged to the United States, and Washington will then be reduced to the average of the cities studied in exemptions. A tax of $1.70 a hundred on $35,000,000 gives $595,000. That, in my opinion, is the maximum of possible losses by virtue of "excessive exemptions" of real property in answer to question No. 2.

It will be interesting to analyze the Senator's $180,000,000 figure as the measure of exempt property.

The Bureau of Efficiency report, after deducting the $320,750,000 of United States property on which taxes are assumed as paid under the $9,000,000, still leaves $283,991,600 of property as exempt from taxation. This latter sum is made up as follows:

Educational and scientific purposes		$35,000,000
Religious purposes		25,000,000
Cemeteries		2,000,000
Hospital, charitable, and benevolent institutions		13,000,000
All other, including embassies and legations		5,000,000
Total, private property exempt		80,000,000
Other exempt public property:		
United States property dedicated to use of the District	$31,915,412	
District of Columbia park property (small areas, playgrounds, etc.)	3,035,971	
District of Columbia owned property (municipal)	$50,000,000	
United States park property	119,040,217	
		$203,991,600
Grand total, exempt property		283,991,600

The foregoing statement shows a total of exempt property of $283,991,600, of which $80,000,000 is private property. The remainder is public property, either owned by the United States or by the District.

If, as the Senator proposes, the total exemptions are reduced from $283,991,600 to $180,000,000, or in the sum of $103,991,600, it is logical to find out just what that $180,000,000 would then consist of, or upon what property the United States would be asked to pay taxes by reducing the total amount of exempts by $103,991,600, upon which, at the rate of $1.70, the United States would be asked to assume $1,767,857.20 in taxes.

In arriving at the matter from either direction certain property must inevitably be included in the exempt list. There can be no question about leaving in the present exemptions the following property, which is either wholly municipally owned or which is United States owned and dedicated to District uses without any rent charge from the United States, namely:

United States property dedicated to District use	$31,915,412
District of Columbia owned park property	3,035,971
District of Columbia owned property (municipal)	50,000,000
Total	84,951,383

Deducting this sum of $84,951,383 from the Senator's $180,000,000 still leaves $95,048,617 for exempts under his calculation. What would that consist of? Shall it include all of the $80,000,000 of privately owned exempt property and thus leave the United States to pay taxes on $104,991,600, or 87 per cent, of the $119,040,217 of the federally owned park property which is a municipal benefit and usable by the people of the District as freely as their city-owned park property? Or shall the United States pay taxes on some part of the privately owned exempt property and taxes on a smaller percentage than 87 per cent of the federally owned park property? Whichever way you take the suggested $180,000,000 figure of exemptions the result will either require the United States to pay taxes on some of the privately owned exempt property or on a larger percentage than it should be called upon to pay for exemption of parks which it owns and which it makes available to all intents and purposes as municipal parks. On the other hand, by using the Bureau of Efficiency report and arriving at the average of exemptions for other comparable cities, I have shown that a fair reduction in the $283,991,600 of exempt property would be $35,000,000, bringing the figure down to $249,000,000 instead of the $284,000,000.

That figure of $35,000,000 should be applied, not on the $84,951,383 of District-owned property and United States property dedicated to District purposes, not on the $80,000,000 of privately owned property, but to the $119,040,217 of Federally owned park property. By doing this the United States would assume taxes on approximately 30 per cent of the parks which it owns and which have made it unnecessary for the municipality to go in as deeply for park acquisitions as some other cities have been compelled to do, and largely by bond issues. The taxes on this 30 per cent would, as I have heretofore pointed out, amount to $595,000.

This $35,000,000 is the only fair reduction in the $284,000,000 of exempt property that should be made, based upon the equitable average figures of the Bureau of Efficiency report. The $35,000,000, however, is $68,991,600 less than the $103,991,600 by which the Senator would reduce the total exemptions. I respectfully suggest that this difference of $68,991,600 of exemptions—which, at $1.70, would carry taxes of $1,172,857.20—is the answer to the fourth question which he asked, but did not answer, namely:

How much of the liability of the Federal Government as a municipal taxpayer should be offset by reason of the very considerable economic benefits accruing to the District, owing to the presence here of national monuments and great public buildings which make Washington the Mecca of hundreds of thousands of tourists?

The Senator suggests a reduction in the total exemptions of $103,991,600 which, applying the $1.70 tax rate, would charge the United States with $1,767,857.20. I suggest following the Bureau of Efficiency report figures and reduce the exemptions by $35,000,000, which, applying the $1.70 tax rate, would charge the United States with taxes of $595,000. The difference between the two sets of figures is $68,991,600 of exemptions and $1,172,857.20 in taxes to the United States. I know of no better place for him to find the answer to his fourth question.

I am pleased at the Senator's finding that the District taxpayer is not being taxed more heavily than other cities of this

size. The tables of the report show that they are taxed under cities of their size.

Then the Senator asks this question:

How much of the cost of excess-park acquisition and maintenance should be met by the Federal Government?

He states that the Federal Government should bear—

the amount equivalent to the difference between the cost of parks in average cities of this size and that of the Nation's Capital, or, say $1,100,000.

How he arrives at that figure is not disclosed. Table No. 1, page 7, shows that Washington has 1 acre of parks to every 140 people, while the average is 1 acre to 253 people.

Table No. 13, page 76, answers the Senator's question. It shows that Washington has a per capita cost of $2.38 for "recreation" as against an average of $1.65 for the comparable cities, or 73 cents per capita above the average. This is the item in which the parks are carried. Five hundred and fifty thousand persons, at 73 cents each, equals $401,500 that this excess costs above the average.

We have, then, from the Bureau of Efficiency report the following answer to the Senator's question:

Ordinary tax load	$6,989,082
Loss by excessive exemptions	595,000
Excess park maintenance	401,500
Total	7,985,582

This leaves, by the $9,000,000 payment by the Federal Government, $1,014,418 over and above all items which the Senator included in his statement, with the exception of park purchases, which is a variable sum, from year to year. No figures are available as to who paid the cost of park lands already acquired. The bill this year carries $1,000,000 for park purchases. Upon the basis of these figures the United States is not only paying a fair tax on its property, the excess cost of exemptions, and excess park maintenance above the average, but over and above that is paying $1,000,000 for parks in the city. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. 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. LUCE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 16714, the naval appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 16301) making appropriations for the independent establishments of the Government for the fiscal year 1930, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is agreeable to the minority?

Mr. WASON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 16301, the independent offices appropriation bill, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. WASON, Mr. SUMMERS of Washington, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CULLEN, and Mr. VINSON of Kentucky.

THE HARRIS AMENDMENT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, in view of certain references made to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia in the discussion in the House yesterday on House Resolution 303, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein three short editorials appearing in as many newspapers of Georgia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what are the editorials about?

Mr. COX. They are in refutation of an inference made in the discussion of yesterday to the effect that the Senator was actuated by political motives in offering his prohibition amendment calling for added appropriations for the enforcement of the prohibition law.

Mr. SCHAFER. And the editorials maintain that he was not?

Mr. COX. Yes.

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

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I shall not object, but I would observe this, since I was one of those who mentioned the name of the Senator from Georgia yesterday, I did not, and I do not think that any one ascribed motives, political or otherwise, to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken about that; and I can show him the RECORD.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not yield. I did ascribe political motives to the Democratic Party in this House in their movement conducted with reference to that question, and I doubt if the newspapers of Georgia have any better evidence upon that than we have here; but I do not object. I have a very high regard for the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this relates to a matter that was discussed here yesterday, I think it is proper that these editorials should go in the RECORD, and therefore hope that no one will object.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, in view of the fact that the new wet leader in the House does not object, I shall not object.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Do I understand that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] says that he attributed political motives to the Democratic Party? An astounding presumption!

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the three short editorials published in Georgia newspapers, which are as follows:

[From the Albany Daily Herald, January 29, 1929]

SENATOR HARRIS

The several gentlemen who are reported to be grooming themselves for Senator WILLIAM J. HARRIS's office might do well to put their ears to the ground before spending time and money in an effort to return him to private life. We have no quarrel with those who aspire to high office, but the man who imagines he can beat Senator HARRIS in 1930 is so lacking in judgment that he prejudices his own case. He tempts us to conclude that he is lacking in the qualifications with which a Senator should be endowed.

If opposition to the Senator is to be an echo of 1928, and if his opponent is to base his claim on the vote cast in Georgia last November, a study of the returns will give no comfort to the anti-Harrisites. Senator HARRIS will be reelected in 1930, no matter what the issue or who the challenger.

[From the Adel News]

SENATORS HARRIS AND GEORGE

With no reference whatever to the last national campaign, but solely from the viewpoint of ability and conscientious service to their State and the Nation as well, this paper here and now goes on record as standing squarely with Senators HARRIS and GEORGE should they have opposition for their seats in the United States Senate in the next election, which is some time off now. It would be a sad day for Georgia should she swap them for some of the politicians who have been suggested as their successors. It would be worse than a calamity to the State and to the country.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, January 31, 1929]

THE HARRIS AMENDMENT

A story printed in the Washington Post of Sunday represents Senator HARRIS as offering his now famous $24,000,000 amendment to the deficiency bill for increased prohibition enforcement as a clever move "to mend his political fences in Georgia." The story relates that by the Senator's campaign support of Governor Smith he so alienated the dry anti-Smith Democrats of this State as to put in jeopardy his reelection to the Senate next year, but it says his authorship of this amendment "assures that reelection."

No man in high official life in Georgia for half a century has had a closer hold on his constituents than Senator HARRIS.

In the campaign of last year Senator HARRIS knew perfectly well the character and extent of the Georgia opposition to Governor Smith, and had he been a timid politician with loose principles and chameleon convictions, he easily might have paltered with the situation. Instead he accepted loyally the actions of his party and, like the courageous man that he is, he gave to the party and to its candidates his faithful support. And the State would have been amazed to witness him doing anything less than that.

There was not a moment during the late campaign, nor has there been one since, when the reelection of Senator HARRIS was dubitable. It needed no reenforcement by this $24,000,000 prohibition appropriation or any other. No one in Georgia ever doubted the Senator's conscientious devotion to the prohibition cause and all understand that the appropriation he champions is a sincere nonpolitical and non-

electioneering endeavor to promote the better enforcement of the prohibition law.

He was plenarily fortified in declaring to the Senate that prohibition enforcement, so-called, is an all too palpable "farce," and he is fully justified in putting up to the authorities—the Congress and the administration—whether they are set to continue the great farce or accept some helpful part of the enormous fund they admit will be demanded to secure any very obvious betterment of present conditions.

At least Senator HARRIS has brought the crucial issue face to face with those whose duty it is to make prohibition effective, if that is at all possible. They must now agree with him, accept the proffered aid, or throw up their hands in admitted despair.

As for his support of Governor Smith's candidacy after nomination, that added to the popular esteem for Senator HARRIS instead of derogating from it. He thereby enhanced his reputation as a 100 per cent Democrat who was and is loyal enough to subordinate a personal desire to the demands of the great party of which he is so distinguished and useful a leader.

PRINTED HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. BEERS. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged report from the Committee on Printing, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 48

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the printing act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, empowered to have printed 2,500 additional copies of the hearings held before the committee entitled "Tariff Readjustment, 1929" during the current session.

With the following committee amendments:

In line 6, after the word "the" where it appears for the first time, insert the word "consolidated," and, in line 7, after the word "committee," insert the words "relative to."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEERS. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Can the gentleman inform us, or if not, can the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means inform us, whether the hearings are being printed daily?

Mr. HAWLEY. The daily hearings are being printed daily.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And are they right up with the work there?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes. The hearings of one day will be in printed form the second morning after that day.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, some Members have spoken to me about getting copies of these hearings. There seems to be a misunderstanding on the part of some Members about committee hearings. Some seem to think that they are obtainable at the document room and that they are distributed through that room. I think it well to have the statement go in the RECORD that no committee hearings, except by special order, are ever distributed through the document room or the folding room. They are distributed from the committee rooms themselves. I take it that any Member interested can by going to the Committee on Ways and Means obtain copies of these hearings.

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes. We have been sending them out and will continue to do so so long as the supply lasts. We are taking the full thousand that we are entitled to print. This resolution provides for printing the consolidated hearings, when they are corrected, and they will be available to everybody in the committee room.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. This is the usual resolution?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. On two occasions I have asked for hearings on certain schedules and I been unable to obtain them.

Mr. HAWLEY. At first we thought that 600 copies would be sufficient, but an unprecedented number of witnesses has appeared and the 600 limit was raised to the full thousand.

The question was taken, and the committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMPILATION OF FACTS REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. BEERS. Mr. Speaker, I have another privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 82

Resolved, That the compilation made by M. A. Musmanno from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the facts regarding all amendments of the Constitution of the United States proposed since 1889 be printed as a public document.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

SUITS AGAINST DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3581) to authorize the Commissioners of the District to settle claims against the District of Columbia.

The conference report was read.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3581) entitled "An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by the House insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and empowered to grant relief in claims for refund of taxes paid, or for cancellation of assessments heretofore made and subsequent to September 1, 1916, in such cases where like assessments, or assessments against property of similar character, have been held to be void or erroneous by decision of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, or the Supreme Court of the United States: *Provided*, That any claims for refunds of taxes heretofore paid or for cancellations of assessments heretofore made shall be filed within one year from the approval of this act.

"Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as reducing the period of the statute of limitations."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same.

FREDK. N. ZIHLMAN,
CHARLES L. UNDERHILL,
RALPH GILBERT,
Managers on the part of the House.

ARTHUR CAPPER,
JOHN J. BLAINE,
WILLIAM H. KING,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3581) entitled "An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia," submit the following detailed statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the conference report, namely:

On No. 1: By this amendment the House struck out the section of the Senate bill limiting proceedings to cancel tax assessments or recover taxes paid to one year from the date of the decision of a court of last resort holding void the tax law.

The House amendment limited the time for filing such claims to a period of one year from the approval of the act, but under such amendment the claims to be filed within the year might involve taxes or assessments over an unlimited period of years. On the other hand, the bill as passed by the Senate would allow no relief unless a court of last resort (presumably the Supreme Court of the United States) held the tax law or assessment void. This would not cover cases arising under the so-called Borland law or amendment since September 1, 1916, in which certain assessments for paving or repaving have been held erroneous by the District Supreme Court, the Court of Appeals, or the Supreme Court of the United States.

By the action of the conferees the Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House No. 1, and agrees to the same with an amendment limiting the claims to be filed within a year from the approval of the act to those involving taxes or assessments since September 1, 1916, the date of the Borland amendment or law. This puts a practical limitation on the claims to be handled by the commissioners, and is in accordance with the recommendation of the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia. Passage of the bill, so amended, will afford relief to those who have been unjustly taxed or assessed and discriminated against, as determined in other cases of like character by the courts.

On No. 2: The bill as reported to the Senate by its District of Columbia Committee limited settlements by the District Commissioners to $5,000 in amount. The Senate, in passing the bill, reduced the amount to $3,000. The House, by its amendment No. 2, restored the amount of authorized settlement to $5,000, which is in accordance with the bill as originally drafted by the District Commissioners and the corporation counsel, and also the general policy of Congress with respect to claims against the Government. By action of the conferees, the Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House No. 2, and agrees to the same.

FREDK. N. ZIHLMAN,
CHARLES L. UNDERHILL,
RALPH GILBERT,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, which I have no desire to do, can the gentleman give any information as to the prospect of getting legislation completed in reference to condemnation proceedings in the District of Columbia?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will say to the gentleman that the House has already passed that legislation. The House committee appointed a subcommittee to follow that legislation in the Senate. The Senate have agreed to the bill with some slight amendments, which I understand are acceptable to the corporation counsel and attorney for the Department of Justice. My understanding is that the bill is on the Senate Calendar, amending the code providing for condemnation in the District of Columbia.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is some one following it up and making some effort to get it to us?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The District Committee of the House have had a subcommittee wait upon the Senators composing the District of Columbia Committee and have enlisted their cooperation in agreeing on a bill which I understand is now on the Senate Calendar.

Mr. CRAMTON. That applies to purchases for the District of Columbia and not for the Federal Government?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. This is for the Federal Government. In addition the Senate has reported a bill changing the method for the District of Columbia government. The bill passed by the House and amended by the Senate applies to purchases by the Government.

Mr. CRAMTON. Both of these bills are of great importance.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. And the committee has been following up the legislation in every possible way.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

JOHN W. STOCKETT

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 2319, to disagree to the Senate amendments, and that the conferees be appointed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2319) for the relief of John W. Stockett.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman from Kansas give us some idea about this situation? It is my recollection of it that the Senate bill raised this allowance far beyond the agreement arrived at by the House. What is the fact?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. The Senate raised it to $142,500. The House reduced it and put on an amendment limiting the attorney's fee to 10 per cent.

Mr. CRAMTON. What is the provision as to the attorney's fee in the Senate bill?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Nothing.

Mr. CRAMTON. The House bill fixed $50,000 as the amount of the claim, and the Senate raised the amount to $142,500. There seems to be nothing to prevent the extra $100,000 going to the attorney. Is the gentleman from Kansas in a position to give any assurance to the House as to the attitude of the conferees?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. The War Claims Committee by a unanimous vote requested the conferees that might be appointed from that committee to insist on the House amendment. If I am on the conference, I shall do that.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is it not a fact that after the passage of this bill by the House the person involved has made a statement to the effect that he was perfectly satisfied with the amount carried in the House bill?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I am advised by the clerk of the Senate committee that they have a signed statement from the claimant that he is willing to accept the House amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the House should accept a provision to pay $142,500, with no limitation as to the attorney's fee, you might as well go out of the business of having a War Claims Committee or a Claims Committee and pass these bills as the Senate demands. But I am so well satisfied that the House conferees will not yield to that sort of legislation that I shall not object.

Mr. SNELL. Is this the bill concerning which common rumor says that as it passed the Senate it carries three times the amount the claimant would have been satisfied with?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I am not prepared to answer that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I suppose all this is going into the RECORD. Referring to the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], I do not know anything about a private agreement; but from the record itself, the official record of the committee and of the Congress, there certainly is no indication that anywhere a bill was put through for more than the claimant thought he was entitled to; but, on the contrary, the claimant believes that he was entitled to three times as much as is contained in the bill, and measured by the amount paid upon other patents of a similar character, his claim would lie.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman from Kansas yield in order that I may answer the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Whatever may be the equitable amount due to the claimant, under a bill that has no limitation as to attorney's fees, there is no certainty as to what the claimant himself will get. Does the gentleman from Tennessee think that it is a safe or proper practice for Congress now to adopt, to pass a claims bill with no limitations on the attorney's fee?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well, Mr. Speaker, I see no real necessity for answering that question——

Mr. CRAMTON. Not a particle of necessity——

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. But I will say that I do not think that Congress ought to interfere with a contract. However, the attorney's fee question is not involved in this request to go to conference. The only reason why I have interposed was that this claim must not be prejudiced by remarks, not made by the gentleman from Michigan, but by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], that the bill has been lobbied through for three times as much as the claimant wanted.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I want to say that the Supreme Court in the Massey case held that the Congress could fix the rate for attorney's fees.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Why do you not have it fixed in all cases? You ought to have a general law.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am willing to make it general.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will yield further, the practice is well established, so far as I know, as to all of these claims. For instance, we discussed it at length on Wednesday in connection with Indian claims, where it has been settled that 10 per cent should be the limit, and we have considered going further than that in some cases and providing that in no event should the amount be over $25,000.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. What I am suggesting is that we ought to pass a general statute as to all these claims, providing a maximum fee, if you desire, and a minimum fee, so that it will apply to all bills alike. We discussed this in the Ways and Means Committee with reference to certain limitations, the report having come to Congress that claims for tax refunds are costing the taxpayers 50 per cent of their refunds and some of them running as high as $300,000 and $400,000 on one claim. It seems to me it will not be long before Congress will have to take charge and see whether a taxpayer is overcharged for the services of an attorney, so it seems to me Congress should take a comprehensive view of it and pass a general statute as to applications for refunds out of the Treasury and for appropriations out of the Treasury by Congress.

Mr. CRAMTON. As far as I am concerned, I am not disposed to oppose any such limitation, however broad it is, but until that good time arrives I do not want to see any claim bill go through without a limitation, and it has this much weight with me, that if I did not fully trust the committee that is going to have charge of it in conference and feel sure they would not permit the bill to go through as it passed the Senate, I should object to its going to conference at all.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STRONG of Kansas, SINCLAIR, and LOWREY.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS MEMORIAL LIGHTHOUSE AT SANTO DOMINGO

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs on House Joint Resolution 354, authorizing the appropriation of the sum of $871,655 as the contribution of the United States toward the Chistopher Columbus Memorial Lighthouse at Santo Domingo.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to file a supplemental report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs on House Joint Resolution 354, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Were any minority views filed?

Mr. PORTER. No. I will say for the information of the gentleman that some question arose as to the cost of maintaining this memorial after it was constructed. I received information yesterday from the Dominican Government that it was perfectly willing to pay all the expenses of maintenance, and that is what I have put in the supplemental report.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. This is a memorial to Christopher Columbus?

Mr. PORTER. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Who was not a Nordic.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KNUTSON, at the request of Mr. CLAGUE, on account of sickness.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee did on this day present to the President for his approval bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 9570. An act to provide for the transfer of the returns office from the Interior Department to the General Accounting Office, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11859. An act for the relief of B. C. Miller; and

H. J. Res. 350. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Frederick A. Delano and Irwin B. Laughlin as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 2, 1929, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Saturday, February 2, 1929, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To authorize and direct the Secretary of War to execute a lease with Air Nitrates Corporation and American Cyanamid Co. (H. R. 8305).

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

(10 a. m.)

Continuing the powers and authority of the Federal Radio Commission under the radio act of 1927 (H. R. 15430).

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

(10.30 a. m.)

To authorize the establishment of a national hydraulic laboratory in the Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce and the construction of a building therefor (S. 1710).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

796. A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting report and recommendation to the Congress concerning the claim of Clyde H. Tavenner for the refund of the unused portion of money deposited by him with the Public Printer for the printing of speeches in 1916 when he was a Member of Congress; to the Committee on Claims.

797. A letter from the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting detailed statement of the business of the Washington Gas Light Co., with a list of its stockholders, for the year ending December 31, 1928; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. NEWTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 5452. An act to amend the trading with the enemy act so as to extend the time within which claims may be filed with the Alien Property Custodian; without amendment (Rept. No. 2323). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MORROW: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 5146. An act to reserve certain lands on the public domain in Santa Fe County, N. Mex., for the use and benefit of the Indians of the San Ildefonso Pueblo; without amendment (Rept. No. 2324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 5147. An act to reserve 920 acres on the public domain for the use and benefit of the Kanosh Band of Indians residing in the vicinity of Kanosh, Utah; with amendment (Rept. No. 2325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McSWAIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 16451. A bill to provide for the inspection of the battle field of Star Fort, S. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2326). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. S. J. Res. 182. A joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the storm and flood stricken areas of Southeastern United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2327). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. S. J. Res. 111. A joint resolution authorizing the acceptance of title to certain lands in the counties of Benton and Walla Walla, Wash., adjacent to the Columbia River bird refuge in said State established in accordance with the authority contained in Executive Order No. 4501, dated August 28, 1926; without amendment (Rept. No. 2328). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 14938. A bill to provide for the use of net weights in interstate and foreign commerce transactions in cotton, to provide for the standardization of bale covering for cotton, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2329). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WATRES: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 16131. A bill to enable the Postmaster General to make contracts for the transportation of mails by air from island possessions of the United States to foreign countries and to the United States and between such island possessions, and to authorize him to make contracts with private individuals and corporations for the conveyance of mails by air in foreign countries; with amendment (Rept. No. 2330). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GIBSON: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 13752. A bill to provide for the construction of a children's tuberculosis sanatorium; with amendment (Rept. No. 2341). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 15440. A bill for the relief of Frank Yarlott; with amendment (Rept. No. 2322). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 13258. A bill for the relief of H. L. Redlingshafer for payments made in official capacity disallowed by the General Accounting Office; without amendment (Rept. No. 2333). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 15635. A bill for the relief of George A. Hormel & Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2334). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. S. 4890. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the Gallup Undertaking Co. for burial of four Navajo Indians; without

amendment (Rept. No. 2335). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. S. 1338. An act for the relief of James E. Jenkins; without amendment (Rept. No. 2336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWBOTTOM: Committee on Claims. H. R. 14910. A bill for the relief of Cary Dawson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GUYER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 15421. A bill for the relief of D. B. Heiner; without amendment (Rept. No. 2339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 16122. A bill for the relief of E. Schaaf-Regelman; without amendment (Rept. No. 2340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BUSHONG: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9519. A bill for the relief of David McD. Shearer; without amendment (Rept. No. 2331). Laid on the table.

Mr. BUSHONG: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11494. A bill for the relief of Marijune Cron; without amendment (Rept. No. 2332). Laid on the table.

Mr. BUSHONG: Committee on Claims. S. 1442. An act for the relief of Brewster Agee; adverse (Rept. No. 2337). Laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16181) for the relief of Petro Melazzo; Committee on Appropriations discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 16745) for the relief of Pasquale Mirabelli; Committee on Appropriations discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 16791) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near Point Marion, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STOBBS: A bill (H. R. 16792) to amend sections 599, 600, and 601 of subchapter 3 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 16793) to provide for the continued employment of certain research specialists beyond the age of retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 16794) to amend the act entitled "An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1925; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NEWTON: A bill (H. R. 16795) to amend the third proviso of section 202 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 16796) to suppress unfair and fraudulent practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 400) to require the Secretary of War to return to the several States from which they were carried away as spoils of war the muster rolls and other records of their citizens in the war between the States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York; Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 401) providing for a joint committee to investigate and report upon the facts governing the administration of justice in bankruptcy and equity receivership cases in the United States District Courts of the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ABERNETHY: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 52) for the appointment of a committee of the House and Senate to cooperate with the New Bern Historical Society and a committee of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina in the observance of certain historical events which occurred during the Colonial and Revolutionary period at New Bern, N. C.; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, indorsing and urging the passage of the cruiser bill now pending in Congress; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SELVIG: Concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, approved January 25, 1929, memorializing the Congress that it is the sense of the members of the Minnesota Legislature that an adequate agricultural tariff be enacted at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEWTON: Memorial of the State of Minnesota, favoring readjustment of tariff schedules affecting agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALDRICH: A bill (H. R. 16797) granting a pension to Frank A. Russell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BUSHONG: A bill (H. R. 16798) granting a pension to Sarah E. Reinert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 16799) granting a pension to Henry Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 16800) for the relief of the State of Vermont; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 16801) for the relief of J. P. Boland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOOPER: A bill (H. R. 16802) granting a pension to Rebecca Ruth Bartram; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 16803) granting an increase of pension to Geraldine Wheatley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McSWEENEY: A bill (H. R. 16804) granting a pension to Mary L. Sumney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16805) granting a pension to Margaret Frizzell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 16806) granting a pension to Maude A. Sarbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16807) granting an increase of pension to Hester Benjamin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 16808) granting a pension to Charlye H. Lannert; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: A bill (H. R. 16809) granting a pension to Idella F. Lemmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 16810) granting a pension to Ida Van Loan McWhood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16811) granting a pension to Lizzie F. Briggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16812) granting an increase of pension to Susannah Finkle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 16813) for the relief of William Henry Tittle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16814) for the relief of William McKinley Laws; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16815) for the relief of Walter F. Kirchoff; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16816) to correct the military record of John J. Mullen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 16817) granting a pension to Ruth E. Dillman; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

8525. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of residents of Coalinga, Calif., indorsing House bill 14462, proposing a tariff of $1 per barrel on crude oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8526. By Mr. BOYLAN: Petition of retail shoe dealers, opposing any change in present tariff rates of hides and leather used in manufacture of shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8527. By Mr. BULWINKLE: Petition of W. G. Thompson and others, of Charlotte, N. C.; to the committee on Ways and Means.

8528. By Mr. CONNERY: Resolution of City Council of Peabody, Mass., for placing a tariff on finished leather; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8529. By Mr. GARNER of Texas: Resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas, requesting appropriate legislation for return of certain war records to the States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8530. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Resolution of the Texas Legislature, favoring a fair and adequate tariff on all products of farm and ranch; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8531. Also, resolution of the Texas Legislature favoring the return of the Confederate records to each of the States relative to the military service of their citizens in the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8532. By Mr. KVALE: Petition adopted at a mass meeting under auspices of Cooperative Livestock Shipping Association, Willmar, Minn., on January 29, 1929, and presented by O. B. Augustson, chairman of committee, urging prompt enactment by Congress of legislation to provide for adequate supervision of weights and grades of livestock at all direct buying points; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8533. Also, petition of national legislative committee, Veterans of Foreign Wars, by T. M. Thomson, a member, Minneapolis, Minn., urging prompt and favorable action by Congress on House bill 14676; to the Committee on Pensions.

8534. Also, petition of Julia R. Johnston and Eva Norris, Sophia L. Rice Auxiliary, No. 10, Willmar, Minn., urging enactment of legislation increasing pensions for disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War, also for their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Pensions.

8535. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Reserve Officers' Association of the city of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring sufficient appropriation to provide for the training of 26,000 reserve officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8536. Also, petition of Seldner & Enequist (Inc.), and sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for passage of Senate bill 1271, known as the Norbeck bird conservation bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8537. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of J. Lawrence Fox, Howard A. Kelly, Mrs. J. Bannister Hall, jr., Edwin G. Baetger, jr., Sifford Pearre, Bertram N. Bruestle, J. W. Lindan, Douglas Gorman, William Cunningham, and Glen F. Kahn, all of Baltimore, Md.; Raymond M. D. Adams, Port Deposit, Md.; and Dr. Henry Barton Jacobs, and D. G. McIntosh, jr., Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8538. By Mr. McCORMACK: Petition of Mrs. John J. Broderick, Miss Marie A. Broderick, and Mrs. Charles Flynn, 69 Roseclair Street, Dorchester, Mass., protesting against the so-called Newton maternity bill and the equal rights bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8539. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of C. A. Week, Fieldston, New York City, favoring the passage of the Norbeck game refuge bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8540. Also, petition of Mrs. Paul C. Ranson, Miami, Fla., favoring the passage of the Norbeck game refuge bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8541. Also, petition of the General Federation of Womens Clubs, favoring the passage of the Norbeck game refuge bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8542. By Mr. PRATT: Petition of history department of the Monticello, Sullivan County, N. Y., high school, favoring approval of the cruiser bill and adequate appropriations to enforce the prohibition law; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

8543. By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: Petition of George Boysen, Boysen Shoe Co., and residents of Cedar Falls, Iowa, regarding tariff on hides and leather; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8544. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of W. E. Mitchell, J. A. Brown, et al., of Union Township drainage district, La Grange, Mo.; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

8545. By Mr. SELVIG: Resolution of the McCrea Farmers' Club, Mrs. E. H. Brown, secretary, of Warren, Minn., that Congress enact a farm-relief measure at an early date; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8546. Also, resolution of the Warrenton Community Club, Warren, Minn., that Congress enact a farm-relief measure at an early date; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8547. Also, resolution of the Joe River Farmers' Club, St. Vincent, Minn., representing 30,000 acres of land, signed by J. W. Brown, president, and John Anderson, secretary, that Congress enact a farm-relief measure at an early date; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8548. Also, resolution of the Boxville Farmers' Club, signed by Mrs. George E. Willey (secretary), M. W. Munger, Elmer Erickson, John L. Dalquist, and others, of Warren, Minn., that Congress enact a farm-relief measure at an early date; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

SATURDAY, *February 2, 1929*

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 31, 1929)

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had adopted a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 48) to provide for the printing of 2,500 copies of the consolidated hearings on "Tariff readjustment, 1929," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3581) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16301) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WASON, Mr. SUMMERS of Washington, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CULLEN, and Mr. VINSON of Kentucky were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2319) for the relief of John W. Stockett, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STRONG of Kansas, Mr. SINCLAIR, and Mr. LOWREY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

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

H. R. 6864. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to require steamship companies to carry the mail when tendered;

H. R. 13414. An act to amend section 1396 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relative to the appointment of chaplains in the Navy;

H. R. 13507. An act to amend section 3 of Public Act No. 230 (37 Stat. L. p. 194);

H. R. 14920. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Wisconsin to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Rock River at or near Center Avenue, Janesville, Rock County, Wis.;

H. R. 15324. An act authorizing the attendance of the Marine Band at the Confederate veterans' reunion to be held at Charlotte, N. C.;

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to cooperate with the other relief creditor governments in making it possible for Austria to float a loan in order to obtain funds for the furtherance of its reconstruction program, and to conclude an agreement for the settlement of the indebtedness of Austria to the United States; and

S. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the city of New York to enter upon certain United States property for the purpose of constructing a rapid transit railway.

SALES OF FOREIGN MANUFACTURED LEATHER (S. DOC. NO. 217)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 169 of March 19, 1928, a report relative to the extent of the sales of foreign manufactured leather from goat skins and kid skins in the United States since January 1, 1925, and the rates of wages paid workers in the tanning of black and colored kid in the United States and competing countries, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.